Research Article

© 2024 Blakaj Gashi et al.
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Received: 23 April 2024 / Accepted: 29 June 2024 / Published: 5 July 2024

Poetic Expression Across Languages:
A Comparative Analysis of Translations of Goethe’s Poem in Albanian

Albulena Blakaj Gashi¹
Sadije Rexhepi¹*
Agnesa Haklaj²

¹Professor of German Literature
²Teaching Assistant of German Literature,
Department of German Language and Literature,
Faculty of Philology,
University of Prishtina “Hasan Prishtina”,
Kosovo
*Corresponding Author

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2024-0133

Abstract

The field of translation studies distinguishes two main directions: firstly, the relationship between the translated and the original text, emphasising the preservation of meaning, linguistic equivalence and the strategies used in translation, and secondly the style of the translator, that has recently received attention in this field. This paper attempts to combine both of these approaches while analysing the translation of Johann W. Goethe’s poetry into Albanian applied on three different translations of Goethe’s ballad Erlkönig. A linguistic and textual analysis of these translations, has been also carried out. The main focus is on the analysis of the reciprocal relationship between the translator’s style and the translated text. Furthermore, while comparing the translations, this paper explores the practice of poets translating poets and addresses the question of whether the fact that the translator being a poet influences the style of the translated text? Does the translator's poetic style influence the making of a good translation, and does the style of the translated poet (Goethe) have an influence on the poetic style of the translating poet?
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1. Introduction

Yet who would wish to discourage the peoples of the world from translating, merely because it is fundamentally impossible? – Thomas Mann

Among Johann Wolfgang Goethe’s literary works translated into Albanian, his poetry occupies a special place. Goethe’s poetry is diverse and seems to have attracted many poets and translators who adapted, translated, and published it in many different volumes. German writers became known in
Albanian culture mainly through the translation of their poems, especially through the interest of the Albanian poet Hil Mosi. The largest number of poems translated by Mosi (1885-1933) are those of Goethe. In 1909, Mosi published Goethe’s first translated poem entitled “Vjollca” in the newspaper “Lidhja ortodokse”. In the following years, many of Goethe’s translated poems were published in Albanian newspapers outside the Albanian-speaking territories. Albania only gained its independence in 1912, before which it was still under the rule of the Ottoman Empire and written Albanian was forbidden.

Although Mosi’s translation was the first published one, Blakaj (2017) is of the opinion that one of the first translations of Goethe’s poems in Albanian is the one that Ndre Mjeda (1866-1937) made of Goethe’s well-known ballad “König von Thule”. Although it was not published until 1917, it is known that this collection contains poems written up to 30 years earlier, which may also apply to the translations (Blakaj: 2017).

The translation of Goethe’s poetry in the Albanian-speaking world has continued over the years right up to the present day, where the works of the German author have been translated, retranslated, published and reissued several times, as separate collections, or as volumes. Among the first translators of Goethe into Albanian are the great masters of Albanian literature, such as Mjeda, Mosi, Noli, Fishta, Shantoja, Poradeci. Later translations were made by Laurasi, Kruja, Kolevica, Zheji, Doko, Jorgoni, Bala, Blaci, Zhiti, Simoni, Shvarc, Zallari, Blakaj and many others. Each of these translators has their own merits, for by giving the translated poems something new and unique, they attempt to transfer Goethe’s poetic style into the Albanian language. However, these repeated attempts (up to 12 different translations, e.g. “King of Thule”) indicate that translation is a utopian task (Gasset, 1992), as each of these translators is striving to find just the perfect words and they believe that it is possible to create ideal versions of the poems. The fact that there is no “one right” translation argues its impossibility, which in a sense is undeniable. As Raffel (2021) argues, it is impossible to fully translate something written in one language into another, as every human language differs in structure, sound and vocabulary, making exact language equivalents by definition non-existent. An author uses his mother tongue with great skill and thus achieves two things: comprehensibility and modification of common usage, while retaining his personal style. An author’s personal style results from his slight deviation from the usual meaning of the word. In fact, every language has its own linguistic style compared to every other language. It is therefore utopian to believe that two words belonging to different languages, which the dictionary gives us as translations of each other, denote exactly the same objects (Gasset, 1992). Given that there is no equivalency between languages, the translator’s task should lean more towards that of mediator between languages. Goethe himself takes the view that translations that attempt to convey the spirit and style of the original work through the use of equivalents in syntax and idiom are of limited value. He believes that the translator should attempt to transfer meaning, form, imagery and style from a language exactly into the text, not at the expense of the language in which he is translating, but rather to enrich it (Walte, 2002). This applies in particular to the translation of poetry, as Goethe valued himself first and foremost as a poet.

In a similar sense Rudolf Pannwitz (2018) suggests that:

“The basic error of the translator is that he preserves the state in which his own language happens to be instead of allowing his language to be powerfully affected by the foreign tongue. Particularly when translating from a language very remote from his own he must go back to the primal elements of language itself and penetrate to the point where work, image, and tone converge. He must expand and deepen his language by means of the foreign language” (p. 240).

Regarding the translators task Walter Benjamin (1992) also follows the same line of thought as he argues that Pannwitz’s and Goethe’s remarks on translation “must be by far the best thing published in Germany on the theory of translation” (p. 163).

The importance attached to the language in which one is translating, is also evident in the
Albanian translations, as we can see in Rexhep Qosja’s comments on the translation work of Mjeda: “Mjeda translated in his original way, preserving the Albanian spirit of the verse, as language and as thought, while remaining honest to himself.” (Quku, 2004: 267). About Mjeda, Qosja further writes: “We have no poet who is so original, so much of himself and of his own feelings and thoughts [...]” (Quku, 2004: 267), which leads us to another question about translation worth exploring, that is the question that many translation theorists have addressed, namely whether poets should be the only ones who translate poetry (Levy, 2011). In Albanian, Goethe has had the good fortune to be translated by some masters of Albanian poetry as mentioned above. Refsum (2017), in explaining the Norwegian term gjendiktning, writes that the translation of poetry is an especially creative kind and should be understood as ‘re-poetizing’. Jarman (2013) argues that translation serves to transform one literature into another, and that a good poet is probably the best catalyst for this metamorphosis. Part of a poet’s craft training is to turn to translation, and the more gifted the poet is, the more valuable the translation and the more likely it is that the translation will be a new addition to the poetic art. A good poem should become another good poem – one that belongs as much to the translator as to the original author. Paz (1992) suggests that: “the good translator of poetry is a translator who is also a poet or a poet who is also a good translator” (p. 158). Gil (2015), on the other hand, says: “When the poet translates, he remains a poet in his translation” (p. 148). In analysing Rilke’s translations, Gil goes on to write that the poet differs from the translator primarily in that the latter’s translation can be correct, while the former’s is also poetic. The poet’s own creativity will emerge in the translation, a creativity that can also reveal new layers of the original. Even more than the translator, the poet can impose his own style on the translation and strive to develop his own poetic language through the translation. It can therefore be said that the poet’s style influences his translations as much as the translation influences his poetic style – it is a reciprocal relationship.

Researchers Boase-Beier (2014), (2020) and Baker (2000) have focused, among others, on the analysis and significance of the translator’s style. Boase-Beier (2020) suggests that style for Translation Studies means “paying attention to what is unique to a text and the choices it embodies, being aware of patterns in the text and paying close attention to the attitudes, views and opinions expressed in or suggested by the text” (p.13). Baker (2000) argues that the translator’s task involves much more than simply reproducing the style of the original, stating that “it is as impossible to produce a stretch of language in a totally impersonal way as it is to handle an object without leaving one’s fingerprints on it” (p. 244). Even the earliest Albanian poets who translated poetry were aware of the difficulties inherent in this art. Mjeda states that: “translation is one of the most difficult literary arts because it requires will; from all those difficulties at times insurmountable, in which the translator encounters, many who, without even knowing it, turned out to be a lair/disappointment instead of a translator, hence the Italian proverb: traduttore, tradittore” (Mjeda cit. in Quku, 2004: 267). It should also be noted that Mjeda goes on to write about the difficulties of translation, by mentioning the “different natures of languages”, and describes the difference between a good translation and a poor one as follows: “What a great difference there is between a picture that looks cold compared to the canvas painted by a great painter” (Mjeda cit. in Quku, 2004: 267).

2. Analysis of the Albanian Translations of Erlkönig

"Erlkönig" is Goethe’s ballad from 1782. It is one of Goethe’s most popular works and is even considered the most popular German poem, probably due to the fact that it’s been set to song by many well-known composers, such as: Schubert, Loewe, Becker, Liszt, etc. As it encouraged the composers, the musicality of this ballad could have been both a stimulus and a challenge for various translators. This ballad was chosen for analysis because it is one of the earliest Goethe poems translated into Albanian and has aroused the interest of translators from different periods. Each of these translations has significant differences, which made us curious to compare them. Three different translations were chosen for the analysis, namely those by Hil Mosi, Robert Shvarc and Përtef Kruja. The selection was based on the fact that these translators are well-known translators of...
German authors into Albanian, including Goethe. Other reasons for the selection are that they were shaped by a number of factors, including their distinct upbringings, that they lived and worked in different eras, that they were exposed to different linguistic traditions and translated into different dialects. Additionally, all three translators are also known for their contribution as writers, with Hil Mosi particularly renowned in the realm of poetry.

The interpretations that have been made of this ballad are numerous and differ in content, starting with the name, for which a variety of scholars have their own arguments. It is believed that Goethe was inspired to write this ballad by Herder's preliminary translation of a Danish fairy tale, but the Brothers Grimm in their dictionary considered the name “Erlkönig” a misinterpretation of the word:

“ERLKÖNIG, m.s. Erlenkönig. in Herder's “Stimmen der Völker” (1778) became Danish. Ellerköng, Ellekonge, d. i. Elverkonge, Elbekönig, ruler of the Elbe (sp. 400) was incorrectly translated, which later also seduced Göthe. There is no Erlkönig in any legend.” (Grimm, 1971).

So, according to them, there is no Erlkönig in any saga or folktale. But here, too, there are different interpretations. One interpretation is that in German and Scandinavian mythology, an “Erlkönig ” is an evil spirit that hides and lies ready to threaten people, especially children. The Erlkönig thus becomes a figure that connects us with various figures from different mythologies. He is the death of a certain sexual kind, he is Odin/Wodan, a Hamlin. He does not simply cause death but lures the innocent with the promise of a life full of pleasure and without pain. In view of Goethe's reach, the Grimms brothers' argument that it may have simply been a translation error seems unlikely. The figure of the Erlkönig seems to have always been associated with something evil among the peoples of the North, something that lives in the forest and inspires fear, especially in children who, if they stay in the forest for too long, will get killed by a single touch.

This uncertainty has also caused problems for Albanian translators, who have tried to find an appropriate equivalent for the figure of the Erlkönig that would have an effect on the reader. The differences in the translation can be recognised from the beginning. The name Erlkönig is first translated by Mosi as Gogoli, by Shvarc as Mbreti i pyllit = King of the Forest and by Kruja as Mbreti i xhindërë = King of the Djinns. In this case, it seems that the three Albanian translators, seeing that the Albanian language does not have a suitable name for the Erlkönig, adapted the title to the content.

The name Gogol, which Mosi chooses, is a figure intended to frighten children, a figure from fairy tales and folklore. He is depicted as a terrifying creature that adults use to frighten children, if they do not remain calm or if they cry. He is also called Gogomel (Meyer, 2007: 174). The translation of the word Erlkönig from Kruja with the word Djinn also connotes something evil. According to the Dictionary of Albanian Mythology and Demonology (Qazimi, 2008), the djinn, just like the devil, has entered Albanian demonology from the field of demonology of monotheistic religions, especially Islamic demonology, and has replaced earlier figures of primitive mythology. In various regions, people believe that they should protect their children from djinns who come and take them from their cradles. Shvarc translates Erlkönig as King of the Forest. Although it is very neutral and simple, it is perhaps better if we consider the fact that the forest is mysterious, and we never know what it hides and what awaits us.

The ballad of the Erlkönig is about a father's rapid ride through the forest at night with his son by his side. The night is stormy and the forest is dark. We know that the father is trying to keep his son warm and safe. There are four characters in this ballad: the lyrical I, the father, the son and the Erlkönig. The first and last stanzas are in the third person and are described by the lyrical subject, while all other stanzas consist of dialog between other characters in the second person. The lines of the poem in the original rhyme according to the AABB scheme, and the Albanian translators adhere to it.
In order to see whether these translations have succeeded in preserving the meaning, the emotional content and the rhyme scheme of the original poem, and whether they can stand as independent creations, a more detailed analysis is made, an analysis that does precisely what Goethe hated most: “They want the truth, they want the real and so they destroy poetry” (Eckermann, 1982: 169). In the first verse, Goethe uses the words: “spät”, “Nacht” and “Wind” to create a frame that depicts the situation and evokes a gloomy feeling. This frame is contrasted by the third and fourth verses, where we notice the sense of security of the son who is protected by his father. If we draw on Mieke Bal’s (2017) framing theory, it can be argued that Goethe through the deliberate selection and arrangement of the specific textual elements, has effectively conveyed a particular meaning, provoking emotions of fear. Considering that different framings can lead to very different meanings and interpretations of the same content, it is important to note that the translators were aware of this and were careful to preserve what Lakoff referred to as intellectual-emotional content (Lakoff, 2008). They attempted to create the same emotional tone in Albanian by using words and/or phrases such as: “Kaq natën mes erës; Kush sulet [...] nëpër terr e stuhi; Natën, për erë.”

Goethe begins the ballad with the cataphor “wer” = “who” and not with the subject, which arouses the reader’s curiosity, especially when it is used in the first position in the verse, as in this case. The person to whom this cataphor refers, the father, appears in the second verse. Only Shvarc’s translation begins with “kush” = “who”. Mosi and Kruja use the indefinite pronoun “kush” = “who”, but do not retain its force because they do not use it at the beginning of the verse. In the first stanza, Shvarc chooses “sulet me kalë” = “hurries on horseback” to translate the word “reitet”, which in Albanian is translated with the corresponding form “kalëron” = “to ride”, which he may have done to show that the father is in a hurry. However, it can be argued that it would be sufficient to stick to the original and place the emphasis on the ride through the forest on a stormy night, as mentioned above.

Kruja, on the other hand, emphasises the night by placing the word “night” and “in the wind” at the very beginning of the verse. He uses two different translations for “riding”, once “kalin nget” (v. 1) and the other time “kalin grah” (v. 3), thus adding a synonymy, although “reitet” only appears once in the original in the first verse. It can be argued that he does this in order to create the rhyme “nget-vet” (v. 1, 2) and “krah-grah” (v. 3, 4).

Although it is unlikely that Shvarc did not understand the word Knabe (v. 3), he translates it with the word “foshnjë” = “infant”, but in German “Knabe” means “boy”. Goethe uses the word “Kind”
= “child” in the second verse, then specifies the gender by using the word Knabe in the third verse. Mosi uses the word boy for the first time and not child. In the original the author refers to the name "Kind" = “child” with the anaphora “Knabe” = “boy” and “ihn” = “him”, while in Mosi’s translation we have recurrence, because he uses the word: “djali” = “boy” in both verses. Shvarc refers to “djalin” = “the boy” with “foshnjen” = “infant”, while Kruja correctly uses the word “feminë” = “the child” for the “Kind” and “djalin” = “the boy” for “Knabe” = “boy”. In the last verse both Shvarc and Kruja refer to the name the boy with the short form of the personal pronoun in accusative “E” before the verbs “E struk” / “E shtrengon” / “e shtrengon, e mbron” which is a characteristic of Albanian language.

Goethe uses the personal pronoun “Er” = ‘he’ three times as an anaphor to refer to the father (v. 3, 4). A characteristic of the Albanian language is that the ending of the verb indicates the person, without the need to use personal pronouns. Kruja reproduces this by using only the verbs struk/shtrengon and Shvarc by using “shtrengon”, “mbron”, while Mosi uses other names with epithets for the father, such as “trim” = “brave” and “kalorës” = “knight”. Mosi does not simply translate the fourth verse with the Albanian equivalent, but adds a substitute verse “Për rreth lëshon hana nji rrëze t’zbehtë!”.

Goethe uses the rhyme AABB, and it seems to be important for all translators to remain faithful to the same rhyme. As will be further elaborated, the translators retain the rhyme, even if this means sacrificing the meaning by using different words and structures from the original. The original verses of the first stanza in German, have the same number of syllables, with each verse having 9 syllables. In Albanian, Mosi remains the most faithful to the original, where in his translation each verse has 10 syllables (if we do not count the “e” at the end, which has the function of lengthening the preceding vowel and is not pronounced when read).

Erlkönig (Stanza- II)

Mosi (Stanza II)
"Pse ftyrën fsheh ti, o bir, pa ja nda?"
"Qysh, bab’ ti s’qenke gogolin tue pa?
Shiko, ka do brina, porsi t’ish një dre!"
"Ajo, bir’ s’asht gogol! qenka i re!"

Shvarc (Stanza – II)
- O bir ftyryn me frikë pse e fsheh?
- Mbretin e pyllit, babush, a’se sheh,
Me kuroër mbi kokë e bishtin e gjatë?
- Është mjegull ajo, o bir, është natë!

Kruja (Stanza – II)
"O bir, pse ftyryn me frikë mbulon?"
"Mbretin e xhindëve, babë, s’e shikon,
Me një kuroër e bisht të gjatë?“
O bir, është mjegulla nêpër natë!"

In the second stanza, we see the child who believes he can spot the figure of the Erlkönig. But

"Object doubling is a syntactic phenomenon that is morphologically reflected in the placement of an object symbol (OZ) in the verb that governs the object. The OZ reflects certain grammatical features of the object - those of the case: the OZ appears in the accusative (OZA) as a reflex of the dir. Obj. in the dative (OZct) as a reflex of the indir. Obj. as well as the characteristics of the number and the person.” (Buchholz & Fiedler, 1985: 439).

"The omission (of personal pronouns) is also based on this; that the verb form reflects certain grammatical features of the subject (in the personal ending) and the object (in the object sign).” (Buchholz & Fiedler, 1987: 280).
Goethe, even in this ballad, works as in the King of Thule, leaving some gaps in the text for the reader to 'fill'. In terms of reception aesthetics, as discussed by Jauß (1987) and Iser (1972, 1994), the dialogue between the text and the reader is of the utmost importance. Jauß (1987) proposes that the meaning of a literary text is not fixed, but emerges through the interaction between the text and the reader. Thus, for example, the reader does not know where the father and his son are going and why they are riding through the night. Then, how does the child know the Erlkönig and why is he so afraid of him as soon as he sees him, even though the Erlkönig initially entices him with friendly words? Such a feeling also seems apparent in the translation. The father tries to reassure his son by telling him that it is just fog. To make the bond between father and son seem stronger, Goethe uses many pronouns, as in Prometheus, especially in the dialogue between the two when they address each other as “mein Vater” = “my father” and “mein Sohn” = “my son”. There are even cases where the German author uses recurrence as a reference to emphasise this even more. In Albanian, two of the translators mentioned, translate it with “O bir” = “O son” instead of “Biri im” = “my son”, but the exclamation “O” fulfils this function even better. We can also see the use of the exclamations in the following stanzas in translations. The translations mentioned, those of Shvarc and Kruja, are very similar, especially the last two verses, in which they even chose the same words for the rhyme: “gjatë - natë”. In the last two verses, Mosi uses the words “dre - re” = “deer - cloud”, which do not appear in the original, so that the verses rhyme. The translation of the second stanza made by Shvarc and Kruja is closer to the original.

While Shvarc and Kruja use declarative sentences instead of the interrogative sentences used in the original poem, Mosi conveys more emotion and surprise through the use of exclamatory sentences. In the second verse, Mosi makes further adjustments by adding words and making a comparison with “[...] ka do brina, porsi t’ish nje dre!” In Goethe’s verses, it is the son who repeats the word Erlkönig, while the father never mentions him, whereas in Mosi’s translation, the father says “ajo, bir´ s’asht gogol!, qenka i re!” Shvarc and Kruja do not repeat the word Erlkönig at all, which is used in the original at the beginning of the verse, probably to emphasise it more strongly. The following stanzas depict the dialogues that take place between the Erlkönig and the boy/the son and between the son and the father.

Erlkönig (Stanza – III)
"Du liebes Kind, komm, geh mit mir!
Gar schöne Spiele spiel' ich mit dir;
Manch' bunte Blumen sind an dem Strand,
Meine Mutter hat manch gältten Gewand." –
Hil Mosi (Stanza – III)
- “Ec’ ti tek un, n’don m’u dëfrye!
Shum lojra t’gzueshme do loz me tyre,
Shum’ sende t’bukra un’ kam me t’ble,
Prej arit em’ am’ do t’bajë nji veshje t’re!"
Robert Shvarc (Stanza – III)
“Fëmijë e dashur, eja me mua
Kam lodra të bukura, si thua?
Do të të çoj mes lulesh përrallore,
Do të të vesh me tesha princërore!”
Pertef Kruja (Stanza – III)
“Eja me mua, o vogëlush,
Lojnat e mia s’i di askush;
Lule gjith’ majrya në breg do të kesh,
Me rroba ar’i im’ ëmë na vesh.”

In the third stanza, Shvarc conveys the feeling that arises when reading the ballad in the original. Alliteration predominates in the original. Shvarc creates a parallelism between the verses: “Do të të çoj mes lulesh përrallore,/ Do të të vesh me tesha princërore!” = “I will lead you among fairy flowers, / I will clothe you in princely garments” and gives the verses a rhythmic structure with the
words “përrallore” = “fairy” and “princërore” = “princely”. All three translators translate the third verse in a particular way: Mosi translates “bunte Blumen as sende t’bukura” = “beautiful things”, Shvarc with “lulesh perrallore” = “fairy flowers” and Kruja with “Lule gjith’ngjyra” = “colourful flowers”. Despite the precise translation that Shvarc makes of this poem, he sometimes makes some omissions that cause the poem to lose a little of its intended meaning. For example, the second line of this stanza reads: “Gar schöne Spiele spiel ich mit dir”, which should be translated as “Very beautiful games I will play with you”, he translates as “Kam lodra të bukura” = “I have beautiful toys”, thus placing the emphasis on the things themselves i.e. on the toys. In Mosi’s translation, on the other hand, “lojra” and in Kruja’s “lojnat” = “the games” are translated with a noun that indicates an action. Or, in the last verse, which Goethe writes: “Meine Mutter hat manch gülden Gewand.” = “My mother has a golden robe”, that seems like an incentive to convince the boy to join him by mentioning the concept of the mother. Shvarc removes it completely: “Do të të çoj mes lulesh përrallore” (v. 3), “Do të të vesh me tesa princëare!” (v. 4), which completely changes the meaning of the stanza. Mosi, on the other hand, translates the third verse, which is merely a description, by promising the boy things in the second person “…kam me t’ble” = “I will buy for you”. Kruja also addresses the boy in the second person, “do te kesh” = “you will possess/have”, while in the last verse he also introduces the Erlkönig and thus uses the first-person plural “… im’ emë na vesh” = “my mother will clothe us”. Mosi uses apostrophes throughout the poem to abbreviate words, as is common in the Gegë dialect in which he writes, unlike the other two translators who use the standard. By using the abbreviations, Mosi’s translation is more economical and differs from Shvarc and Kruja in linguistic terms, i.e. in phonetic, morphological and syntactic aspects. Example: “Prej arit em’ am’ do t’bajë nji veshje t’re”.

Erlkönig (Stanza – IV)

"Mein Vater, mein Vater, und hörest du nicht,  
Was Erlnenkönig mir leise verspricht?” –  
"Sei ruhig, bleibe ruhig, mein Kind;  
In dürren Blättern säuselt der Wind." –  
Hil Mosi (Stanza – IV)  
"O bab’, or tat’, aspak s’po ndëgjon  
Se çfarë gogoli nën za po m’premton?"  
“Aman, bir, s’flet kush, kot je tu’u frigseum!  
S’asht tjetër por era mbi gjethet tue fisklluem!”
Robert Shvarc (Stanza – IV)  
-Babush, babush, a nuk po e dégjon,  
Mbretri i pyllit çfarë më premont?-  
-Qëtësohu o bir, askush nuk të flet,  
Êshët era në pyll, që klith e bërtet.  
Pertef Kruja (Stanza – IV)  
"O babë, o babë, s’dëgjon ti vetë  
Çka mbreti i xhindëve më premont lehtë?"  
"Pusho, qëtësohu, o biri im,  
Në gjethe era fërshëllin.”

The name "babush" that Shvarc chooses (more than once) for the father seems very sweet and endearing compared to the “baba” used by Kruja, since the ending -ush (-ling) is used to put the words in the diminutive form. Both these translators also use a recurrence like the original, while Mosi uses the synonym of the name, which gives more emphasis to the child’s need to be heard, and the exclamation “O” in “O bab”, “or tat”, which convey more emotion. Throughout the poem, then, exclamations are often used instead of the possessive pronoun, and here too we can see the use of exclamations, both in Mosi’s and in Kruja’s translation.

Erlkönig (Stanza – V)

"Willst, feiner Knabe, du mit mir gehen?"
In the fifth stanza, in which Goethe creates a parallelism with: “Meine Töchter sollen/ Meine Töchter führen” (v. 2, 3). Mosi and Kruja repeat only the noun and the possessive pronoun, respectively: “T’mij bija, T’mij bija, Vajzat e mia/ Vajzat e mia” = “My daughters, My daughters / My girls, my girls”. In Mosi’s translation, it should be noted that he uses the possessive pronoun “T’mij” before the noun “bija”, which is not common in the Albanian language, except in a more poetic usage. Shvarc uses “Çupat e mia” = my daughters” just once and substitutes the next with shoqet e tua (your friends). In the original, Goethe uses the modal verbs “willst” and “sollen” = “want and should”, which is not found in any of the analysed translations. The modality of the verb “sollen” was expressed with the future tense in the translations of Shvarc and Kruja. Shvarc uses the verbs in the future tense: “do të këndojnë, do të lodrojnë” = “they will sing, they will play”, as does Kruja with; “do t’i gëzojnë” = “they will rejoice”. On the other hand, Mosi uses the Gege forms of the verbs, whose characteristic is the infinitive with me + (geg.) Partizip, which is not used in Standard Albanian, such as: “me luejtun, me t’rrokë, me kënduem, me kcyet”.

Erlkönig (Stanza – VI)
“Mein Vater, mein Vater, und siehst du nicht dort
Erlkönigs Töchter am düstern Ort?” –
“Mein Sohn, mein Sohn, ich seh es genau:
Es scheinen die alten Weiden so grau. –”

Hil Mosi (Stanza – VI)
“Or atë, bab’ i im, n’at vend t’fsheht’ s’e shiqon
Qysh m’nji ai, gogoli, gjithnjë po m’vështron?”
“Qetsoju, o bir, ç’po flet ti kështu?
Arat, rreth me cuba, ty t’duken ashtu!”

Robert Shvarc (Stanza – VI)
-Babush, babush, a s’të ngjan se janë
Çupat e mbretit atje matanë?
-O bir, o bir, unë dalloj fort mirë,
Janë vetëm livadhet në errësirë.

Pertef Kruja (Stanza – VI)
“O babë, o babë, ja vërej atje,
Bijat e mbretit në terr s’i sheh?
O bir, i shoh, i shoh mjaft mirë:
Sheljjet e vjetra ngjajnë ashtu, bir!”
As in the fourth stanza, Goethe again uses a recurrence of Mein Vater, mein Vater in the sixth stanza. All three translators use the recurrence. Shvarc uses “Babush, babush”, without the possessive pronoun, Kruja translates it with the exclamation “O babë, o babë”, while in Mosi’s translation we have the use of the exclamation and two synonyms for the word father: “Oratë” and “bab’i im”, which are used with the possessive pronoun. When analysing the translations, it is necessary to note the use of the inversion, e.g. in the last verse of Mosi and Kruja we have an inversion, while Shvarc did not use one.

Elements of sexual attraction, paedophilia, and a pronounced homophobia have often been attributed to this poem. At the beginning are the verses: “Gar schöne Spiele spiel’ ich mit dir” (I play beautiful games with you), which in the VII stanza escalate to:

Erlkönig (Stanza – VII)

Ich liebe dich, mich reizt deine schöne Gestalt;
Und bist du nicht willig, so brauch ich Gewalt."

"Mein Vater, mein Vater, jetzt faßt er mich an!
Erlkönig hat mir ein Leids getan!"

Hil Mosi (Stanza – VII)

- T’due, or djal’ m’josh’ shtat’ i bukur i yti
Tek un n’mos ardhsh vet’, po vi e të kapi për fyti! –
"Oh babë, kuku, babë, tash ... gogoli m’shtrëngoi
E i’ dhimbje shum’ t’madhe në trup tim ma çoi!"

Robert Shvarc (Stanza – VII)

"Të dua shumë, pamja jote më tërheq!
Dhe në mos ardhsh me dashje, do vish me të keq!"

-Babush, babush, ai po më kap e po më merr,
Mbreti i pyllit më kall frikë e tmerr!
Pertef Kruja (Stanza – VII)

"Unë të dua, ti po më josh,
Nuk vjen ti vet? Të marr me forcë!"

O babë, o babë, ja më përlau,
Oh, mbreti i xhindëve sa fort më vrau!

These verses have been correctly translated by Shvarc, with the exception of the word Gestalt (figure), which he has translated as “pamja” = “appearance”, which in Albanian does not necessarily refer to the body. It should have been translated as “trupi yt” = “your body”. It can clearly be seen that Hil Mosi has succeeded in conveying the feeling that this verse evokes in the reader, along with what the verse can connote. The word “trup” = “body” in the last verse in Mosi’s translation was added by the Albanian translator himself, because it does not appear in the original verse and the verse loses some of its meaning as a result. Mosi then added the expression “e të kapi për fyti” = “and i’ll grab you by the throat”, because in Goethe’s verse it only says: “po nuk erdhe me qejf, do të përdor forcë” = “if you do not come willingly, I will use force”. Mosi seems to have added it to rhyme with the first line, i.e. “yti-fyti”. Kruja chooses for this verse: “ti po më josh” (v. 1) = “I’m seduced by you”, escaping the trap by using the all-encompassing personal pronoun “ti” = “you”.

In the last two verses of this stanza, we see that the threat of the Erlkönig becomes reality. The child seems to feel the pain and turns to his father insisting that he trusts him. Goethe uses a repetition of “Mein Vater, mein Vater” = “My father, my father” in the third verse of the stanza to intensify the son’s insistence.

Shvarc translates the verse: “Babush, babush, ai po më kap e po më merr” = “Daddy, daddy he is grabbing me and taking me”, arbitrarily adding the words “po më merr” = “he is taking me”, which is possibly intended to rhyme with the “tmerr” = “horror” of the next stanza. It must be said, however, that the last verse of this stanza translated by Shvarc as “Mbreti i pyllit më kall frikë e tmerr!” = “The king of the forest causes me fear and horror!” is not a good translation, because in the original, as mentioned above, pain is inflicted on the child. In Goethe’s verse it even says: “ein Leid getan”, which
in Albanian means “an evil, a pain inflicted on me”, i.e. something concretely physical and not just fear and horror, emotions that were already expressed by Goethe in the above stanzas.

\[
\text{Erlkönig (Stanza – VIII)}
\]
\[
\text{Dem Vater grauset's, er reitet geschwind,}
\]
\[
\text{Er hält in Armen das ächzende Kind,}
\]
\[
\text{Erreicht den Hof mit Müh' und Not;}
\]
\[
\text{In seinen Armen das Kind war tot.}
\]

\[
\text{Hil Mosi (Stanza – VIII)}
\]
\[
\text{I ati me t'shpejtë ther kalin zjarmuer}
\]
\[
\text{E tue u dridhun mba djalin ndër duer}
\]
\[
\text{E kur sos n'shtëpi krejt lodhun e lmekë,}
\]
\[
\text{Shiqon se i biri njat' her kishte vdekë...}
\]

Robert Shvarc (Stanza – VIII)

\[
\text{Babai rrënqethet, me vrap kalin e nget,}
\]
\[
\text{Fort djalin shtrëngon, që regëtin e s'flet.}
\]

\[
\text{Me ankhth e llahtar arrin në shtëpi,}
\]
\[
\text{Por i vdekur ish djali në krahët e tij.}
\]

Pertef Kruja (Stanza – VIII)

\[
\text{Baba tmerrohet, nget si stuhi,}
\]
\[
\text{Ndër krahë i dridhet fëmija e tij;}
\]
\[
\text{Arrin kështjellën, lodhur e rrekur,}
\]
\[
\text{Porse ndër krahej dijali i kish vdekur.}
\]

The father’s concern for his son, for his safety, which we notice for the very first time in the entire poem, and where it seems that he already believes his son’s words, also his desire to save his son, are elements that are transferred to the Albanian readers as well. Shvarc even reinforces this idea by using the description “me ankhth e llahtar”, in the penultimate verse, which does not appear in the original. Mosi does the same with a verb group that represents the mode of an action: “tue u dridhun” and here we notice that the father begins to trust his son!

In the translation, besides compensation and paraphrasing, there is also the addition of linguistic elements, e.g. in the last stanza, Shvarc adds the negative verb “s’flet” = “does not speak” in the second verse “Fort djalin shtrëngon, që regëtin e s’flet”, which we do not find in other translators.

If one considers the tense in which the poem was written as a whole, but also the last stanza, it is noticeable that the first three lines of this stanza, i.e. those of the lyrical I, are in the present tense, while only the last line is in the past, but the boy was and remains dead. This suggests that perhaps the boy is not being dead at all, but has been raped by the Erlkönig and is no longer a child. In Mosi, the translation reads: “Shiqon se i biri njat’ her kishte vdekë…” = “he sees that the son had died then…”, although in this case the translator adds “njat’ her” = “then” and a time clause in the verse before it, beginning with “e kur...” = “and when...”, which represents a simultaneous action. Mosi and Kruaja use the past perfect tense at the end: “kishte vdekë, i kish vdekur” = “he had died, had died”, while Shvarc uses a predicative adjective in the imperfect tense. These elements show that the son was already dead when the father reached the house, so we have a resultative function.

3. Conclusion

In this paper, the translation of Goethe’s ballad Erlkönig from German into Albanian by the three Albanian translators Mosi, Shvarc and Kruja was analysed. Each translator has rendered the essence of the original text, succeeding in certain aspects, be it the choice of words, the rhyme, the number of syllables, the emotions evoked in the reader and/ or the structure or style of certain verses. Regardless of whether the translations deviate from or stay too close to the original, it can be argued that the translated poems stand as original creations. However, as already indicated, the process of literary translation, especially of poetry, is challenging, as the translator’s task is not limited to
preserving the meaning and content, but also takes into account the structure, rhyme and metre. In this case, it is particularly difficult to maintain the number of syllables, because the target language differs lexically. In order to preserve the rhyme, the translators were forced to sacrifice other linguistic features. As already mentioned, every language has its own linguistic style compared to every other language. It is therefore utopian to believe that two words from different languages, which the dictionary provides us with as translations of each other, denote exactly the same objects (Gasset, 1992). The translator’s task becomes even more difficult when the dictionary is of no help at all, as is the case with the title Erlkönig. Compared to English (Erlkönig- Erlking), the Albanian language does not have a suitable name for the Erlkönig, and the three Albanian translators had to adapt the title to the content. They chose three different terms, such as: “Gogoli” = “Bugbear”, “Mbreti i pyllit” = “King of the Forest”, “Mbreti i xhindeve” = “King of the Djinns”. The process of adapting words for which they find no equivalent in Albanian is noticeable throughout the poem, and sometimes the translators even substitute an entire verse (e.g. Mosi s. I, v. 4). It is worth mentioning not only the striving for equivalence, but also the effort to remain faithful to the original text, which can be seen in the translators attempt to reproduce Goethes techniques and thus preserve the structural and stylistic features of the poem. The attempts are recognisable in cases where the translators, like the German author, use: recurrence (e.g. Shvarc: s. 4, v. 1, s. 6, v. 1, s. 7, v. 3.), synonymy (e.g. Shvarc, Kruja and Mosi), alliteration (e.g. Mosi s. II, v. 1/ s. VII, v. 3; Kruja s. I, v.1/ s. II, v. 4/ s. 3, v. 3, 4) or even mirror the syntax by using sentence structures that are atypical for the Albanian language, such as placing the verb at the end of the sentence (Mosi s. I, v. 1).

Differences in verse structure can also be seen throughout the poem, which is mainly due to the different nature of the two languages, i.e. German and Albanian. In some cases, it seems that there are many differences in the structure of the verses, such as the non-use of pronouns as in the original (Mosi s. 1, v. 3, 4), but these come as a result of the structure of the Albanian language, because the structure of the Albanian language allows not to repeat the subject, but the ending of the verb takes over this function. Similarly, the object, the accusative object, can be marked with the short form of the personal pronoun without repeating the noun or pronoun, since the Albanian language has a doubling of the object (Shvarc s. 1, v. 3, 4).

Another factor analysed in this paper is the translator’s style, with a focus on the translator’s poeticity. Gil’s argument that “When the poet translates, he remains a poet in his translation” (Gil, 2015: 148), is substantiated by comparing the three Albanian translations. Mosis translation differs from the other two in its more poetic character and distinctive style. Gil further argues that the poet’s own creativity comes to the fore in the translation. More than the translator, the poet can impose his personal style on the translation and strive to develop his own poetic language through the translation. This becomes clear when we analyse Mosi’s translations of Goethe’s poems, as much of his own poetic style can be seen in his translations. However, not only is the translation influenced by the translator’s style, but the translator’s own poetic style is also influenced by the translated text. As an example, we can look here at Mosi’s poem Dashunia and compare it with his translation of Goethe’s Erlkönig, where we already in the first verse can recognise a similar form and style:

“Kaq natën mes erës kush n’kal’ po nget?” (Mosi’s translation of the Erlkönig)

“Ça zêmren t’êmë kshtu sot pesh ka çumun?” (Mosi’s own poem)

With regard to the reception of Goethe’s poetry in Albanian, the distinctive and diverse approaches adopted by each translator have proved to be an enriching addition to the Albanian-speaking audience, as the poem has gained a broader recognition and is now more appreciated in Albanian literary circles. As discussed in this paper, Goethe’s work has become part of the Albanian literary canon, influencing poets and translators. The various translations have provided a foundation for critical analysis among scholars, enabling a deeper understanding of Goethe’s poetry and the complexities involved in translating poetry across different languages.
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Abstract 

The assessment of project success has become a well-established perspective in the realm of project management. The entrepreneurial project concept enables a deeper exploration of the connection between entrepreneurship and project management. This study aimed to identify criteria and success factors within the entrepreneurial project domain. Employing a quantitative approach, 118 projects conducted in the Colombian context were analyzed. The findings indicate that the assessment of entrepreneurial project success during the implementation stage encompasses criteria related to project efficiency and organizational effectiveness. Notably, the study revealed that success factors include the industrial sector and innovation in the business model. 
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1. Introduction 

Within the broad field of organizational and management studies, the relationship between entrepreneurship and project management has attracted interest in recent years (Lundin et al., 2015). Some authors point to a gap between practice and scientific research in this relationship (Lundin et
al., 2015). On the one hand, they highlight a productive and long-standing relationship in many practice settings, but it is very recent and poorly documented in scientific research (Kuura and Lundin, 2019).

In this sense, Fonrouge et al. (2019) argue that although the two fields should be kept separate because they do not share the same discourse and code, the possibility of their convergence on shared topics would allow for further scientific development of both domains, considering that both have developed as interdisciplinary fields.

In that direction, Laursen and Killen (2019) took up the contrast between causality and effectuation approaches, raised by Sarasvathy (2001), as a framework that would allow relating entrepreneurship and project management research. Lundin et al. (2015) noted that planning, cost control, and deliverable performance are good management practices for entrepreneurship and projects.

Auschra et al. (2019), coined the expression “Project-type Enterprises” to point out that the creation of new enterprises, a process specific to the entrepreneurship domain, follows a project logic, especially in what has to do with sequenced activities, such as the formulation of objectives, the establishment of milestones, hierarchical planning techniques, and cost control.

Martens et al. (2018) highlighted the importance of strengthening the relationship between entrepreneurship and project management by conceptualizing, for example, that innovation, among other concepts, constitutes a meeting point between both fields. Similarly, some studies have related concepts specific to entrepreneurship, including entrepreneurial orientation and individual entrepreneurial orientation, with project management issues, including project success (Martens et al., 2018; Sabahi and Parast, 2020; Sajid et al., 2021; Kaufmann et al., 2022; Shekarian and Parast, 2021; Al-Kwifi et al., 2023).

Finally, Kuura et al. (2014), based on the works of Soila-wadman (2009), Macheridis (2009), Belousova et al. (2010), Asquin et al. (2011) and Shepherd and Patzelt (2013) highlighted, among others, that the “entrepreneurial project” is one of the domains that allows for deepening, with empirical support, the theoretical debate between the two fields. Asquin et al. (2011) conceive the entrepreneurial project as a means to deepen the perspectives of entrepreneurship and project management. According to these authors, an entrepreneurial project is a form of organization that allows structuring value creation processes based on innovative actions for the exploitation of business opportunities and the creation of companies.

Entrepreneurial or business projects play a pivotal role in managing a country’s economic, social, and environmental prosperity, particularly in job creation. Entrepreneurship contributes significantly to value creation by implementing innovative and pertinent business models to seize environmental opportunities. Consequently, governments worldwide have prioritized creating favorable conditions for the development of successful ventures and companies (Martínez-Romero et al., 2023; SENA, 2019). However, in the context of Colombia, a considerable percentage of entrepreneurial projects fail, as indicated by a gap between Total Early-stage Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA) and Established Business Ownership (EBO) based on the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor methodology (GEM) (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Gap between TEA and EBO in Colombia](image-url)
These antecedents point to two aspects worth highlighting: first, the scarcity of research studies related to the fields of entrepreneurship and PM, and second, the factual problem of the level of failure of entrepreneurial projects. These two aspects offer the opportunity to develop research processes with empirical support to answer the following questions: What criteria are relevant to evaluating the success of the entrepreneurial project? What factors influence the success of entrepreneurial projects? and, What is the relationship between the success of the entrepreneurial project in the implementation stage and the product stage?

2. Evaluation of Success within the Framework of Project Management

The concept of success in PM, referred to as the "school of success" or factors according to Turner et al. (2010) and Söderlund (2011), emphasizes the essential role of PM in precisely defining what success entails. Success, seen as an ambiguous, multidimensional, and temporal concept, requires varied measurement criteria contingent on stakeholder groups, timeframes (short, medium, or long term) (Müller and Jugdev, 2012), and project types (Shenhar et al., 2002; Ika, 2009).

Within the PM framework, several authors have identified criteria for evaluating success through empirical research. Converging on a dimension termed "project efficiency," authors such as Khan et al. (2013), Ika et al. (2012), Shenhar et al. (2001), and Shenhar and Dvir (2007) group indicators measuring the efficiency and effectiveness of project management (Pinto and Slevin 1988). Cooke-Davies (2002) and Diallo and Thuillier (2004) define this dimension as an assessment of project management during the implementation stage, encompassing operational indicators like schedule compliance, budget management, and product quality—directly related to efficiency in implementation (Shenhar and Dvir, 2007).

Seminal authors in the success school have documented dimensions aimed at measuring the success of the project product. These include organizational benefits (Khan et al., 2013), business results (Shenhar et al., 2001), and business success (Shenhar and Dvir, 2007), covering aspects of business effectiveness and incorporating indicators such as sales levels, market share, and other tangible and intangible benefits resulting from the project. Kaufman and Kock (2022), in the domain of personalized engineering projects based on client requirements, consider profitability as a success criterion.


Until the first decade of the 21st century, two review works synthesized progress in studying success within the PM framework. Jugdev and Moller (2006) noted the evolution from analyzing the success of project management (efficiency and effectiveness in the implementation stage) to studying project success, analyzing both implementation and project product performance. Ika (2009) highlighted the process of determining project success or failure through contrasting contextualized success criteria and factors, especially concerning different project typologies.

3. Entrepreneurial or Business Project

The entrepreneurial trend, characterized as projectification by Midl er (1995) and project society by Lundin et al. (2015), manifests itself in the tendency for innovation efforts to adopt the form of projects (Lundin, 2016). Investments, particularly those directed towards launching new products,
implementing new businesses, enhancing existing processes and products, implementing and/or improving infrastructures, and driving organizational changes, are commonly structured as projects (Shenhar and Dvir, 2007). This has led to the emergence of various project typologies, contributing to the complexity of their categorization.

While some authors have analyzed business or entrepreneurial projects, conceptual delimitation of these projects has often been neglected. For instance, Araki and Martins (2023) discussed aspects of governance and creativity within this context; Martins et al. (2023) highlighted it as an instrument for creating new opportunities and starting new businesses; Mbiru et al. (2020; 2023) interpreted it as a scenario allowing integration of business and entrepreneurship thinking with the field of PM. Di Muro and Turner (2018), labeling it an "Opportunity Project," emphasized the alignment of good PM practices with the Business Model (BM) within the entrepreneurship theory framework.

In Auschra et al. (2019), two categories of project-type companies were identified. One is based on scientific research processes, resulting in disruptive products classified as technology-based companies or industries (Sońta-Drączkowska and Mrożewski, 2020; Mallik, 2023). The other comprises non-scientific companies relying on incremental innovations in the business model. The former tends to have slow commercialization processes, while the latter experiences fast commercialization and monetization processes.

Building on this background, this work proposes a conceptual delimitation of the entrepreneurial project, applying criteria of purposes and attributes as proposed by Crawford et al. (2005) to categorize projects. The entrepreneurial project is defined as a project typology with the purpose of structuring innovation, resulting in a venture, business, or business organization. It encompasses both technology-based companies and those based on innovations in the business model. In its preparation stage (initiation and planning), it incorporates concepts from both PM and entrepreneurship. Additionally, for performance evaluation from the execution stage onward, a viable approach involves combining indicators from PM and factors related to business effectiveness. The business model, defined as the design of the structure and governance of transactions enabling a company to create and capture value (Zott and Awi, 2010), plays a crucial role. In practical terms, the BM involves structuring the company’s processes, activities, relationships, talents, resources, and offers with a vision of value creation for stakeholders. Finally, business effectiveness (EFO), developed within organizational theory, serves as a dimension to measure the success of organizations or businesses (Sharma and Singh, 2019; Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983).

4. Empirical Context of the Study

In Colombia, a series of public policies has been established to support an institutional framework fostering the creation and consolidation of companies, promoting an entrepreneurial culture. The legal framework in Colombia aims to improve institutional conditions for the creation of micro, small, and medium-sized businesses (MSMEs), fostering entrepreneurship culture and seeking collaboration between the productive and academic sectors. National efforts have led to the development of programs and services supporting the creation and strengthening of companies, particularly addressing training, financing, and technical support for business projects. Law 789 of 2002 established the Emprender Fund (EF) as the primary seed capital fund in the country (SENA, 2019).

4.1 Emprender Fund Model

The Emprender Fund is a Colombian government initiative designed to promote entrepreneurial projects. Projects managed by this fund involve business plans structured to create productive units or companies, aiming for impact and sustainability in the market. In PM theory, the management of these projects comprises two stages: the implementation stage and the product stage, representing
the new company. The first stage serves as a setting for dialogue between PM practices, management practices, and entrepreneurship practices.

Operational components of the EF model include actors, methodologies, and indicators (see Figure 2). Key actors include the Entrepreneur, Entrepreneurship Manager, Evaluators, Interveners, and Resource Operators. The “Entrepreneur” represents a project interest group that fulfills the roles of proponent of the project, business plan, implementation manager and product beneficiary. The entrepreneur fulfills the conceptual role of “project owner”, therefore, he is responsible for realizing the benefits and achieving the strategic objectives of the investment (Zwikael and Meredith, 2018; Meredith and Zwikael, 2020). The entrepreneur must meet certain training profiles or population typology. The “Entrepreneurship Manager” is an official who accompanies the entrepreneur throughout the process of ideation, structuring and implementation of the business plan. The “Evaluators” are those who evaluate and prioritize business plans, based on established protocols, among others, for financial evaluation (Suwaed et al., 2023). The “Interveners” are responsible for evaluating the execution of the business plans, through the established indicators. Finally, the “Resource Operators”, which are public or private institutions that manage the EF money.
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**Figure 2:** EF Operating Model

The EF methodology involves protocols for structuring, evaluating, and prioritizing business plans, along with a regulatory and institutional framework governing the model. Business plans are structured based on a business model, and innovation is evaluated using the OSLO manual categories (OECD, 2005). Evaluation indicators align with PM practices and organizational effectiveness, measured through audit processes (Figure 3).

![EF model description within the framework of the school of success in PM](image)

**Figure 3:** EF model description within the framework of the school of success in PM
Success within the EF framework involves compliance with indicators related to employment generation, budget execution, marketing management, execution time, production, sales, and sustainability in both the execution and survival stage and the product stage (Figure 4).

![EF conceptual model](image)

**Figure 4**: EF conceptual model

The hypotheses of the EF conceptual model are described below:

H1: the sustainability of the company at the time of project closure (SOS) is a valid criterion to evaluate the success of the entrepreneurial project in the implementation stage (EXI1).

H2: Project efficiency (EPR) is a valid criterion to evaluate the success of the entrepreneurial project in the implementation stage (EXI1).

H3: Organizational effectiveness (EFO) is a valid criterion to evaluate the success of the entrepreneurial project in the implementation stage (EXI1).

H4: The profile of the entrepreneur (PDE) affects the success of the entrepreneurial project in the implementation stage (EXI1).

H5: The industrial sector (SIN) affects the success of the entrepreneurial project in the implementation stage (EXI1).

H6: Business model innovation (IBM) affects the success of the entrepreneurial project in the implementation stage (EXI1).

H7: The success of the entrepreneurial project in the implementation stage (EXI2) is related to the success of the product of the entrepreneurial project (EXI2).

H8: The success of the entrepreneurial project product (EXI2) is related to the entrepreneur profile (PDE).

H9: The success of the entrepreneurial project product (EXI2) is related to the industrial sector (SIN).

H10: The success of the product of the entrepreneurial project (EXI2) is related to innovation in the business model (IBM).

5. **Methodology**

This study was developed within the framework of the quantitative approach, which has been the predominant orientation in the literature on success in the PM context (Khan et al., 2013; Joslin and Müller, 2015; Serrador and Turner, 2015; Aga et al., 2016; Musawir et al., 2017). The hypothetico-deductive method was followed and related to the frameworks of the PM school of success, entrepreneurship theory, organizational theory, and empirical particularities of the EF model indicators. The population under analysis comprised 155 projects developed in the Department of
Sucre-Colombia, between the years 2011-2019. As a criterion for inclusion in the sample, the project was considered to have three relevant documents for the study: business plan, business plan evaluation report, and reports of the project implementation process. Finally, a sample of 118 projects that met the inclusion criteria was used, representing 76% of the population of projects considered.

5.1 Data management strategy

Data was collected in three phases. The first phase involved structuring a project list based on public information from the EF web portal. In the second phase, project-specific documents such as business plans, evaluation reports, and audit reports were accessed through the Center for Innovation, Technology, and Services of SENA, Sucre section. The third phase involved collecting registration and survival data of business projects from the public portal Single Business Registry (RUES). A complete secondary database was constructed without missing or atypical data.

5.2 Measurement strategy

The success of the project was analyzed in two stages: success in the implementation stage (EXI1) and success of the product (EXI2).

Phase 1: For the evaluation of EXI1, the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) method was chosen, as it is suitable for secondary data and does not require normality assumptions (Hair et al., 2019). EXI1 was operationalized as a higher-order construct and measured using the repeated indicators approach with a formative-reflective model (Sarstedt et al., 2019). The lower order constructs included Project Efficiency (EPR), Organizational Effectiveness (EFO), and Sustainability of the company at the time of project closure (SOS). EPR and EFO were measured formatively. Convergent validity was analyzed using the global item method (Cheah et al., 2018). Indicators for EPR included budget compliance (CUP), schedule compliance (CUT), marketing compliance (CUM), and production performance (DPR). EFO indicators included employment generation compliance (CUE) and sales performance (DVE). SOS was measured using the Altman model (Altman, 1968).

Phase 2: In this phase, EXI1 was related to contextual variables: Entrepreneur Profile (PDE), Industrial Sector (SIN), and Business Model Innovation (IBM) using categorical regression. PDE categories included SENA apprentice, rural youth, professional, and postgraduate. SIN categories included exploitation of other livestock species, livestock exploitation, manufacturing exploitation, and exploitation of services. IBM categories included process innovation and product innovation.

Phase 3: EXI2 was evaluated based on the survival time of the business organization resulting from the entrepreneurial project. Survival was measured using a threshold of 48 months, and logistic regression was used to relate EXI2 with EXI1, PDE, SIN, and IBM. Dummy variables were created for PDE, SIN, and IBM. In the field of entrepreneurship, Varela and Soler (2015) proposed the concept of business pipeline, which allows for the evolutionary analysis of the entrepreneurial process and the permanence in the market of businesses that result from entrepreneurial projects. Likewise, in the field of organizational theory, Hanna and Freeman (1984) proposed the approach of population ecology of organizations, used by the Private Competitiveness Council and by Moya-Clemente et al. (2020) in their models for measuring the net business birth rate and business continuation indicator respectively. A common approach can then be inferred between the fields of PM, entrepreneurship and organizational theory around the concept of "survival".

Finally, to relate EXI2 with EXI1, EPD, SIN and IBM, the logistic regression technique was chosen, which is suitable for dichotomous or binary dependent variables. The calculations were made through SmartPLS version 4 software. The EPD, SIN and IBM variables were categorized as dummy variables.

Table 1 summarizes the operationalization of the variables during the development of the three measurement phases.
Table 1: Operationalization of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Dimensions - Unit of Analysis</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Indicators/Variables</th>
<th>Theoretical / Empirical support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFO: Organizational effectiveness.</td>
<td>EFO: Organizational effectiveness.</td>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>Timely compliance (schedule)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUM</td>
<td>Compliance in marketing management</td>
<td>Shenhar and Dvir (2007), EF model indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Production compliance</td>
<td>Sharma and Sing (2019), Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDE: Entrepreneur Profile</td>
<td>PDE: Entrepreneur Profile</td>
<td>DVE</td>
<td>Sales compliance</td>
<td>Sharma and Sing (2019), Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUE</td>
<td>Compliance in employment generation</td>
<td>Shenhar and Dvir (2007), EF model indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIN: Industrial Sector</td>
<td>SIN: Industrial Sector</td>
<td>SIN1</td>
<td>Exploitation of other livestock species</td>
<td>Müller y Turner (2007a; 2007b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIN2</td>
<td>Livestock exploitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIN3</td>
<td>Manufacturing exploitation</td>
<td>Müller y Turner (2007a; 2007b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIN4</td>
<td>Services Exploitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IBM2</td>
<td>Product innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXI2: Product Success</td>
<td>EXI2: Product Success</td>
<td>EXI2</td>
<td>Time that the project remains in the market as a business organization</td>
<td>(Ika et al., 2012); (Khan et al., 2013); Varela y Soler (2015); Hannan y Freeman (1984), Private Competitiveness Council (2021)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Results

6.1 Convergent validity, collinearity, loadings and external weights of the lower order constructs: EPR and EFO

The study evaluated the convergent validity, collinearity, loadings, and external weights of the lower-order constructs EPR and EFO. The redundancy analysis revealed significant path coefficients of 0.850 and 0.739 for EPR and EFO, respectively, exceeding the suggested threshold of 0.7 (see Table 2). This indicates communality between the indicators used in constructing the latent variables (Hair et al., 2021). Collinearity analysis indicated no problems, as all values were below 3, signifying the absence of collinearity among the indicators.

Table 2: Convergent validity of the EPR and EFO constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Path coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original sample (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPR (formative) -&gt; EPR (reflective)</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFO (formative) -&gt; EFO (reflective)</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows that there are no collinearity problems between the indicators involved in the measurements and construction of the latent variables, considering that all their values are less than 3 (Hair et al., 2021).

Table 3: Collinearity of model indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>CPR</th>
<th>CPR</th>
<th>CUE</th>
<th>CUE</th>
<th>CUM</th>
<th>CUM</th>
<th>CUP</th>
<th>CUM</th>
<th>CUP</th>
<th>CUT</th>
<th>CUT</th>
<th>DPR</th>
<th>DPR</th>
<th>DVE</th>
<th>DVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.640</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>2.438</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>2.561</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of external loads and weights demonstrated significant contributions from most indicators, except for CUM and CUT (see Table 4). While CUM had an absolute contribution below 0.5 and was not significant at 5%, it was retained in the model because its relative contribution to the EPR construct (12%) exceeded the suggested threshold of 10%. Similarly, CUT, with an external load below 0.5 and not significant, was retained due to its theoretical importance in the evaluation of success in the PM framework.

Table 4: Analysis of external loads and weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External loads</th>
<th>Original sample (O)</th>
<th>t statistics ([O/STDEV])</th>
<th>p-values</th>
<th>External weights</th>
<th>Original sample (O)</th>
<th>t statistics ([O/STDEV])</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPR &lt;- SOS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPR &lt;- EXI1</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>4.498</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR &lt;- EXI1</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>4.196</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>CUE &lt;- EXI1</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>4.296</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE -&gt; EFO</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>4.296</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>CUM &lt;- EXI1</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>1.754</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUM -&gt; EPR</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>1.790</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>CUP -&gt; EPR</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>4.408</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP &lt;- EXI1</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>4.288</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>CUT &lt;- EXI1</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUT -&gt; EPR</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>DPR -&gt; EPR</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>5.809</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR &lt;- EXI1</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>5.346</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>DVE &lt;- EXI1</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>8.201</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVE -&gt; EFO</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>9.390</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Reliability, construct validity and discriminant validity of EXI1

The study examined the reliability, construct validity, and discriminant validity of the higher-order construct EXI1, measured based on the lower-order constructs SOS, EPR, and EFO. Results indicated good interdependence between lower-order constructs and EXI1, with significant loadings of 0.710, 0.858, and 0.868, respectively (see Figure 5). Internal coherence of EXI1 was satisfactory, with Alpha values exceeding 0.7 and rhoc less than 0.95. Convergent validity was established with AVE exceeding 0.5, indicating adequate communality (Hair et al., 2022). Discriminant validity was supported by HTMT ratios exceeding 0.85 (see Table 5).
Figure 5: Model of the superior construct EXI1

Table 5: Analysis of reliability, construct validity and discriminant validity of EXI1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Composite reliability (rho_a)</th>
<th>Composite reliability (rho_c)</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</th>
<th>Discriminant validity (HTMT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXI1</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.664*</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXI1 -&gt; SOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, it is important to highlight that the measurement of a higher order construct EXI1 was achieved, within the framework of the parameters of measurement theory (Hair et al., 2021), which explains the variance of lower order constructs at high levels (EPR=73.4%, SOS=50% and EFO=75.1%). Regarding higher-order construct calculation, Sarstedt et al. (2019) have been categorical in stating that the relationships between lower and higher order constructs are not part of the structural model, a postulate that is fully shared in this work. However, it is important to note that for the case under study, the calculations are only made within the framework of measurement theory, since at this stage of the study, the EXI1 was not contrasted with any of this other concepts. Therefore, the evaluation was done only at the measurement model level. Considering the above, the significant relationships between EXI1 and the lower order constructs SOS, EPR and EFO, which support a communality (AVE=66.4%), are legitimate parameters to accept H1, H2 and H3. That is, the dimensions: project efficiency, organizational effectiveness and sustainability of the company at the time of project closure, are valid criteria to evaluate the success of the entrepreneurial project in the implementation stage. Measurement theory is applied to confirm the reliability and validity of measurement models and structural theory allows analyzing the relationship between the latent variables that are contrasted in a model.

In the second stage, the success of the project in the implementation stage (EXI1) was compared with categorical variables of entrepreneur PDE, SIN and IBM. Low correlation values in Tables 6 and 7 indicated no multicollinearity problems.

Table 6: Original correlation variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PDE</th>
<th>SIN</th>
<th>IBM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDE</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIN</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7: Variables transformed from correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PDE</th>
<th>SIN</th>
<th>IBM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the predictors PDE, SIN, and IBM failed to configure a statistically significant model, explaining only 3% of the variance in project success in the implementation stage (EXI1) (see Table 8 and 9).

Table 8: Summary of the model and ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>Squared R</th>
<th>Adjusted R-squared</th>
<th>Apparent prediction error</th>
<th>Anova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Data</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: EXI1, Predictors: PDE, SIN, IBM

Table 9: Coefficients, correlations and tolerances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Zero order</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDE</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>2.871</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIN</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>6.448</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: EXI1

The report of correlations, tolerance of betas, and ANOVA in Tables 8 and 9 revealed that the coefficient of the PDE was statistically significant but the least important for the model.

Upon eliminating the PDE and recalculating the model with SIN and IBM variables, a statistically significant model was achieved. SIN and IBM explained 10.2% of the variance of EXI1 (see Table 10). The coefficient of the IBM variable was not statistically significant, and the industrial sector (SIN) emerged as the most important variable for the model.

Table 10: Summary of the model and ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>Squared R</th>
<th>Adjusted R-squared</th>
<th>Apparent prediction error</th>
<th>Anova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Data</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: PEXI, Predictors: SIN, IBM

Likewise, the report of correlations and tolerance of the coefficients shown in Table 11 shows that the coefficient of the IBM variable is not statistically significant and that the most important variable for the model is the SIN. Therefore, the model was calculated one by one.
Results indicated that the PDE vs. EXI1 relationship was not statistically significant, SIN vs. EXI1 relationship was statistically significant, and the IBM vs. EXI1 relationship configured a statistically significant model at 6.5%. SIN explained 4.7%, and IBM explained 2.1% of EXI1 (see Table 12). In that sense, H4 is rejected and H5 and H6 are accepted, which indicates that the profile of the entrepreneur, as defined by the EF, does not affect the success of project implementation, but the industrial sector and innovation in the business model have a positive impact.

6.3 Comparison of previous results

In the third stage, the success of the project product (EXI2) was compared with EXI1, PDE, SIN, and IBM using logistic regression coefficients (Table 13).

P-values of the logistic regression model indicated that the success of the product of the entrepreneurial project (EXI2) was not related to EXI, PDE, SIN, nor innovation in IBM. Therefore, H7, H8, H9, and H10 were rejected.

The study provided a comprehensive analysis of the convergent validity, collinearity, loadings, and external weights of lower-order constructs (EPR and EFO) and the reliability, construct validity, and discriminant validity of the higher-order construct EXI1. The results supported the validity of dimensions such as project efficiency, organizational effectiveness, and sustainability for evaluating the success of entrepreneurial projects in the implementation stage.

Furthermore, the comparison of results in the second and third stages revealed insights into the impact of entrepreneur profile, industrial sector, and innovation in the business model on the success of the implementation stage and the success of the project product. The entrepreneur profile had no
significant impact, while the industrial sector and innovation in the business model were significant predictors of success in the implementation stage. However, these factors did not significantly predict the success of the project product.

7. Discussion of Results and Contributions

The study’s results contribute to the understanding of evaluating entrepreneurial project success, particularly in the implementation stage. The discussion highlights key findings and their implications, drawing comparisons with existing PM models and emphasizing the unique aspects of entrepreneurial projects.

7.1 Validity criteria for evaluating project success in the implementation stage

The results affirm the validity of efficiency indicators such as budget management and schedule management, aligning with existing literature (Khan et al., 2013; Ika et al., 2012; Shenhar et al., 2001; Shenhar and Dvir, 2007; Pinto and Slevin, 1988; Cooke-Davies, 2002; Diallo and Thuillier, 2004). However, the study asserts that, for entrepreneurial projects, efficiency indicators alone are insufficient. Empirical evidence suggests the necessity of incorporating organizational effectiveness indicators and product quality indicators into the evaluation criteria, as defined by the EF.

This finding diverges from models presented by Khan et al. (2013), Ika et al. (2012), and Shenhar and Dvir (2007), which considered indicators of organizational effectiveness but not specifically in the implementation stage. The EF methodology recognizes the importance of analyzing quality through models like Altman (1968) and assessing organizational effectiveness in financial, administrative, human resources, market, and operational aspects. The study argues for the need to complement traditional PM models with elements from entrepreneurship and organizational theory to comprehensively evaluate entrepreneurial project success.

7.2 Critical success factors (CSF) in the implementation stage

The study identifies critical success factors in the project implementation stage, including the industrial sector and innovation in the business model, while discarding the profile of the entrepreneur as a CSF. This finding aligns with prior works (Müller and Turner, 2007a; 2007b), supporting the importance of industrial sector considerations during implementation. However, it challenges existing literature by negating the entrepreneur's profile as a CSF in the implementation stage.

The study suggests that the entrepreneur's profile is more representative of a population categorization than an individual management skill or capability profile. In this sense, the finding does not invalidate empirical evidence from previous works, but rather points out the practical need for the EF to implement strategies to evaluate the profile of entrepreneurs in their selection processes. According to Zwikael and Meredith (2018) and Meredith and Zwikael (2020), the entrepreneur is responsible for the development of the organization resulting from the project. Therefore, they are responsible for the success or failure of a project.

7.3 Contribution of innovation in the business model

A noteworthy contribution is the identification that innovation in the business model explains 2.1% of the variance in the success of entrepreneurial projects in the implementation stage. This finding aligns with propositions from previous studies (Di Muro and Turner, 2018), emphasizing the relationship between PM and business models in projects categorized as opportunities. It suggests that successful management of entrepreneurial projects involves transformations in the business model, contributing to the theoretical dialogue between PM and entrepreneurship.
7.4 Relationship between project success in implementation and product success

The study addresses the relationship between project success in the implementation stage and product success, a highly debated hypothesis in PM theory. The findings align with Atkinson's (Atkinson, 1999) proposition that a project successful in implementation may not necessarily yield a successful product, and vice versa. This highlights the complexity of project success evaluation and emphasizes the importance of considering both implementation and product stages.

This study contributes by refining criteria for evaluating entrepreneurial project success in the implementation stage, emphasizing the need for a holistic approach that incorporates efficiency, organizational effectiveness, and product quality indicators. The identified critical success factors, including the industrial sector and innovation in the business model, provide valuable insights for project practitioners and researchers. The study encourages the integration of entrepreneurship and organizational theory into PM models, fostering a more comprehensive understanding of entrepreneurial project success.

8. Conclusions

The evaluation of the success of an entrepreneurial project at the implementation stage is closely tied to the economic sustainability of the resulting company, the project’s efficiency, and indicators of organizational effectiveness. As it stands, project management theory is insufficient to comprehensively cover all the constructs, definitions, and propositions necessary to support this assessment. Consequently, evaluating the success of entrepreneurial projects requires a theoretical dialogue that encompasses project theory, entrepreneurship, and organizational theory.

During the implementation stage, critical success factors are identified for entrepreneurial projects, such as the industrial sector and innovation in the business model. The study establishes that the success of entrepreneurial projects during implementation does not exhibit a direct relationship with the success achieved in the subsequent product stage. This idea emphasizes the need for a nuanced and specific understanding of the stages involved in evaluating success in entrepreneurial projects.

The study underscores the importance of integrating entrepreneurship and organizational theory into project management models to achieve a more comprehensive and personalized approach for evaluating the success of entrepreneurial projects. By recognizing the unique nature of these projects and considering efficiency, organizational effectiveness, and product quality indicators, practitioners and researchers can better navigate the complexities inherent in entrepreneurial efforts.

In essence, the conclusions drawn from this study contribute to refining the understanding of the success of entrepreneurial projects, advocating for a more holistic and context-specific approach that goes beyond traditional project management paradigms. This combined perspective recognizes the multifaceted nature of entrepreneurial projects, paving the way for further theoretical development and practical application at the dynamic intersection of project management, entrepreneurship, and organizational theory.

Among the limitations of the study, it should be noted that the study looked for success factors of the entrepreneurial project using three different variables: the industrial sector, innovation in the business model, and the entrepreneur’s profile. The data analyzed failed to support the hypotheses related to the entrepreneur’s profile, which indicates that the categorization made by Emprender Fond to recruit its entrepreneurs does not affect the success of the project. In this sense, there is a latent need to deepen the search for success factors related to the entrepreneur’s profile, so it is pertinent to ask: What characteristics of the entrepreneur have a positive influence on the success of the project? The theory of entrepreneurship in the line of individual entrepreneurial orientation offers an adequate framework for searching for such factors.
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