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Abstract:
This article examines entrepreneurial identity in both the Pakistan and China to develop a deeper and more holistic understanding of the concept of entrepreneurial identity through the lenses of identity theory and social identity theory. By examining the entrepreneur as both a role and an identity, this article explores how an entrepreneur views the entrepreneur's role, the entrepreneur's counter-roles, and the "self-as-entrepreneur" and seeks to understand how entrepreneurs build their identity as an entrepreneur. A more nuanced view of entrepreneurial identity can be explored for entrepreneurs in both the Pakistan and China by looking at the role identity in different social constructs. The study argues that Pakistan entrepreneurs use counter-roles to bridge the gap between their perception of entrepreneur-as-role and self-entrepreneur, while China's entrepreneurs have less struggle to reconcile the two and use counter-role as a way to paint "calling" entrepreneurship, justifying their abandonment of other identities.
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Introduction:
It has been argued that entrepreneurs are so as to be a person in their world because of a distinct need to stand out in their society (Oyserman et al. 2002; Teal and Carroll 1999). Consequently, this direction and these identities can be built and perceived differently on the basis of the social constructs in which the entrepreneur lives and works. This study aims to understand further how entrepreneurs with similar levels of early-stage entrepreneurial activity in the Pakistan and China (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, 2016), but different levels of cultural and institutional support for entrepreneurship, develop the entrepreneur's position by analyzing their own discourse. This explores this through the lens of position identity (identity theory) and as a group member (social identity theory) by exploring the vocabulary they use when addressing their business identity. It seeks to understand how entrepreneurs perceive the role of the entrepreneur, hereafter referred to as "entrepreneur-as-role." This understanding can explain the study, since the business concepts associated with being an entrepreneur (Lundqvist et al., 2015) that vary in different cultures and thus influence the actions of an entrepreneur in alternative ways. It will then look at how entrepreneurs understand each other in this situation, having assumed the role of the "builder" (Donnellon et al., 2014) without mentors in the workplace on whom they could model themselves and having only defined the role separately. This will be defined as "self-as-entrepreneur." The counter-role feature (Ibarra, 1999; Thoits and Virshup, 1997) is analyzed to understand
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better how counter-role understanding feeds into entrepreneurial identity. These counter-roles are then followed by an understanding of the identities that entrepreneurs felt they needed to give up in an attempt to embrace a business identity in an attempt to understand the core essence of the business identity. The aim of exploring these ideas is to understand further how entrepreneurs in the Pakistan and China view their entrepreneurial identity through their rhetoric and decide how this strengthens the stratifications used to categorize the definition of identity.

Theory:

Identity Theories

Identity creation may refer to a person's ability in physical, functional, and social capacities to establish, negotiate, and sustain an identity. Personal identity can be said to underlie certain forms of identity, which is a general view of the self (Deaux, 1992). This self, as we communicate with the world from our embodied selves and can not separate the self from its embodiment, could be argued to be linked to embodiment (Archer, 2000). Acceptance of a person being able to define themselves as an object and name / classify themselves accordingly is viewed differently by the theory of social identity, which maintains that this phase is self-categorization, and by the theory of identity, which calls it self-identification.

Individuals can be criticized for seeing themselves through their society's prism of definitions (McCall and Simmons, 1978). A social identity comes from identifying with a particular group—identifying with that group, expressing their beliefs, and upholding that identity when contrasting their group "in" with other groups "out." Uniformity with a specific group is an important aspect of group-based identity and can be oriented on mental (e.g. social stereotyping), attitude (e.g. group loyalty) and behavioral factors (Haslam et al., 1996). In a group-based identity, in order to form the identity, only the perceptions of the individual are involved; the individual does not necessarily need to interact with the group (Turner et al., 1987).

Identity theory puts an emphasis on the ability to categorize the self as a role-occupier and to integrate the meanings and expectations thereto within the self (Burke and Tully, 1977; Thoits, 1986). Role identity has its basis in differences in perceptions of a particular role as it relates to “counter-roles.” Individuals negotiate meanings from contexts and personalities, then define their own significance and perception of a role, relate the role to counter roles around them, and then adapt their acts to reflect and maintain those roles (Thoits and Virshup, 1997). This theory suggests that people are distinct from others they associate with. In comparison to other roles, the role of a person is seen, but as distinct from those roles. The individuals who play counter-roles are crucial to the creation of their role identity by the individual in the role-based identity theory. When negotiating a position, contact with others is important.

Since an individual has many positions or identities, knowing how an individual prioritizes them within the self is important. A key element in an individual's identity hierarchy is centrality verses salience. Centrality refers to the emphasis a person places on a focal identity in relation to other identities (an individual's reflection on their identities). In the theory of social identity, salience refers to the willingness to assume a certain social identity to manipulate a group (Oakes, 1987), whereas the theory of role identity refers to an individual's willingness to trigger an identity in a given situation (Stryker, 2002). Therefore, for several reasons, a person may become an entrepreneur, but consider other positions or group identities as being more important to their self, while others may prioritize the entrepreneurs.

Entrepreneurial identity

In the literature, constructing an entrepreneurial identity is related to identity building theory in that a person develops, explores, and incorporates a "test" self into a new role which they develop for themselves (e.g., Ibarra, 1999). Built on Archer's (2000), Kasheperovera and Kitching (2014) embody identity theory to discern the
embodiment element of entrepreneurial identity they argue is often ignored in research into entrepreneurial identity.

Social norms may play a major role in establishing this as-yet-unknown role while creating a new company, and as such, Donnellon et al. (2014) argue, the business image associated with a professional role as a creator. In a literature review, Donnellon et al. (2014) found that the most common way to build an entrepreneurial identity is through storytelling and narrative formation (e.g. Jones et al., 2008), a social constructivist approach (Fletcher, 2003). Farmer et al. (2011) proposed a model that connects entrepreneurial position with self-perceptions, desire for entrepreneurial identity, and entrepreneurial behaviour. Several studies have underpinned entrepreneurial behaviors with attitudes and characteristics, including creativity / innovation, comfort with risk and uncertainty, positive temperament, constructive competition, and self-efficacy (Covin and Slevin, 1989; Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Ratten, 2014; Wiklund, 1999).

**Literature review**

It has been argued that entrepreneurial identity is an influential identity that motivates individuals to take on business roles (Murnieks and Mosakowski, 2007). The interpretation of these positions can be influenced by social forces, such that before the person negotiates and identifies with an entrepreneurial identity, an individual must construct the role of "entrepreneur." In line with this, the effect of a negative initial entrepreneurial experience on the creation of an entrepreneurial identity was explored by Newbery et al. (2018). Individuals also need to find a way to match this identification with their current positions and social identities (Williams Middleton, 2013), which can be a venture-building challenge where no established team or position can be available to assist the entrepreneur in setting up a new company. Rae (2006) argues that the development of an entrepreneurial identity is both a social process and a theoretical process involving the simultaneous creation of a new business.

Bygrave and Hofer (1991) argued that entrepreneurship should be seen not as an isolated activity, but as a social process. Rigg and O'Dwyer (2012) have described becoming an entrepreneur when it comes to using social interactions to become part of a "community of practice." Lundqvist et al. (2015) argue that role descriptions often associated with an entrepreneur who is experienced in their immediate environment can help shape the behavior of the entrepreneur by showing them what they should do.

Pellinen (2014) found along this line that an entrepreneur uses network interactions to understand the value of their own assets in their business, suggesting a new group identity. Hoang and Gimeno (2010) looked at the process of becoming an entrepreneur through a role transfer lens to argue that individuals face challenges by attaching an organization founder's position to their overall self-concept, where conflicting identities that lie. Shepherd and Haynie (2009) conclude that in order to mitigate the dueling forces of inclusiveness and individuality, entrepreneurs need to manage multiple "micro-identities" and that those who are unable to balance these factors risk a decline in their overall sense of well-being. Such micro-identities arise from an individual's multiple roles, i.e., the role they play in work, family, social circles, etc.

Shepherd and Haynie (2009) argue that entrepreneurs need to manage multiple "micro-identities" in order to mitigate the dueling powers of inclusiveness and individuality and that those unable to balance these factors face a decline in their overall sense of well-being. These micro-identities emerge from the multiple roles of a person, i.e., their position in work, community, social circles, and so on.

The theory of identity focuses on social-relational structures and the relationship between people; the theory of social identity focuses on the characteristics of contexts where the identity can be activated; both theories recognize the importance of the interests and intentions of the person. Thus you can consider an understanding of the conditions for an identity's likelihood and actual activation.
The above-mentioned research focuses on entrepreneurial identity, whereas most of the work comes from countries that may argue for having a different approach to entrepreneurship than China, a newcomer to the market-based economy. Thus, in China, the construction of an entrepreneurial identity may look different from the countries examined in the literature above. Even among Western nations, strategies vary, as demonstrated by studies exploring how a state and its respective institutions encourage entrepreneurship and development (e.g., the National Development System Framework of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development).

There are few entrepreneurial identity papers specifically focused on China, but the above-mentioned work may not capture the creation of an entrepreneurial identity in China entirely. Yao et al. (2016) proposed that while "entrepreneur models" (characteristics and behaviors) have parallels across cultures in China, Taiwan, and the United States, there are also enough cultural differences to demonstrate a relationship to the individual values of a country and its access to entrepreneurship.

In the 1990s, there was support for privatization and state-owned business reform. Unlike many Western and developed countries, China's emphasis on manufacturing has remained a strong contributor to its economy, with

Table 1. Summary of respondents’ entrepreneurial ventures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial venture</th>
<th>Years as an entrepreneur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 1</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Custom-made business management software</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 2</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Database services and management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 3</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Online real estate services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 4</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Property development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 5</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Accessory design and sales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 6</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>High-tech home appliance design and development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 7</td>
<td>Business Support</td>
<td>Leadership and mentoring consultancy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 8</td>
<td>Business Support</td>
<td>Business and technology consultancy and support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 9</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Corporate auto rental service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan 10</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Agro-tech farming development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN 1</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Business Support</td>
<td>Business to business industry news reporting and business incubation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN 2</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Auto component design and development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN 3</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>IOS and Android app developer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN 4</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Language training and tutoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN 5</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Data and technology analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN 6</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Group gaming experiences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN 7</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Filtration system design and development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN 8</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics graduate recruitment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN 9</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>IOS and Android app developer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN 10</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Digital advertising</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
different focus areas, as Orr and Roth (2012) pointed out, relying more on rapid advertising and less on studying and recognizing its customer base than other market-driven economies that foster entrepreneurship and innovation.

The theory and literature review, therefore, underlie the following research questions to be examined: How do entrepreneurs perceive the role of the "entrepreneur" (the role of the entrepreneur)? How does this position (self-as-entrepreneur) define entrepreneurs? What is the counter-role function in defining the identification (counter-roles) of the entrepreneur? What have the entrepreneurs abandoned in their identity to give salience to the business identity (manage other identities)?

Methodology

This work has followed a qualitative inductive approach in order to provide a detailed account of the opinions of the entrepreneurs. This article does not attempt to form an underlying theory of entrepreneurial identity with the assumption that roles and identities can be influenced by social contexts (Hytti, 2005). Alternatively, the emphasis is placed on an entrepreneur's array of interrelated and subjective understandings of their position and identity within their own frameworks and validity (Ussher, 1999). This work considers facts as subjective constructions (Berger and Luckmann, 1991) based on an individual's interpretations (Gergen, 2015). For entrepreneurial identity analysis, this approach has been used (see Kasperova and Kitching, 2014). The authors have not established a priori theories or coding, but have tried to understand phenomena based on interview observation (Dana and Dana, 2005).

For this study, a total of 20 interviews were conducted, 10 in the Pakistan, which is argued to follow the "Anglo-American" model of how its entrepreneurs could take an invention to the market (dispersed ownership, market-centered) (Organization in Economic Cooperation and Development, 1997) and 10 in China, whose model is not described as such, but where the market and individual owner are concerned. The businessmen interviewed were all founders of a company they are still operating. Participants are chosen through the universities of researchers based on professional connections. Both interviewees agreed to participate and were told that they would retain their privacy. The overview of the companies of the businessmen can be seen in Table 1.

Since researchers in the Pakistan and China conducted the interviews, the researchers asked the questions in the same order in a semi-structured manner. The questions have been designed to allow participants to discuss issues that would provide
responses to the research questions as a whole. The researchers asked the interviewees at certain points to explain their responses and provide more information. The interviews took place in the Pakistan in English and in China in Chinese.

The questions were initially written in English and all the authors accepted. They were then properly translated, after which the questions were reviewed by one of the bilingual researchers to ensure that they expressed the same meaning. In order to understand how participants perceived the "entrepreneur-as-role," interviewees were asked to explore what they considered to be an entrepreneur. Participants were then asked if participants thought they were an entrepreneur to differentiate them from others in order to understand how they regarded themselves vis-a-vis the word "entrepreneur," in order to understand the "self-as-entrepreneur." Finally, they were asked which aspects of their personality they felt had to be lost to assume the role of entrepreneur.

Interviews were reported and lasted about three-quarters of an hour. The recordings were later transcribed by a professional translation service and translated into English. A bilingual researcher who was present at the Chinese interviews to ensure accuracy verified these translations. The data were coded and analyzed using a thematic analysis of discourse to define information trends and patterns (Braun and Clarke, 2013). This study attempted to build an understanding of entrepreneurial identity based on the experiences of entrepreneurs, while allowing for the "multiplicity of interrelated, subjective, and often oppositional understandings" (Taylor and Ussher, 2001: 295) that entrepreneurs, especially those from different countries, may have about their identities seeking to understand how they create their identities. (Berger and Luckmann, 1967).

The study paid attention to the discursive features of the language used in the interviews in order to better understand how the participants built their views on the topics. The research was informed by vocabulary, word choice, and voice, with coding based on interpreting the interviewee's use of words. Therefore, the findings presented by nation will illustrate facets of entrepreneurial identity not necessarily associated with existing literature but expanding existing entrepreneurial identity narratives. In line with thematic discourse analysis, the meaning is derived from the language used, rather than from the language used that represents current meanings (Braun and Clarke, 2013).
discourse analysis revealed through interpretive repertoires in which participants made sense of their company identity (see description of Table 2). The following sections are more detailed in analyzing the responses.

Data analysis and results

Pakistan

Businessman-as-role. The PAKISTAN study participants' debate revealed an appreciation of the entrepreneur's position in two main ways—as a stereotype, or an archetype of "greater than life," and as an innovator of risk-taking. When asked to describe who they think is an entrepreneur, most respondents used a metaphor to construct the third person, concentrating on characteristics. There has been an emphasis on the businessman's infallibility; the businessman is someone who always lands on his feet. Iconic entrepreneurs, like Richard Branson, have been named as examples. It, however, was applied equally to criminal actors, attention hunters, and a tv character in a soap opera that was known to always look for the next way to make money from others.

The terminology used created the idea through both positive and negative ways that they are able to do what others are unable to do. The position assumes an almost larger person than life who goes down a different road and displays rough independence. They were described by their wits as living by a different set of behavioral rules. Warren (2004) pointed out Hobbs (1991)'s research that the word "entrepreneur" had been considered more negative before the 1980s and was often associated with an eccentric and odd personality rather than having a more modern connection with supporting a country's economy's growth.

The debate often gravitated to the risk and the relationship of an entrepreneur with it, again concentrating on their explanations on a trait. During the interviews, Hazard was an overall marker. The entrepreneur-as-role wasn't just someone who could rationalize and quantify risk; it's someone who's inspired and excited about it. In a way that others are unable to create new ideas, better lives, and develop systems, the entrepreneur is able to use risk. The desire to excel mitigates the risk. The entrepreneur is identified by Pakistan 8 as "Brave and wants to step out of routine, who sees risk as an exciting challenge" and Pakistan 4 as having "a clear vision... a mission which inspires them." This supports research suggesting that social environments play a role in creating a position (Hytti, 2005) and that established entrepreneurial attitudes and characteristics can influence how the entrepreneur-as-role is generated through the inter-role.

Self-as-contractor. The interviewees, however, know themselves and identify themselves differently from the businessman-as-role as an entrepreneur. This causes a disconnection between the entrepreneur-as-role construct and the self-as-entrepreneur's job identity. Initially, the participants often seemed uncomfortable with describing themselves as an entrepreneur, with interview participants frequently denying that they were "really an' entrepreneur'" at the beginning of their discussion on the topic. Pakistan 5 said that he thought of himself as an entrepreneur, "I just don't like it at all."

Nevertheless, later in the talk, after making their frustration clear with the term, the interviewees were able to describe in great detail what made them distinct in the self-entrepreneur. The self-as-entrepreneur embodied the entrepreneur-as-role in different ways. Although risk was described as an entrepreneur-as-role hallmark, when defining the self-as-entrepreneur, the risk was contextualized. Paramount in the debate was the overwhelming essence of personal responsibility. While the entrepreneur-as-role is cunning and capable of taking risks and coming out on top, the day-to-day obligations that surround it weigh down the self-as-entrepreneur. The terminology became more precise, relating to loans, accounting and money management, and how many stakeholders, including staff, vendors, consumers, and investors, could be held accountable. The language also became more focused on the consequences of failure for the entrepreneur-as-self, indicating that the interviewees might have felt as if their self-as-entrepreneur persona had been embodied without any guidance to see them through it. Pakistan 6 spoke about having a big responsibility for "120 staff, clients, lesso suppliers, but you need a good working atmosphere. It's a big load on you. I hope it never goes wrong. "So the salience for the organization's self-seeming to come from the organization's" care-taker "position.
The debate also centered on another trait of innovativeness that was stated in entrepreneurial attitude and trait study. The interviewees described the self-contractor as able to question things with an eye to change them. In this description, there was a subtle difference from the archetype entrepreneur's previous definition, which was described as creating new things and processes. The self-as-business person portrayed the characteristic increasingly like a scrutinizing examiner who takes a gander at enhancements instead of at brave innovation. The language depicted it as an attribute that couldn't be "killed." Pakistan 2 portrayed "improving the wheel instead of rethinking it," and Pakistan 10 said they take a gander at everything and state, "For what reason would they say they are doing it that way? They are burning through so much time!"

Against functions. The "they are" used in the entrepreneur-as-role description became "I am" in the counter-roles description. The debate suggested that the counter-role was how the interview subjects reconciled their association with the entrepreneur-as-role rather than the self-as-entrepreneur. The non-entrepreneur has an easily understood job role that blends into an "ordinary" position such as a student or an employee. The non-entrepreneur is depicted as being able to easily switch between these positions, losing the role of the worker at the end of the day and picking it up the next time. For the non-entrepreneur, the only real decision is whether to go to work or not, and the only outcome of the wrong decision is that they would not be compensated. The non-entrepreneur's inspiration is daily paycheck.

In their own need to take on many jobs without a clear description, the entrepreneurs interpreted this as their unwillingness to shed their position as an entrepreneur, always taking it home with them, working around the clock, even though they were only talking about new processes and ideas. This relentless imagination does not overwhelm the non-entrepreneur who turns to others to solve problems. "We want the nine-to-five's protection, while entrepreneurs depend on themselves almost exclusively," said Pakistan 4. Pakistan 6 described them as "strong but not easy to fit in."

In this counter-role, the entrepreneur may show some of the ingenuity and autonomy that they see in themselves without following the model in the entrepreneur-as-role definition of the 6 International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation XX(X). The interviews indicate that the counter-role, where salience was seen in being cared for — regular paychecks and other-set schedules — was a compliment to the institution's self-as-entrepreneur association with being responsible and an institution caretaker.

The vocabulary indicated confusion when the interviewees tried to identify themselves as entrepreneurs, but the use of a counter-role to define and appreciate the self-as-entrepreneur seems to mitigate. The interviewees can demonstrate that by defining the non-entrepreneur as motivated by regular paycheck, they are motivated by more than money. When comparing it with the non-entrepreneur's desire just to come to work and do things as told, they may describe themselves as imaginative. When explaining the tendency of the counter-role to "turn off" at the end of the working day, we will understand their unbridled imagination. We can give credit to themselves for the danger we take when posing the counter-role as content to work without trying to solve problems or improve things.

Other identities are treated. They are focusing on the great responsibility as an entrepreneur, the conversation of the interviewees centered on two approaches to understanding the parts of themselves / their personalities. They had to compromise to assume this position. Several respondents argued that the "dream" made the sacrifices worthwhile, not explaining (or perhaps no longer remembering) what these self-sacrificed pieces are. Pakistan 10 said, "The organization becomes an individual, so I believe you're expected to compromise to support the person... the dream lasts... it can't be about you."

Others used strong language to argue that to be an entrepreneur, they gave up anything on their own. We spoke about the harmony and routines during certain hours of the day that keep them engaged with the family. Most maintained that they tried to stay away for a reasonable amount of time, but that they also brought homework with them because their intentions were to create new systems and find new ideas around the clock.

http://www.ijmsbr.com
China

Entrepreneur-as-role. The debate revealed two key correlations with the entrepreneur-as-role for these interviewees: accountability and frustration with the current state of affairs. The respondents also referenced meanings given by others in positions of authority when creating what they saw as the position. The knowledge source was included in the interview discourse: educators, educational materials and Chinese proverbs. Therefore, the entrepreneur-as-role was more objective and less based on societal expectations compared to the interviewees in the Pakistan. The vocabulary used was aspiring; that is, the discussion focused on what the entrepreneur should be rather than what the entrepreneur is. The respondents were often included in the definition, frequently suggesting "we should" or "they should."

In order to help create their definition, the entrepreneur-as-role needed to be original and creative, hardening to traits. CN 2 said an entrepreneur is beginning something creative, "instead of just copying what already existed," and CN 6 replied that an entrepreneur is trying to "create something new that people have not done before." The interviewees built this originality further as they described the entrepreneur-as-role as someone who is dissatisfied with the status quo and felt compelled to break out of it. The restlessness was mixed with the entrepreneur-as-role's imagination.

The interviewees have shared aspirations of the entrepreneur, taking responsibility for their actions and inventions. The vocabulary changed somehow to benefit society and to look after the employees. Negative discourse presented the idea of starting a business to make money. CN 3 described the entrepreneur's role as "first to provide a good service to society and also to be responsible for the better quality of life of the employee."

Self-as-entrepreneur. There was difficulty in defining the self-as-entrepreneur as separate or distinct from non-entrepreneurs. The debate revealed familiarity with the entrepreneur's mark, but dissatisfaction was seen as distinct from their employees. Several respondents initially made it clear that employers are no different from workers. But the respondent accompanied this in each of these cases with a "yet" or a "however" and then a summary of the discrepancies. CN 6 said, "In my business, we don't really want to differentiate partners from employees ... we think alike; we act alike." The same respondent also said, when thinking about the entrepreneur-as-role, that "it's different when you're the entrepreneur because you have to work very hard, put a lot of effort into it, and take responsibility for the outcome."

The other major theme of the self-as-entrepreneur debate was the need to bear responsibility, close to the definition of the entrepreneur-as-role. In terms of ensuring that their company fulfilled its responsibilities to employees, this was discussed. Also addressed in personal terms was the all-encompassing essence of entrepreneurship, reflecting the voice of entrepreneurship as a call. Respondents said it had to outweigh personal issues such as interests and friends for them because many had a great responsibility for them. In this area, salience appeared to come from being not only a caretaker of the business but also of the family and the outside world.

Counter-roles. The non-entrepreneur discussion centered on individuals in the counter-role being driven by money and satisfied with doing their job as defined, similar to the interviewees from the PAKISTAN. Having alleviated their Bell et al. 7 discomforts during the previous question with counter-role stratification, the non-entrepreneur was contrasted with entrepreneurs who have greater aspirations and commitment to their role. While non-entrepreneurs are working to improve their own personal skills, entrepreneurs are being perceived in the debate as working to give back and improve society. The words "devotion" and "creativity" were used to explain how a businessman can take on more responsibility than non-entrepreneurs. Participants in the interview spoke of having to make much more decisions than non-entrepreneurs and being responsible for more investors. The non-entrepreneur was seen as a follower who obeyed the boss and played a role. At the end of the working day, this employee role could be shed or easily transferred to another company, while the entrepreneur was presented as a lifestyle. The description of it was almost as if it were a calling rather than a job or role.
Other identities are treated. Following the definition of entrepreneurship as a lifestyle, respondents readily associated with the concept of sacrificing parts of their identity to assume the entrepreneur's position. CN 1 said, “This is a compromise you have to make... your personal hobbies and interests... you're in this country, heart and soul, it's not like when you started a business.” Respondents recognized how important family and friends are, while also stating they didn't have enough time for these relationships.

Several respondents made it clear that they still thought that they had retained their other personalities, even though they did not have enough time for them. One spoke of being part of a club for science fiction, though rarely attending the meetings. One spoke about incorporating his wife in the meal while acknowledging that he never really had enough time for her. Through word choice, there was a sense of inevitability, as if following the path of entrepreneurship had to mean difficult trade-offs and to work round the clock. CN 2 said he worked "when I'm alive." Both respondents spoke about their long working days, saying they were often the first to arrive and the last to leave. Respondents also said that when they were away from the office, they worked, at least mentally, but the focus was actually on the job for the long number of hours.

Shrouding the entrepreneur's idea as something very theoretical, almost exalted, while also referring to it as an unselfish call to focus on improving society and caring for others might be how these respondents reconciled their sense of duty to their families with their desire to take on the role of entrepreneur. Associating the role of caretaker in their company as well as in their social / family networks can generate some dissonance in their business identity.

**Discussion:**

The data indicated that entrepreneurs in the Pakistan and China base their understanding of the role on different groundings for the first research question examining the entrepreneur-as-role, with PAKISTAN respondents examining examples of real-life and caricature entrepreneurs more than the Chinese respondents do. Through meanings derived from academia and philosophy, the position in China is better understood by the Chinese entrepreneurs. While McCall and Simmons (1978) looked through the societal lens at the sense of identity, this study adds depth to show how the societal lens (Murnieks and Mosakowski, 2007) and function definitions (Lundqvist et al., 2015) shift for the same company concept in the Pakistan and China. This unique lens can have an effect on how each country's entrepreneurs perceive themselves differently, furthering Farmer et al. (2011)'s interpretation of how the position can be related to self-perception.

For the second research question investigating the self-entrepreneur, the data showed that respondents in both the PAKISTAN and China held similar self-entrepreneur meanings in areas such as the large, if not overwhelming, level of responsibility to handle and manage all, which may suggest that a caretaker position is somewhat salient to the entrepreneurial identity of the participants. Popular narratives (Jones et al., 2008), such as holding several mortgages, taking on financial responsibilities, and caring for employees while maintaining stakeholder relationships, framed this position. The voice when discussing the self-as-entrepreneur mirrored Mitchell's (1996) depiction of entrepreneurship as something very different from being an employee, which respondents articulated in this research as either a task or something that could not be ignored and as an exceptional activity that only some people can manage. The interviews showed that calling required a great deal of sacrifice and responsibility.

The data addressed the third question of research by demonstrating that both groups equally understood the counter-roles. All groups said that at the end of the day, non-entrepreneurs could "turn off" and have clearly built up responsibilities in their careers and simple job descriptions, meaning that they are being nurtured by their own caretaker persona. We don't have to carry a great responsibility and are not burdened by an entrepreneur's brimming imagination or relentless workload. This idea that an employee can not (or will not) impact organizational change in the way an entrepreneur does is reinforced by Albertini and Muzzi's (2016) finding that individuals are more likely to implement change through a start-up rather than trying to change internal operations in a business.
Concerning the counter-role feature, if not the purpose, a key difference emerged. The counter-role for the Pakistan entrepreneurs linked the various principles of entrepreneur-as-role and self-as-entrepreneur. The counter-role helped the PAKISTAN entrepreneur accept some of the higher meanings of the role while also bringing them into perspective on how they create a mental scheme 8 The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation XX(X) as entrepreneurs themselves, that is, far more down to earth and burdened with the obligation. This difficulty in understanding the role of an entrepreneur may be related to the characterization by Anderson and Warren (2011) of the entrepreneur being portrayed as a symbol of the PAKISTAN media in public imagination as a set of characteristics larger than life or heroic (Drakopoulou Dodd, 2002; Drakopoulou Dodd and Koning, 2002). This popular understanding of the entrepreneur-as-role can misalign with the identity developed by PAKISTAN entrepreneurs, showing how the interpretation of counter-roles (as illustrated by Burke and Tully, 1977, and Thoits, 1986) has an influence on PAKISTAN business identity.

The counter-role did not have to serve as a bridge between the understanding of the entrepreneur's function and the self as an entrepreneur for the Chinese entrepreneurs, as the perception did not have the same disconnect. It seemed that the position of the entrepreneur was less romanticized and more of an objective concept one either met or did not. That link meant that it was possible to draw more parallels between position and identity than in data from the PAKISTAN. The counter-role in the Chinese sample tended to provide evidence of the entrepreneur's position as a "post" that the entrepreneur might connect with.

This may have mitigated the sense of guilt over perceived negligence of family obligations, and if they felt they were doing so, a key aspect of salience in the Chinese community would not be fulfilled. It may have also buffered the pain of removing itself from its workers. Although China is classified as a society with a high power gap, it is also classified as a collectivist society (see Pavlou and Chai, 2002). This frustration could be partly accounted for by the self-assignment of the position of the entrepreneur (rather than ascending the ranks by seniority) combined with a collectivist culture. The disparity arising from the Pakistan and Chinese groups' salience could be a focus for further study.

Another form in which Chinese entrepreneurs used the "call" to alleviate the conflict among family identities and entrepreneurial identity is by dedicating themselves to their work, which refers to the fourth question of the study. The company's increased salience seemed to clash with the salience they wanted to give to other positions. We identified the role of entrepreneurship that overtakes most other positions and the need for more than anyone else to work in the office. The Pakistan businessmen didn't seem to feel the same remorse, but they recognised some trade-offs, maybe feeling frustration again with not being the archetypal "hero" businessman. We were less willing to recognize the loss of other personalities and less likely to complain about late working hours, choosing instead to claim that we took their work home with them to perform other tasks.

Conclusions and limitations

In all, the entrepreneurs surveyed for this study had similar constructs as entrepreneurs to their individual identities but had different understandings and structures of defining the role of the entrepreneur and their own expected roles in other contexts (e.g. family, friends, and hobbies).

Understanding these distinctions can shape a superior comprehension of how a person's pioneering personality can function inside a general public's builds of the "normal" job of the business visionary and the other expected jobs that an individual should encapsulate in general public. Contrasts in comprehension of the "business person as-job" may have suggestions when encouraging trades or business between these societies. The expression "business person" may mean a person who starts and maintains a business to bunches in various nations, however how this term is seen will vary between various gatherings, requiring thought when conveying between gatherings. While existing writing has explored the way toward the arrangement of pioneering character, this examination demonstrates that the expression "business person" is conceptualized distinctively between various societies. This perspective on a business visionary could impact the improvement of a
pioneering character. The effect of this perspective on business visionaries by a social gathering on the advancement of innovative might be a territory of further examination for future research. Further research could unload the wellsprings of the separates appeared in this exploration to help better comprehend the business visionary as a personality in different social settings. Similarly as with all exploration, this examination has confinements. In understanding the development of an innovative personality, this investigation took a gander at business people who had as of now effectively made an endeavor, which could be contended to make an "endurance inclination" (Gartner et al., 2010). What's more, the business visionaries spoke to numerous enterprises; nonetheless, there could be subtleties between the ventures that this article has not found. In all subjective research, the job of the analyst can't be expelled in the investigation of the information.
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