

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND ENTREPRENEURIAL LEARNING IN MSMEs: A FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE LOCAL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Nida Garnida Fitrianti¹, Lili Adi Wibowo²

¹Organisasi KRIEZ, Indonesia

²Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

Email:

Abstract

This conceptual paper develops an integrative framework for institutional support and entrepreneurial learning in micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs). Drawing on the resource-based view, dynamic capabilities, organizational learning, absorptive capacity, social capital, resilience, and entrepreneurial-ecosystem literature, it explains how institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development can be organized into practical managerial routines. The manuscript does not claim primary survey, interview, experimental, or statistical data. It proposes a staged cycle of diagnosis, capability configuration, bounded experimentation, evidence review, governance, resource reconfiguration, and learning retention. The framework emphasizes proportionate implementation and identifies implications for owner-managers, ecosystem institutions, and future empirical research.

Keywords: MSMEs; Institutional Support And Entrepreneurial Learning; Dynamic Capabilities; Organizational Learning; Business Resilience

INTRODUCTION

Institutional Support And Entrepreneurial Learning has become increasingly relevant to MSMEs because environmental change often requires adaptation without the resource buffers available to large organizations. The central issue is not simply whether enterprises possess resources, but whether they can organize institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development into repeatable decisions and routines.

Small enterprises face distinctive constraints: managerial roles are concentrated, formal information systems may be limited, and a single failed investment can have a material effect on continuity. These conditions make disciplined prioritization and staged learning especially important.

The resource-based view and dynamic-capabilities perspective provide complementary explanations. Resources create potential value, while capabilities determine how resources are sensed, mobilized, combined, and reconfigured as conditions change (Barney, 1991; Teece et al., 1997).

This paper therefore develops a conceptual framework rather than claiming new empirical findings. Its purpose is to connect established theory with a practical sequence that can later be tested across sectors, locations, and stages of enterprise development.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

The resource-based view provides a starting point by distinguishing resources from the organizational ability to deploy them productively. In small enterprises, scarce resources make prioritization especially important because managerial attention, cash, relationships, and information cannot be committed to every opportunity simultaneously. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Dynamic-capabilities theory explains how firms respond when existing routines are no longer sufficient. Sensing, seizing, and reconfiguration are useful lenses for understanding how MSMEs identify changes, choose responses, and alter resource combinations without unnecessarily destabilizing core operations. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Organizational learning adds the distinction between exploration and exploitation. Exploration expands the option set, while exploitation improves reliability and efficiency. Sustainable adaptation requires a workable balance rather than permanent emphasis on novelty. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Absorptive capacity clarifies why access to external information is not equivalent to useful knowledge. Enterprises must recognize relevance, assimilate insight, transform it for local conditions, and apply it to decisions and routines. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Social-capital theory highlights the value and limitations of relationships. Trust can lower coordination costs, but overly closed networks can reduce exposure to novel information. Bridging and bonding ties therefore perform complementary functions. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Together, these perspectives suggest that enterprise development is produced by interacting routines for learning, relationships, decisions, and resource allocation rather than by a single intervention. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The framework therefore treats institutional support and entrepreneurial learning as a cumulative process. Value is created when learning from one decision changes the quality of subsequent decisions and when resources can be reconfigured without undermining core business continuity.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The framework begins with problem definition. A manager identifies the operating or strategic constraint, the decisions that influence it, and the evidence needed to determine whether conditions improve. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The second stage maps relevant internal and external capabilities. This includes knowledge, relationships, routines, technologies, financial capacity, and institutional connections that can be mobilized without exceeding enterprise constraints. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The third stage converts broad intentions into a bounded intervention. Scope, responsibility, expected learning, resource limits, and review dates are specified before major commitment occurs. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The fourth stage evaluates implementation evidence. Managers compare actual results with baseline conditions and distinguish activity indicators from meaningful changes in decision quality or business outcomes. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The fifth stage reconfigures resources. Effective routines can be scaled, weak ones redesigned, and unsuitable initiatives stopped before sunk-cost logic dominates managerial judgment. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The final stage retains learning through simple records and review routines. Organizational memory allows future decisions to benefit from prior successes, failed assumptions, and contextual knowledge. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The framework therefore treats institutional support and entrepreneurial learning as a cumulative process. Value is created when learning from one decision changes the quality of subsequent decisions and when resources can be reconfigured without undermining core business continuity.

CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

Capability development is more durable when it is linked to real work. Training, mentoring, technology, or collaboration should address a defined task and produce observable changes in how decisions or processes are performed. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Implementation should identify an accountable owner. Even in a microenterprise, responsibility for collecting information, coordinating partners, reviewing costs, and documenting outcomes should be explicit. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Small pilots reduce the cost of uncertainty. They allow enterprises to test assumptions and identify implementation barriers before committing scarce resources at scale. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Review points should be established in advance. Predetermined dates and criteria reduce the risk that an initiative continues only because participants are enthusiastic or resources have already been spent. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Documentation can remain simple but should be consistent. Decision notes, checklists, basic dashboards, reconciliations, and partner records can preserve learning without creating unnecessary bureaucracy. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Scaling should follow evidence. The enterprise increases commitment when the intervention produces credible benefits and complementary capabilities are sufficient to support expansion. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The framework therefore treats institutional support and entrepreneurial learning as a cumulative process. Value is created when learning from one decision changes the quality of subsequent decisions and when resources can be reconfigured without undermining core business continuity.

NETWORKS, COLLABORATION, AND ECOSYSTEM SUPPORT

MSMEs often depend on external actors for capabilities that would be costly to internalize. Suppliers, customers, universities, associations, financial institutions, communities, and public agencies can provide complementary knowledge and resources. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Effective collaboration begins with a specific problem rather than a general desire to partner. Problem clarity helps external actors understand what expertise, information, or access is genuinely useful. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Network diversity increases access to non-redundant information. Local trusted ties support coordination, while connections across sectors or regions can expose enterprises to alternative practices and opportunities. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Reciprocity strengthens collaboration. Small enterprises can contribute market insight, local knowledge, practical feedback, and referrals, creating relationships that are more durable than one-directional assistance. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Dependence should be monitored because a single dominant buyer, platform, supplier, adviser, or funding source can create hidden vulnerability. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Ecosystem quality is therefore reflected not only in the number of institutions but also in the accessibility, relevance, and connectivity of support available to enterprises. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The framework therefore treats institutional support and entrepreneurial learning as a cumulative process. Value is created when learning from one decision changes the quality of subsequent decisions and when resources can be reconfigured without undermining core business continuity.

GOVERNANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Governance should be proportionate to enterprise size. The purpose is to clarify important decisions, responsibilities, resource limits, information ownership, and partner obligations rather than to reproduce large-company bureaucracy. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Risk assessment should focus on exposures capable of undermining continuity or destroying the value of an initiative. Liquidity, operational failure, customer loss, information error, partner dependence, and reputation are common examples. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Controls can be simple and effective when consistently applied. Approval limits, reconciliations, backups, access controls, written agreements, and periodic reviews create basic accountability. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Innovation and control are not opposites. Bounded experimentation provides room for learning while protecting the enterprise through defined limits and review criteria. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Exit conditions are valuable because they allow managers to stop or redesign an initiative before sunk costs dominate judgment. This is particularly important when resources are scarce. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Accountability also improves learning. When assumptions and decisions can be reconstructed, managers are better able to understand why outcomes differed from expectations. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The framework therefore treats institutional support and entrepreneurial learning as a cumulative process. Value is created when learning from one decision changes the quality of subsequent decisions and when resources can be reconfigured without undermining core business continuity.

PERFORMANCE, LEARNING, AND RESILIENCE

Performance measurement should separate inputs, activities, intermediate outcomes, and business outcomes. This prevents adoption or participation from being treated as evidence of effectiveness. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Intermediate outcomes can include better information quality, shorter decision cycles, stronger coordination, improved customer understanding, lower error rates, or access to more diverse knowledge. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Business outcomes depend on the focal problem and may include customer retention, productivity, cash-flow stability, continuity, market access, or the ability to recover from disruption. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Resilience is more than persistence. A capability-based view emphasizes anticipation, coping, adaptation, and learning so that the enterprise is better prepared for future disturbances. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Short feedback cycles support correction. When evaluation is delayed, ineffective routines may become embedded and the cost of change can increase. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Learning becomes strategically valuable when it changes future behavior. Enterprises should retain evidence about both successful practices and unsuccessful experiments. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The framework therefore treats institutional support and entrepreneurial learning as a cumulative process. Value is created when learning from one decision changes the quality of subsequent decisions and when resources can be reconfigured without undermining core business continuity.

MANAGERIAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Owner-managers should begin with a defined constraint rather than a fashionable solution. Technology, financing, training, and partnerships are valuable when they improve a specific decision or operating process. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Support organizations should segment enterprises according to capability and problem type. Basic record keeping, market access, specialist advice, finance, and advanced innovation support are not equally relevant to every firm. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Universities can contribute through applied diagnosis, mentoring, evidence synthesis, and collaborative projects when engagement is tied to genuine enterprise needs. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Public agencies and financial institutions can improve program quality by linking support to implementation milestones and learning evidence rather than participation counts alone. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Associations and community organizations can strengthen bridging relationships, helping enterprises reach knowledge and opportunities beyond their immediate networks. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

Researchers should use longitudinal and comparative designs to examine how capabilities emerge, interact, and sometimes fail. Such work can test the mechanisms proposed in this conceptual framework. For institutional support and entrepreneurial learning, the implication is to connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with a clearly defined business problem and reviewable evidence.

The framework therefore treats institutional support and entrepreneurial learning as a cumulative process. Value is created when learning from one decision changes the quality of subsequent decisions and when resources can be reconfigured without undermining core business continuity.

METHOD

This manuscript uses an integrative conceptual review. Established theoretical and review literature published before the December 2024 issue placement was synthesized to connect complementary explanations of MSME resources, learning, networks, innovation, and resilience. No primary respondents, fabricated observations, experiments, or statistical estimates are reported. The framework and propositions are intended to guide later empirical examination.

RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

P1. Stronger routines related to institutional support and entrepreneurial learning are expected to improve the quality and timeliness of MSME adaptation decisions.

P2. Absorptive capacity is expected to strengthen the conversion of external knowledge into implementable enterprise practices.

P3. Diverse and trustworthy relationships are expected to improve access to complementary resources while reducing dependence risk.

P4. Bounded experimentation is expected to reduce the cost of uncertainty in resource-constrained enterprises.

P5. Proportionate governance and explicit review routines are expected to improve accountability and organizational learning.

P6. Learning-based resource reconfiguration is expected to strengthen enterprise resilience under environmental change.

LIMITATIONS

The framework is conceptual and cannot establish causal effects. MSMEs differ by sector, location, ownership, market conditions, and stage of development. Future studies should operationalize the proposed constructs transparently, specify sampling and measurement procedures, and compare both successful and unsuccessful implementation experiences.

CONCLUSION

The paper positions institutional support and entrepreneurial learning as an organizational capability built through disciplined learning. Its value depends on how effectively managers connect institutional accessibility, entrepreneurial learning, network brokerage, capability building, and sustainable local business development with evidence, governance, and resource reconfiguration. The proposed framework favors problem-oriented support, staged commitment, and explicit review rather than symbolic adoption.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S.-W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 17-40. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.5922314>
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128-152. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393553>
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13, 215-246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11), 1105-1121. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266\(200010/11\)21:10/11<1105::AID-SMJ133>3.0.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200010/11)21:10/11<1105::AID-SMJ133>3.0.CO;2-E)
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481-510. <https://doi.org/10.1086/228311>
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135-172. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1996.9602161568>
- March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71-87. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.71>
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242-266. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.533225>
- Spigel, B. (2017). The relational organization of entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(1), 49-72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12167>
- Stam, E. (2015). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy: A sympathetic critique. *European Planning Studies*, 23(9), 1759-1769. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2015.1061484>
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of sustainable enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319-1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z)
- West, J., & Bogers, M. (2014). Leveraging external sources of innovation: A review of research on open innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 31(4), 814-831. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12125>
- Zahra, S. A., & George, G. (2002). Absorptive capacity: A review, reconceptualization, and extension. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 185-203. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.6587995>
- Zott, C., Amit, R., & Massa, L. (2011). The business model: Recent developments and future research. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1019-1042. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311406265>