

Teaching Entrepreneurial Leadership: clarifying the concept for the classroom

by Muhammad Azam Roomi and Pegram Harrison

Abstract

This paper seeks to strengthen the connection between research and teaching in two fields that are well-established in themselves, but not often studied together: entrepreneurship and leadership. We refer to the fusion of these concepts as “entrepreneurial leadership”. After surveying the disparate literature covering both fields together, we present results of a survey of current teaching practices in UK universities for both topics, and make recommendations for essential design elements in entrepreneurial leadership teaching materials.

Introduction

This paper seeks to strengthen the connection between research and teaching in two fields that are well-established in themselves, but not often studied together: entrepreneurship and leadership. We refer to the fusion of these concepts as “entrepreneurial leadership”. After surveying the disparate literature covering both fields together, we present results of a survey of current teaching practices in UK universities for both topics, and make recommendations for essential design elements in entrepreneurial leadership teaching materials.

By identifying the important aspects of leadership that are taught successfully for more corporate contexts, by adapting these to entrepreneurial contexts, and by designing materials for the delivery of this adapted content, this paper aims to provide new insights into the nature and practice of entrepreneurial leadership education.

Muhammad Azam Roomi is a Senior Lecturer and the Director of Research at the University of Bedfordshire’s Centre for Women’s Enterprise. His research interests are in the growth and performance of SMEs, role of social capital and human capital in enterprise development, and women’s entrepreneurship in the UK as well as Islamic and Asian countries.

Pegram Harrison is a Fellow in Entrepreneurship at the Saïd Business School in the University of Oxford, and the director of the London Business School’s Emerging Leaders Programme. His research interests are in social entrepreneurship and regional development.

Literature Review

Research on entrepreneurship education has developed considerably in recent years (Hannon, 2006; Hartshorn and Hannon, 2005; Heinonen and Poikkijoki, 2006; Johnson *et al.*, 2006; Kuratko, 2005; Wilson *et al.*, 2007). However, very little of it considers or investigates entrepreneurial leadership directly. Some sources on entrepreneurial education touch on the integral role of leadership (Jack and Anderson, 1999; Klapper, 2004; Matlay, 2005a; McKeown *et al.*, 2006; Smith *et al.*, 2006) but do not develop the notion in detail. Additionally, there is a concern (typical of early-stage research agendas) to establish clear methodologies (Cox *et al.*, 2002; Gorman *et al.*, 1997; Matlay, 2005b; Matlay, 2006), but this precludes more developed enquiry. Work from other countries, even fairly recently from the US, makes little or no mention of leadership (Chen *et al.*, 2006; Fayolle *et al.*, 2006; Katz, 2003; Solomon, 2007; Streeter, et al, 2002).

There are no comparable surveys of leadership education, nor any consistent understanding of educational best practices. Moreover, within the great variety of approaches, the teaching of leadership in the UK universities tends to be aimed at employees or potential employees of relatively large corporations. There remains a need for more systematic leadership education in entrepreneurial contexts, or of entrepreneurial leadership education.

Literature on entrepreneurial leadership education in UK HEIs

Four recent surveys of the literature on UK entrepreneurship education provide a model for the objectives envisioned here for research into entrepreneurial leadership education. McKeown *et al* (2006) survey three areas across graduate entrepreneurship education: type, content, and delivery methods. We propose a similar inventory of entrepreneurial leadership education, looking at 1) the number, level and structure of programmes to determine which (if any) offer systematic exposure to leadership issues within an entrepreneurial context; 2) the content of such programmes in terms of topics presented and developed; and 3) the delivery methods in terms of teaching strategies, methods, and technologies.

Matlay (2005a) critiques the validity, comparability and generalisability of work on entrepreneurial education, pointing out limits in extant studies, and noting that the progress of entrepreneurship education is hard to assess because there is great variety in key definitions: that of entrepreneurship itself, of the nature of entrepreneurial knowledge and skills, of the nature of entrepreneurial learning, and of the evaluation of entrepreneurial capacity. We aim to address this critique with a conceptualisation of entrepreneurial leadership education that defines a position on these points.

Matlay and Carey (2007) have conducted a 10-year longitudinal project on UK entrepreneurship education generally; (a similar, much earlier study by Fleming (1996) took place in Ireland). With in-depth qualitative data, from 40 universities, on development and implementation of entrepreneurship education, it nonetheless has no focus on entrepreneurial leadership. A strong conclusion to this work, however, is that actual *and perceived* barriers must be overcome to understand stakeholder requirements. We propose that chief among these requirements is the demand for leadership education among potential and early-stage entrepreneurs, and that a more focused understanding of the barriers this group perceives in attaining that goal will greatly enhance the state of entrepreneurship education and practice.

Finally, Hannon (2007) and the National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship have conducted a comprehensive census of 131 HEIs looking at weaknesses in UK entrepreneurship education. The survey's findings point to a number of factors that will bear investigating in the context of entrepreneurial leadership: 1) a high variability across the country in the conceptualisation of entrepreneurship and of leadership, 2) similar variability

in programme design, 3) a lack of understanding of the impact of investment on educational outcomes, 4) some indicative correlation between enterprise and leadership education and entrepreneurial leadership propensity (if not activity), and 5) the proposition that growth in activity will require growth in curricula, pedagogic innovation, teacher capability, institutional resource support.

Our survey is informed by these predecessors. Full results are presented in Section 1; a more detailed presentation is given in Section 0 below; followed by analysis and recommendations for the design of teaching materials in Section 0.

Literature on teaching materials for entrepreneurial leadership education

There is some research on entrepreneurship education, and on leadership education, and even a small amount on entrepreneurial leadership education. In each instance, there are implications for best practices in designing and delivering teaching materials which we use for our recommendations later in the paper.

Okudan and Rzasa (2004) argue for a project-based approach; the notion of the process model in entrepreneurial education is also espoused by Leitch and Harrison (1999), although without direct attention to leadership development. Okudan and Rzasa's work is based on their own teaching experience in an engineering school and on a survey of other entrepreneurial leadership teaching programmes in North American universities; they conduct a brief review of entrepreneurial education literature, but almost none of leadership literature. They are dismissive of three book-length studies of entrepreneurial leadership which we too have found overly theoretical and impractical: Smilor and Sexton, 1996; Schulz, 1999; and Eggert, 1999. Their suggestions for leadership skill development in the context of entrepreneurial education are practical and well-tested: "the course has two foci: 1) leadership skills development, which utilizes concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualisation and active experimentation; and 2) business plan development and implementation, which primarily utilizes active experimentation," (Okudan and Rzasa, 2004: 20). Their work suggests that certain elements should be central to the design of teaching materials: skills development exercises, workshops to form teams and observe team dynamics, consistent "project dissection" or critical appraisal of the project as it evolves. This latter notion of the importance of critical reflection as a tool for leadership education is strongly endorsed by Densten and Gray (2001); the idea appears elsewhere sporadically throughout the literature of both entrepreneurship and leadership, and we have expanded it in our own recommendations for the development of teaching materials.

Entrepreneurship education literature generally endorses active or experiential learning methods that take students out of the lecture-room, especially through the use of technology, and regards integration of such methods into entrepreneurial curricula as progress in the effectiveness of entrepreneurial education (Bécharde and Grégoire, 2005; Charney, 2000; Cooper et al, 2004; Jones, 2004; Kirby, 2004; Kourilsky, 1995; Kouratko, 2003; Leitch and Harrison, 1999; Lüthje and Franke, 2002; Neck et al 1999; Vesper and Gartner, 1997). The same is true for leadership education, although the idea is less comprehensively explored in that section of the literature (Brungardt, 1997; Mitchell and Poutiatine, 2001; Rost, 2000). One implication of this general predilection for active and experiential learning methods in both areas is that such methods can be used to fuse the two educational agendas.

A superficial search of the internet using the string "entrepreneurship AND leadership AND education" produces a notable result: in North America, there are at least 25 university institutes, teaching programmes, educational foundations, or core courses in graduate schools named with the term "entrepreneurial leadership". In the UK currently, there is one (a 5 day CPD course at Liverpool John Moores University). At the very least, this means that where there is a great deal more educational provision for leadership in an entrepreneurial context in

the US than in the UK, there is also likely to be more awareness of the need and value of such provision. Moreover, each of these centres, programmes and courses represents a model, a source of inspiration, and a source of teaching materials to be emulated where possible and appropriate. Certainly, it is possible that none of these does more than re-package traditional entrepreneurship and leadership education, rather than organically fusing them—but the preponderance of such efforts, even if they are superficial, suggests a wide response to a perceived market demand.

There is actually some literature that begins to fuse the two areas. Brockhaus (1982) is an old source, looking at the psychological traits common to leaders and entrepreneurs—but there is no attention to developing those traits. Gupta, MacMillan and Surie (2004) organise their analysis of entrepreneurial leadership around the implications for cross-cultural contexts, and not for developing entrepreneurial leadership generally. Work comparing the evolution of each topic as a field of research does not delve too deeply into actual ideas (Cogliser and Brigham, 2004). Robinson, Goleby and Hosgood (2006: 1) look at entrepreneurship as “one type of leadership orientation”, but are more concerned to develop an entrepreneurial paradigm than an entrepreneurial leadership paradigm. Similarly, the work of Michael Ensley and colleagues (Ensley et al, 2006a; 2006b) and of Robert Vecchio (2003) looks at leadership behaviours in entrepreneurial contexts, and at management trends common to both perspectives, but from a strongly psychological perspective; also, his model of entrepreneurial leadership is designed to integrate process and level influences by identifying how a conception of leadership changes as an entrepreneurial organisation develops. In concluding that “entrepreneurship is simply a type of leadership that occurs in a specific setting” he steps away from a unified notion of entrepreneurial leadership and replaces it with a hierarchical typology in which leadership includes entrepreneurship. As will be seen below in Sections 0, 0 and 0, our survey respondents perceive almost the reverse.

Harrison and Leitch (1994) have specifically addressed entrepreneurship and leadership together, but concentrate on research and theorising instead of practical implications for teaching. They do make some general recommendations touching on the design of teaching materials, and favour a team-based approach to learning; Henry, Hill and Leitch (2003) also re-visit the notion of team-based learning in the context of entrepreneurship training. Eyal and Kark (2004) come closer to recommending specific tactics for developing entrepreneurial leadership effectiveness, but are concerned with the leadership of schools and not companies.

Most directly relevant, Kuratko (2007) introduces a full special issue in leadership journal on entrepreneurial leadership in the 21st century; the issue as a whole takes a fairly psychological approach, but Kuratko’s introduction ranges more widely over the global impact of entrepreneurial leadership, the nature of entrepreneurial leaders, negative effects, ethical issues, and corporate entrepreneurial leadership. This useful variety of perspectives has proved useful in deriving our own understanding of what elements are essential in the design of entrepreneurial leadership teaching materials. It is also worth noting that its conceptualisation of entrepreneurial leadership is as close to being fused as any we have found elsewhere. However, the emphasis is on understanding and assessing entrepreneurial leadership—not necessarily on developing it, or on disaggregating its constituent parts for the purpose of teaching it.

Thus, despite some encouraging initial movement, there remains scope for exploring best practices for the teaching of entrepreneurial leadership, with the pragmatic intention of applying any new insights to the design of teaching materials.

Implications and Impact

The major implications of Hannon (2007) are that further research is needed to identify and benchmark educational best practice; that better professional development and support for educators are needed; and that the NCGE is eager to work more closely with partners to

provide more credible evidence for research, recommendations for educational policy, and new teaching materials to put into practice. Hannon concludes that “overcoming any fragilities in support and development and delivering enterprise education opportunities for all demands an ongoing understanding of the ‘state of play’ across the sector,” (Hannon, 2007: 210).

In conclusion, this paper aims to make measurable impacts on learning: first through research, to achieve improved understanding of entrepreneurial leadership education; and next by providing strong recommendations for educational best practices and the developing new, active, technologically informed, relevant and sustainable teaching materials.

Survey Results

Fifty one educators were surveyed in HEIs in the UK, in the summer and autumn of 2008, with a response rate of 100%. Additional follow-up interviews with 9 respondents were conducted by email and telephone. The survey encouraged respondents to think about entrepreneurship education and leadership education separately before asking about instances of both topics occurring in conjunction with each other, i.e. entrepreneurial leadership education.

Topics covered

When asked to list entrepreneurship topics covered at their HEI, respondents answers were grouped generally under the headings as mentioned in Table 1. Roughly two thirds of entrepreneurial courses include content on leadership, and only about a quarter definitely do not; there is a small grey area of less than 10%. Conversely, only one third of leadership courses contain entrepreneurial content; nearly half definitely do not; the grey area is twice as big at 20%.

Please insert Table 1 about here

According to respondents, there is a significant amount of leadership taught inside entrepreneurial courses and considerably less entrepreneurship taught inside leadership courses. There is some perceived logic to including leadership as a sub-set of entrepreneurship—although about a tenth of respondent report uncertainty about this. There is less perceived logic to including entrepreneurship as a subset of leadership: more respondents refute the idea than confirm it, and a fifth are uncertain (see above, Section 0).

It is also interesting to note that there is generally more uncertainty around leadership—whether it is taught independently, embedded with other material, or at all. Possibly, the lack of clarity about entrepreneurial leadership comes from lack of clarity about leadership pedagogy generally.

In addition, looking at the statements about course content in responses to the questions regarding entrepreneurship and leadership topics covered, there is greater detail and subtlety in describing entrepreneurship topics, whereas leadership topics are often not specified further than the word “leadership”. This implies that the leadership topic agenda is perceived as monolithic, without being informed by ideas from elsewhere. Whether this is true or not is immaterial; the perception of respondents is that leadership courses do not contain much content that is recognisably entrepreneurial, or similar to that found in entrepreneurial courses.

Finally, qualitative data indicate implicit inclusion of leadership topics in entrepreneurial courses: for example, “none, specifically [are covered] but case studies used highlight the actions that entrepreneurs take and the consequences”. Comments about entrepreneurial

topics in leadership courses do not seem to imply even implicit coverage, except in the most general way: “mindset, entrepreneurial behaviour, entrepreneurial thinking”. The main observation is that there very little direct fusion of entrepreneurship and leadership topics perceived in the responses.

Learning methods

The portfolio of learning methods employed for entrepreneurship and leadership show some similarities—lectures dominate in each topic, role playing is only used about half the time in both topics, exams are sometimes used while simulations, site-visits, and technology are rarely employed, etc. More interestingly, there are some major points of difference in the profiles of each topic that indicate fairly little attention to entrepreneurial leadership.

Group exercises comprise an important learning method for entrepreneurship; far less so for leadership, especially where the group members are selected by the students themselves. About half of the respondents use self-selected groups in entrepreneurship, but only 20% in leadership. Where team dynamics can be a major source of learning, and an opportunity for students to witness close hand any behaviours conducive to effective leadership, the lack of group exercises seems like a wasted opportunity; self-selected groups, moreover, provide opportunities for peer reflection on leadership effectiveness in ways that groups comprised of strangers do not. Also, the paucity of group-work in leadership topics, relative to group-work in entrepreneurship topics, indicates little exploration of entrepreneurial topics inside whatever leadership group-work might occur. In short, it implies little teaching of entrepreneurial leadership.

More generally, responses concerning learning methods for leadership seem to emphasize the lower ends of the scale in almost all cases (other than lectures and case studies), with thin but even distribution around other levels. Responses for entrepreneurship are more evenly spread in the middle levels. This might indicate greater diversity in methods employed for entrepreneurship than leadership. More to the point, such a mismatch implies that attention to entrepreneurial leadership is more likely to emerge from an entrepreneurial perspective than a leadership one—that entrepreneurship teachers might be more receptive to including leadership content in their already diversified learning environments, while leadership teachers might find it harder to apply their material in an entrepreneurial context or to relate it to an entrepreneurial perspective. Entrepreneurial leadership, in short, is perceived as being more a matter of entrepreneurship than leadership—apparently the opposite position to that stipulated by Vecchio (2003), as shown above in Section 0.

Teachers

In the response pool, teachers of entrepreneurship are reported as being academics nearly 90% of the time, with contributions from practitioners about 50% of the time. Teachers of leadership are only 70% academics, with practitioners contributing less than 50%. These results do not match the learning methods responses for guest practitioners and speakers: about 40% in entrepreneurship, and somewhat over 40% in leadership. Respondents are reporting practitioner input differently when asked to focus on it more directly, and also minimising it somewhat.

Nonetheless, there is a perception among respondents that practitioner input is considerably less frequent than academic input in both topics. One implication of this might be that any systematic attempt to teach entrepreneurial leadership would be more likely to emerge from an academic perspective than a practitioner perspective. Again, if this is an effective way to approach the challenge of entrepreneurial leadership, then there is an opportunity for academics to conceptualise a theory of entrepreneurial leadership and to teach it more explicitly. If, however, there is little practitioner resource to draw on in teaching the

concept, then the topic risks remaining too theoretical and insufficiently practical. This is a concern not limited to entrepreneurial leadership, though, and common to business and management pedagogy generally.

Institutional support

This area of the responses mainly implies a perception that entrepreneurial ideas are fairly well taught, whereas leadership ideas are less well taught. It also implies that the teaching of leadership skills in an entrepreneurial context—i.e. entrepreneurial leadership—is not emphasised explicitly.

For example, 75% of respondents report that their courses provide the knowledge necessary to *start* a business, but only 60% impart the knowledge necessary to *run* a business. While this is consistent with the fairly familiar idea of the serial entrepreneur—good at starting, bad at running—it also implies a perceived lack of opportunity to focus explicitly on entrepreneurial leadership in the form of knowledge needed to lead a team in various stages of a company’s evolution, even if this requires a shift in leadership techniques along the way. “Knowledge” of a certain concepts relating to entrepreneurship and leadership is not resulting in a unified conceptualisation of entrepreneurial leadership.

Similarly, on the related subject of skills, respondents report that relatively few “leaderships skills needed by entrepreneurs” are fostered, whereas more “social skills needed by entrepreneurs” are encouraged. Again, this seems to demonstrate that a specific skill set for entrepreneurial leadership—however that is conceptualised in the “knowledge” conveyed—is not being identified or taught.

Effectiveness

The effectiveness of leadership learning in fostering entrepreneurial activity was examined through questions about the rate of start-ups by students of different topics. While we observe that about 60% of entrepreneurship students are estimated to become entrepreneurs sooner or later after graduation, it is more interesting to note that fewer leadership students are estimated to become entrepreneurs at all (14%). Also, by a rough estimate their entrepreneurial involvement declines over time—only very small percentage are estimated as starting their own business within 5 years of graduation, as opposed to larger and more reliable percentage estimates for entrepreneurship students. There is a perception that people who study entrepreneurship are more likely to stick to it, whereas most people who study leadership move away from entrepreneurial activity. Does this imply that more focused teaching on entrepreneurial leadership would increase the overall proportion of students becoming and staying entrepreneurs?

Conclusion

With this relatively superficial data, it would be unwise to claim that these results indicate a clear educational opportunity. Yes, entrepreneurial leadership education seems nearly unavailable, but this could imply either that it is greatly in demand or that it is largely unwanted. And though the next section of this paper considers the case for entrepreneurial leadership education in abstract, without consideration for its demand by teachers or students, it seems important to reflect that greater explicitness in entrepreneurial education and in leadership education, might be gained by marrying aspects of the two together in carefully considered ways. We attempt this in the section below.

Analysis and Recommendations

Rationale for entrepreneurial leadership education

The results of our literature review and survey suggest strongly that entrepreneurial leadership education should provide students with both a theoretical understanding and a practical orientation. It should aim to enable students, through a sequence of topics, to gain a basis of knowledge and skills in general management, with its practical outcome being the ability to lead in an entrepreneurial context. Moreover, it should be applicable both in traditional entrepreneurial contexts, such as start-ups or early-stage companies, and in larger and well-established organisations. Entrepreneurial leadership education should serve the needs of any team or organisation where competitive advantage is to be gained from the pursuit of opportunity beyond the resources currently controlled (Stevenson, 1985).

We are forming the notion that if general leadership consists of strategic vision coupled with the ability to influence and motivate others, 'Entrepreneurial Leadership' consists of the same together with an entrepreneurial mindset and skill-set to identify, develop and take advantage of innovative ideas for the sustainable future of the organisation (Thornberry, 2006; Hitt, Ireland and Hoskisson 2001). Entrepreneurial leadership involves managing an organisation through relationships and culture, rather than through command and control; this requires knowing how to handle and deal with the risk, uncertainty and ambiguity that face all entrepreneurial organisations (Burns, 2007). Entrepreneurial leadership education, therefore, should aim to provide students and budding entrepreneurs with a mindset that encourages and teaches them to think and act in an entrepreneurial way. In other words, it must give them the desire to think and act differently from managers (Thornberry, 2006). Entrepreneurial leaders are never satisfied with the status quo (Kirby, 2003; Carter and Jones-Evans, 2006; Thornberry, 2006; Burns, 2007; Morris, Kuratko and Covin, 2008) but are always looking for ways in which they can change and exploit their current transactional situation for the better (Venkataraman and Van de Ven, 1998; Kao, 1989).

Thus entrepreneurial leadership education should inculcate a desire to create, build and change collaboratively (Thornberry, 2006). It should provide students and entrepreneurs with 'hands on' experience of spotting and orchestrating new opportunities, and of galvanizing a team to take advantage of those opportunities before they are missed. Entrepreneurial leadership education should enable students to set direction, communicate and motivate their entrepreneurial teams.

Essential design elements for entrepreneurial leadership education

From earlier research (Begley, 1995; Stewart et al., 1998) Vecchio (2003) derives five elements common to those effective in entrepreneurship and leadership: an internal locus of control, a need for achievement, a risk-taking propensity, a need for autonomy, and self-efficacy. In fact, he finds insufficient evidence for associating these traits with entrepreneurs as opposed to leaders, and encourages recognition of "common trends"—entrepreneurship being, by his conception, a type of leadership. Yet our survey data indicate that this commonality is not well-perceived in either stand-alone entrepreneurship or stand-alone leadership education, and that possibly leadership can be conceived as a type of entrepreneurship instead of the opposite. At the very least, these conflicting views suggests that Vecchio's five elements could form the basis of any materials for teaching either entrepreneurship or leadership, and possibly therefore both together in an explicitly fused concept of entrepreneurial leadership.

Internal Locus of Control

Internal locus of control is the belief and confidence that individuals exercise in order to have full control and influence on all their outcomes (Brooks, 2003). There is an implication in some entrepreneurial personality literature that favours a strong internal locus of control (Lee and Tsang, 2001). In other words, effective entrepreneurs hold within their own

behaviour and characteristics the notion that success or failure depends on themselves alone (Carter and Jones-Evans, 2000). They do not believe fate or luck has influenced any of their outcomes. Significantly, this internal locus of control becomes a source of authority and influence, an ability to motivate others (Kuratko and Hodgetts, 2001)—in short, an ability to lead. Here, an entrepreneurial trait is being identified as a potential source of leadership effectiveness.

Need for Achievement

Entrepreneurial leaders are very high achieving individuals who are always looking for new ways to seek out and act upon new opportunities. High need for achievement is a key entrepreneurial trait (McClelland, 1961; Osborne, 2003) and is identified as a leadership attribute of entrepreneurs (Czarniawska-Joerges and Wolff, 1991; Lupkin and Dess, 1996); entrepreneurial leadership is also allied with high need for achievement (Gupta et al., 2004). Entrepreneurial leadership education should thus highlight this need.

Risk-taking Propensity

Entrepreneurial need to be risk assessors and at the same time be able to accept and encourage risk-taking. Risk-taking propensity has been recognised by many authors and practitioners in this field as a strong attribute of entrepreneurs (Ahmed, 1985; Koh, 1996; Korunka, Frank and Lueger et al., 2003; Pearson and Chatterjee, 2001) and is also associated with entrepreneurial behaviour (Atherton, 2004). Risk-propensity is also important to leadership in certain contexts—and where these contexts are dominant, entrepreneurial leadership is arguably a more appropriate mode than, say, managerial leadership.

Need for Autonomy

An entrepreneur's relationship with others results in a disinclination for certain circumstances where autonomy is restricted, and an attraction to situations where autonomy can be freely exercised. By this conceptualisation, entrepreneurs tend naturally toward specific types of leadership. Educational efforts that identify the need for autonomy and allow students to build on that awareness are likely to develop both entrepreneurial and leadership skills concurrently.

Self-Efficacy

Research shows that people who are high in self-efficacy are more likely to engage in activities associated with start-ups (Boyd and Vozikis, 1994; Scherer, Adams, Carley, and Wiche, 1989; Barbosa, Gerhardt, and Kickul, 2007), to perceive opportunity where others perceive risk, and to feel competent to cope with obstacles. Where leadership is required to seize opportunity, achieve start-up, or confront risk, highly self-efficacious entrepreneurs will be more effective in meeting these challenges. Some research, moreover, indicates that entrepreneurial founders—i.e. leaders—score higher on self-efficacy measures than non-founders (Chen, Greene, and Crick, 1998). So, there is an implication that teaching people to believe in themselves as entrepreneurs is also teaching them to be more effective leaders.

Common Trends in our Survey

Vecchio (2003) identifies trends common to effective entrepreneurship and effective leadership; this suggests topics that would fit well in entrepreneurial leadership education—though it must be stressed that these are not the only topics recommended for inclusion, and that they should be complemented with a variety of other inputs for an effective educational programme.

Moreover, our survey implies a general perception among respondents that creating self-awareness among entrepreneurs about traits that can be harnessed for effectiveness in entrepreneurial contexts also develops leadership effectiveness. This implication is weak, and it basically reverses Vecchio's position that entrepreneurship is a type of leadership. But even if leadership a set of topics that can be learned through studying entrepreneurship, the

intimate relation of the two is likely to bear fruit in developing knowledge, skills and behaviours that result in effectiveness in both entrepreneurial and leadership roles.

Vecchio's own analysis leads toward an attempt at "tying entrepreneurship to leadership" (2003: Section 10), in which he posits other ways of thinking about entrepreneurs' relations to others and how these tend toward a leadership role. In the following section, we propose further ways of setting the context for understanding entrepreneurial leadership that can form the basis for teaching the subject explicitly.

Setting the context

In addition to supporting the suggestions in Vecchio (2003), our survey suggests that it is important to set a context for entrepreneurial leadership education that relates to leadership and entrepreneurial theory in general, as well as to management theory and practice more broadly. In other words, entrepreneurial leadership must not be understood as something too specific or special, but rather as something widely applicable in many kinds and sizes of organisation—as a set of transferrable skills.

To set a meaningful context for understanding entrepreneurship and leadership as a pair of skills transferrable to each other—i.e., as a fused notion of entrepreneurial leadership—we recommend incorporating some teaching relating to leadership and management in general, and also, that this should include theories which naturally relate to the imperatives of entrepreneurial activity. A variety of different forms of general leadership and management theory can be related to an entrepreneurial context:

Leadership theory relevant in entrepreneurial contexts

Team-oriented leadership: This theory looks at the relationship the leader has with its group members, specifically focusing on the leader's ability to elicit high levels of group partaking and involvement between individual members (Gupta et al., 2004). There is strong similarity between this form of leadership and entrepreneurial leadership according to Gupta et al., (2004: 06): "In both cases the leader elicits high levels of participation and involvement by the group".

Value-based leadership: This approach concentrates on the leader's ability to articulate an attractive vision and mission, and to appeal to followers by being admired and respected. The similarity between this approach and entrepreneurial leadership according to Gupta et al., (2004: 06) "lies in the leader's capacity to build a high-expectation vision and to convey confidence in the followers' ability to accomplish that vision".

Neo-charismatic or transformational leadership: This theory focuses on the leader's ability to evoke follower's performance through a transcendence of self-interested behaviour by adhering to the follower's needs for self-actualisation (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985). As Burns has argued (1978: 20), this kind of leadership "binds leaders and followers together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose".

Transformational vs. Transactional leadership theory

In addition, students should explore and learn to distinguish transformational leadership from transactional leadership. Transactional leadership is based on the legitimate power given to the leader within the bureaucratic structure of the organisation (Mullen, 2002; Burns, 1978). This leadership style heavily emphasises the end-result—for example, work tasks and outcomes, rewards and punishments (Mullen, 2002). Transactional leadership is concerned with managing workers under strict rules and regulations to avoid change as much as possible and to avoid making decisions that could alter the status quo of the organisation.

Transformational leadership, on the other hand, is a more appropriate model for an entrepreneurial context. It portrays leaders as charismatics or visionaries (Burns, 1978; Burns, 2004) who are able to inspire and energise workers into following them and thereby transcend self-interest for the good of the organisation (Robbins, 1984). Transformational

leaders are always looking for ways to overturn the status quo of their organisation through major change (Burns, 2004). They are able to influence and motivate their followers to do more than is expected using their ability to empower and to encourage others to achieve a shared vision, and by leading through example (Yuki, 1989).

Students should have the opportunity to distinguish between these two fundamental forms of leadership, and learn how transformational leadership is both necessary and desirable in an entrepreneurial context. In constantly changing markets, an entrepreneurial leader's ability to implement and support change in an organisation, rather than following or waiting for it to happen, is often the chief source of competitive advantage (Taffinder, 1995).

Influencing Strategies

Truly transformational leaders cannot rely on the mere exercise of power or status in leading an organisation; in order to be effective, leaders must be capable of moving an organisation towards its goals without coercion. Similarly, Parks (2006) argues that successful entrepreneurship is not achieved by dictating what should happen, but by maintaining a shared understanding between an entrepreneurial team and its leader. Thus entrepreneurial leadership education should also develop influencing strategies such as reason, friendliness, coalition forming, bargaining, assertiveness, appeals to higher authority and the judicious threat of sanctions (Duening and Sherrill, 2005).

Communicating a shared vision

"Vision is the cornerstone of the entrepreneurial architecture" Burns (2005: 85). In other words, entrepreneurial leaders need an ability to define and communicate a shared vision for an organisation (Burns, 2005). This shared vision in turn creates enthusiasm and motivation, builds confidence, and strengthens connections within a team and throughout an organisation, by working on people's emotions (Burns, 2005). Being able to communicate at an emotional level, and to engender a sense of common concern through appropriately deployed influencing strategies, are essential traits of entrepreneurial leaders and should therefore be an important objective of entrepreneurial leadership education. Students should learn how to communicate emotionally about the value of opportunities, and to show that exploiting these opportunities will achieve the shared vision (Ireland, Hitt and Sirmon, 2003).

Managerial vs. Entrepreneurial Leadership

Similar to the distinction between transactional and transformational leadership, the differences between 'Managerial' and 'Entrepreneurial' leadership are accentuated in an entrepreneurial context. Both require distinctive skills and capabilities in order to be effective. Managerial leadership uses discipline and control to reduce complexity, and is concerned with detail and logic. Entrepreneurial leadership, on the other hand, is more concerned with building up long-term reciprocal relationships along the value chain of an organisation, where effectiveness is determined by the ability to influence others, set direction, communicate, motivate, develop change and handle resources strategically, and to encourage others to act in a competitively advantageous and opportunity-seeking way (Burns, 2005; Covin and Slevin, 2002; Ireland and Hitt, 1999; Rowe, 2001). Thus, understanding the traits and behaviours that distinguish the managerial leader from the entrepreneurial leader (Duening and Sherrill, 2005; Burns, 2005; 2007; Morris et al., 2008) should also be embedded in entrepreneurial leadership education.

Interpersonal skills

In addition, entrepreneurial leadership education should develop particular sorts of interpersonal and team-working skills that focus on leading organisations by consensus and agreement, rather than command (Burns, 2005). Thus another role of entrepreneurial leadership education is to teach people how to build interpersonal skills that win them the trust, credibility and respect of teams, and the ability to inspire and encourage high performance (Wickham, 1998).

Conflict and entrepreneurial leadership

All leaders need to understand how to deal with conflict, and if necessary be able to adjust their preferred behaviours to handle conflict constructively. Given the shifting complexity of most entrepreneurial environments, entrepreneurial leaders need this ability more than most (Burns, 2005); in other words, since entrepreneurial leaders generally face higher uncertainty and ambiguity, to be effective the entrepreneurial leader needs both a conceptual understanding of how to adapt and handle conflict, and an innate tendency to put this ability into practice. Burns cites the ‘Thomas-Kilman conflict modes instrument’ for categorising the ways in which conflict is handled in different situations: avoidance, accommodation, compromise, competition and collaboration (Brooks, 2003; Burns, 2005; Thomas, 1976). Burns (2001) and Timmons (1999) observe that in entrepreneurial contexts, only certain types of response to conflict are effective: “successful entrepreneurs are interpersonally supporting and nurturing not interpersonally competitive” Burns (2001: 257). Thus entrepreneurial leadership education must develop this specific sort of conflict-handling ability.

Adversity

As with conflict, leaders must learn how to deal with adversity, failure and disappointment. They must be able to look at disruptions to progress and (a) analyse what went wrong, (b) learn from their mistakes, and (c) accept liability for their responsibility and move on (Lippitt, 1983; 1987). Other research suggests, however, that entrepreneurial leaders deal with adversity in somewhat different ways: less of (a), a more intuitive or semi-conscious approach to (b), and an easy ability with (c). In short, they do not waste valuable time considering ‘what if?’ but instead quickly learn from and take responsibility for their mistakes (Kirby, 2003). Entrepreneurial leadership education should therefore develop tactics for emphasising to teams that failure is due to circumstantial reasons, not individual ones—that failure is nobody’s fault (McGrath and MacMillan, 2000). Since failure is part of being creative and failure must be accepted in order for risk to be taken in the first place, an important role of entrepreneurial leadership is to channel creativity and risk in tandem, and maintain rules for coping with imbalances (Ireland and Hitt, 1999). Students of entrepreneurial leadership should learn how to achieve sufficient freedom to let creativity develop, but equally should learn methods of mitigating and tolerating adversity. These essential design elements for entrepreneurial leadership teaching materials are summarised in Table 2.

Please insert Table 2 about here

Discretionary design elements for entrepreneurial leadership education, and suggested readings

In addition to these recommendations, a number of other considerations have been suggested (by our work) which are worth considering in designing teaching materials for entrepreneurial leadership. Also included in each section are references to sources that can be used in building a bibliography for each area of study.

Corporate Entrepreneurship

Topics relating to corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship should be well-integrated in entrepreneurial leadership education, mainly because they allow access to entrepreneurial concepts by students less inclined to entrepreneurial activity in themselves but interested in understanding it—students who intend to be consultants or investors, for example. Also, it is important to stress that entrepreneurship can be considered as a set of

skills transferrable to any organisational context where innovation, risk-taking, opportunity recognition, and other similar imperatives occur.

Equally, corporate entrepreneurship education should emphasize leadership themes. Corporate entrepreneurship is the creation of new business in large established organisations by entrepreneurial people being innovative and creative and generating new ideas (Guth and Ginsberg, 1990). Students should learn that entrepreneurship occurs in corporate contexts as well as start-ups and smaller, younger organisations, and how leadership in such contexts differs from corporate or other traditional forms of leadership. Distinctive elements of leadership learning in a corporate entrepreneurship context should emphasise following themes:

- Creating and constructing the entrepreneurial culture (Burns, 2005)
- Creativity and innovation and how each should be encouraged and rewarded (Burns, 2005; 2007)
- The degree of freedom and encouragement which are given to entrepreneurs to produce new ideas with potential. (Slevin and Covin, 1990; Sinetar, 1985; Dess, Lumpkin and McGee, 1999; Kuratko and Hodgetts, 2004)
- Support and encouragement given to risk-taking (Burns, 2005)
- Management and organisation structure (Burns, 2005)
- Availability of resources, both tangible and intangible (Sathe, 1985; Von-Hippel, 1977; Souder, 1981; Sykes, 1986; Hisrich and Peters, 1986; Katz and Gartner, 1988; Sykes and Block, 1989)
- Team-work and cross-functional teams (Burns, 2005)
- The learning organisation (Burns, 2005)
- To construct an entrepreneurial architecture (Burns, 2007)
- Strategic thinking (Burns, 2005)

The Dark Side of Entrepreneurial Leadership

Entrepreneurial leadership education should also look at some risks and pitfalls to which it is particularly prone. Certain factors discussed can result in a destructive outcome for the entrepreneurial leader (Kets de Vries, 1985).

- Confrontations with risk (Kuratko, 2007; Morris et al., 2008): Entrepreneurial leaders are always changing and questioning the status quo of the organisation; this entails risk which might be high or low depending on the associated reward, which forms the basis against which the entrepreneurial leader tends to evaluate the risk (Kuratko, 2007; Morris et al., 2008). These risks can be grouped into financial, career, family/social, and psychic categories (Kuratko, 2007; Morris et al., 2008). If tolerance of the level of cannot be communicated to other stakeholders, then confrontations destructive to the team are more likely to occur.
- Stress also features strongly (Kuratko, 2007; Akande, 1992; Buttner, 1992; Morris et al., 2008) in spoiling the fulfilment of demands and expectations, and ultimately in undermining an entrepreneur's ability to take responsibility for failure.
- Lack of self-awareness may also be associated with the dark side to entrepreneurial leadership. This could include unrealistic desire for success or becoming overly controlling, resulting in distrust within an organisation (Kuratko and Hodgetts, 2007).

Entrepreneurial leadership education should address these issues and provide practical solutions on how entrepreneurs can avoid the dark side of entrepreneurial leadership.

Ethics

The particular perspective on ethics of entrepreneurial leaders should also be taught, through means that demonstrate how important a 'value system' is to entrepreneurial leaders' effectiveness (Kuratko, 2007). Research shows that entrepreneurial leaders who are seen to have an ethical approach in their decision making are more likely to be followed; while

conversely, entrepreneurial leaders seen to demonstrate an unethical approach towards decision making, are unlikely to gain followers within an organisation (Kuratko, 2007). Effective entrepreneurial leadership education will stress the importance of ethical behaviour in decision-making for entrepreneurs, to improve organisational performance as well as for its own sake.

The Entrepreneurial Mindset

Entrepreneurial leadership education should teach students and potential entrepreneurs how to exploit and use an entrepreneurial mindset—their own, as well as that of people working with them. An entrepreneurial mindset is both an individualistic and collective phenomenon that is important to entrepreneurs, managers and leaders (Covin and Slevin, 2002). McGrath and MacMillan (2000) have defined an entrepreneurial mindset as a way in which individuals think about business, focusing on the benefits occurring with uncertainty. This means that an entrepreneurial mindset is vital in capturing opportunities and as a result, can contribute to a competitive advantage for an organisation (Miles, Heppard and Miles et al, 2000). Education that emphasize this might include materials designed to increase (1) the ability to recognise and analyse entrepreneurial opportunities (Casson, 1982; Shane and Venkataraman, 2000); (2) entrepreneurial alertness (Kirzner, 1997; Alvarez and Barney, 2002); (3) real options logic; (4) entrepreneurial framework (Ireland et al., 2003); (5) dominant logic (Bettis and Prahalad, 1995; Prahalad and Bettis, 1986).

Human Resource Management

Managing human resources is critical to the success of any firm; and all the more so to organisations that might contain no other resources in-house, such as start-up ventures (Morris et al., 2008). Thus, integrating human resource management materials within a programme on entrepreneurial leadership is vital for introducing students to the central importance of investing considerably in the HRM function (Morris et al., 2008). Properly understood, HRM can make the difference between success and failure in an entrepreneurial organisation or venture: in recruitment, through proper job descriptions and person specifications encouraging entrepreneurially inclined individuals to apply to the organisation; in selection, through properly structured interviews and psychometric evaluations; in hiring, through properly structured remuneration packages; in development, through appropriate motivation and the dispensation of rewards and compensations that are effective in an entrepreneurial context. Entrepreneurial leadership education should look at HRM in such a way that emphasizes such distinctive features of managing human resources in an entrepreneurial context.

Empowerment

In order for entrepreneurs to be effective they need to feel empowered by a sense of themselves as leaders. Another role, therefore, of entrepreneurial leadership education is to create this sense of empowerment; our research suggests the following tactics for doing so:

- Operate an empowerment-focused organisation (Burns, 2005) and create empowering job designs such as job enlargement, job rotation, job enrichment (Brooks, 2003). Students will explore, and benefit from the above points and recognise why they are key issues and requirements for an entrepreneurial leader to implement into an entrepreneurial organisation in order to empower and motivate their entrepreneurs.
- Build trust. Entrepreneurial leaders must learn how to trust their employees to do their work and inspire them to take an active role over their actions instead of using tight control mechanisms to ensure the work gets done (Burns, 2005). If the employees feel trusted they are more empowered to be creative and innovative for the good of the organisation.

- Continuously train employees. (Burns, 2005) with on- and off-the-job training in order to capitalise on opportunities to innovate as they arise. Training should be continuous because of the constantly evolving nature of entrepreneurial organisations.
- Develop the knowledge and skills to encourage and support the rapid transfer of knowledge and information sharing between one another (Burns, 2005). Students will learn and understand how important it is to recognise employee's contributions.
- Reward success.
- Tolerate mistakes and failures.
- Involve employees in decision-making by giving them authority, listening to their ideas, suggestions and solutions (Burns, 2005).
- Maintain a decentralised, flat organisational structure (Brooks, 2003).
- Be approachable (Burns, 2005).

The discretionary design elements for entrepreneurial leadership teaching materials are summarised in Table3.

Please insert Table 2 about here

Conclusions

This paper has reviewed current literature relating to entrepreneurship and leadership and surveyed teaching practice in the UK, and on this basis makes specific recommendations for designing teaching materials for entrepreneurial leadership.

In brief, entrepreneurial leadership education should teach students how to cultivate their entrepreneurial capability in leadership roles and their leadership capability in entrepreneurial contexts. Essentially, it should be about developing appropriate forms of social capital with which to combine, exploit and maintain the particular capabilities and expertises of entrepreneurial teams, especially balancing creativity, influence, a particular attitude to risk, and an ability to access scarce resources strategically. Through learning these general and specific things concurrently, students can become proficient in their ability to exploit opportunity, to maintain their teams' core competencies for pursuing innovation, and to gain competitive advantage for their organisations in uncertain environments—in short, to become entrepreneurial leaders.

References

- Ahmed, S. U. (1985). "Nach, Risk-Taking Propensity, Locus of Control and Entrepreneurship," *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6(6), 781-782.
- Akande, A. (1992). "Coping with Entrepreneurial Stress," *Leadership and Organisational Development Journal*, 13(2), 27-32.
- Alvarez, S. A., and J. R. Barney (2002). "Resource-Based Theory and the Entrepreneurial Firm," in *Strategic Entrepreneurship: Creating a New Mindset*. Eds. M. A. Hitt, R. D. Ireland, S. M. Camp and D. L. Sexton. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Atherton, A. (2004). "Unbundling Enterprise and Entrepreneurship: From Perceptions and Preconceptions to Concept and Practice," *Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 5(2), 121-128.
- Barbosa, S. D., M. W. Gerhardt, and J. R. Kickul (2007). "The Role of Cognitive Style and Risk Preference on Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy and Entrepreneurial Intentions," *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 13, 86-104.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Béchar, J-P., and D. D. Grégoire (2005). "Entrepreneurship Education Research Revisited: The Case of Higher Education," *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(1), 22-43.
- Begley, J. M. (1995). "Using Founder Status, Age of Firm, and Company Growth Rate as the Basis for Distinguishing Entrepreneurs from Managers of Smaller Business," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10, 249-263.
- Bettis, R. A., and C. K. Prahalad (1995). "Strategic Management Journal," *Strategic Management Journal*, 16, 5-14.
- Boyd, N. G., and G. S. Vozikis (1994). "The Influence of Self-Efficacy in the Development of Entrepreneurial Intentions and Actions," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18, 63-90.
- Brockhaus, R. H. (1982). "The Psychology of an Entrepreneur," in *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*. Eds. C. Kent, S. D. and V. K. Englewood Hills, NJ: Prentice Hall, 39-56.
- Brooks, I. (2003). *Organisational Behaviour*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Brungardt, C. (1997). "The Making of Leaders: A Review of the Research in Leadership Development and Education," *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 3(3), 81-95.
- Burnes, B. (2004). *Managing Change*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Burns, P. (2001). *Entrepreneurship and Small Business*. Hampshire: Palgrave.
- (2005). *Corporate Entrepreneurship Building an Entrepreneurial Organisation*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- (2007). *Entrepreneurship and Small Business*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buttner, E. H. (1992). "Entrepreneurial Stress: Is It Hazardous to Your Health?," *Journal of Managerial Issues* 4(2), 223-240.
- Carter, S., and D. Jones-Evans (2000). *Enterprise and Small Business: Principles Practice and Policy*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- (2006). *Enterprise and Small Business Principles Practice and Policy*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Casson, M. (1982). *The Entrepreneur*. Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble Books.
- Charney, A., and G. D. Libecap (2000). "The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education," in *Insights: A Kaufman Research Series*. Kansas City.
- Chen, C., P. Greene, and A. Crick (1998). "Does Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy Distinguish Entrepreneurs from Managers?," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, 295-316.
- Chen, Z., H. Li, S. Kong, and Q. Xu (2006). "An Analytic Knowledge Network Process for Construction Entrepreneurship Education," *Journal of Management Development* 25(1), 11-27.

- Cogliser, C. and K. Brigham (2004). "The Intersection of Leadership and Entrepreneurship: Mutual Lessons to Be Learned," *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 771-799.
- Cooper, S., C. Bottomley, and J. Gordon (2004). "Stepping out of the Classroom and up the Ladder of Learning: An Experiential Learning Approach to Entrepreneurship Education" *Industry and Higher Education*, 18(1), 11-22.
- Covin, J. G., and D. P. Slevin (2002). "The Entrepreneurial Imperatives of Strategic Leadership," in *Strategic Entrepreneurship: Creating a New Mindset*. Eds. M. A. Hitt, R. D. Ireland, S. M. Camp and D. L. Sexton. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cox, L. W., S. L. Mueller, and S. E. Moss (2002). "The Impact of Entrepreneurship Education on Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy," *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 1(1), 229-245.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, B. and R. Wolff (1991). "Leaders, Managers, Entrepreneurs on and Off the Organisational Stage," *Organisation Studies*, 12(4), 529-546.
- Densten, I. L., and J. Gray (2001). "Leadership Development and Reflection: What Is the Connection?," *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(3), 119-124.
- Dess, G., G. T. Lumpkin, and J. E. McGee, J E (1999). "Linking Corporate Entrepreneurship to Strategic, Structure and Process: Suggested Research Directions," *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 23(3), 11-28.
- Duening, T. N., and W. Sherrill, W (2005). *Entrepreneurism: Exploring Entrepreneurship from a Business Process Perspective*. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University, Atomic dog publishing.
- Eggert, N. (1998). *Contemporary Leadership for Entrepreneurial Organizations: Paradigms, Metaphors, and Wicked Problems*. Westport: CT: Quorum.
- Ensley, M. D., K. M. Hmieleski, and C. L. Pearce (2006a). "The Importance of Vertical and Shared Leadership within New Venture Top Management Teams: Implications for the Performance of Startups," *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(3), 217-231.
- Ensley, M. D., C. L. Pearce, and K. M. Hmieleski (2006b). "The Moderating Effect of Environmental Dynamism on the Relationship between Entrepreneur Leadership Behavior and New Venture Performance " *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(2), 243-263
- Eyal, O., and R. Kark (2004). "How Do Transformational Leaders Transform Organizations? A Study of the Relationship between Leadership and Entrepreneurship," *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 3(3), 211-236.
- Fayolle, A., B. Gailly, and N. Lassas-Clerc (2006). "Assessing the Impact of Entrepreneurship Education Programmes: A New Methodology," *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(9), 701-720.
- Fleming, P. (1996). "Entrepreneurship Education in Ireland: A Longitudinal Study," *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, European Edition* 2(1).
- Gorman, G., D. Hanlon, and W. King (1997). "Some Research Perspectives on Entrepreneurship Education and Education for Small Business Management: A Ten-Year Literature Review," *International Small Business Journal*, 15(3), 56-77.
- Gupta, V., I. C. MacMillan, and G. Surie (2004). "Entrepreneurial Leadership: Developing and Measuring a Cross-Cultural Construct," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(2), 241-260.
- Guth, W. D., and Ginsberg, A (1990). "Guest Editor's Introduction. Corporate Entrepreneurship," *Strategic Management Journal*, Special Issue, 5-16.
- Hannon, P. D. (2006). "Teaching Pigeons to Dance: Sense and Meaning in Entrepreneurship Education," *Education + Training*, 48(5), 296-308.
- (2007). "Enterprise for All?: The Fragility of Enterprise Provision across England's Heis," *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14(2), 183-210.

- Harrison, R. T., and C. M. Leitch (1994). "Entrepreneurship and Leadership: The Implications for Education and Development," *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 6(2), 111-125.
- Hartshorn, C. and P. D. Hannon (2005). "Paradoxes in Entrepreneurship Education: Chalk and Talk or Chalk and Cheese?: A Case Approach," *Education + Training*, 47(8/9), 616-627.
- Heinonen, J. and S-A. Poikkijoki (2006). "An Entrepreneurial Self-Directed Approach to Entrepreneurship Education: Mission Impossible?," *Journal of Management Development*, 25(1), 80-94.
- Henry, C., F. Hill, and C. M. Leitch (2003). *Entrepreneurship Education and Training*: Ashgate Publishing.
- Hisrich, R. D. and M. P. Peters (1986). "Establishing a New Business Venture Unit within a Firm," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1(2), 307-322.
- Hitt, M. A., R. D. Ireland, and R. E. Hoskisson (2001). *Strategic Management: Competitiveness and Globalization*. Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.
- Hornsby, J. S., D. W. Naffziger, D. F. Kuratko, and R. V. Montagno (1993). "An Interactive Model of the Corporate Entrepreneurship Process," *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 17(2), 29-37.
- Ireland, R. D. and M. A. Hitt (1999). "Achieving and Maintaining Competitiveness in the 21st Century: The Role of Strategic Leadership," *Academy of Management Executive*, 13(1), 43-57.
- Ireland, R. D., M. A. Hitt and D. G. Sirmon (2003). "A Model of Strategic Entrepreneurship: The Construct and Its Dimensions," *Journal of Management Development*, 29(6), 963-989.
- Jack, S. R. and A. R. Anderson (1999). "Entrepreneurship Education within the Enterprise Culture," *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 5(3), 110-125.
- Johnson, D., J. B. Craig, and R. Hildebrand (2006). "Entrepreneurship Education: Towards a Discipline-Based Framework," *Journal of Management Development*, 25(1), 40-54.
- Jones, C., and J. English (2004). "A Contemporary Approach to Entrepreneurship Education," *Education and Training*, 46(8/9), 416-423.
- Kao, J. (1989). *Entrepreneurship Creativity, and Organisation Text, Cases and Readings*: Prentice-Hall.
- Katz, J. A. (2003). "The Chronology and Trajectory of American Entrepreneurship Education: 1876-1999," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(2), 283-300.
- Katz, J. and W. B. Gartner (1988). "Properties of Emerging Organisation," *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 429-441.
- Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1985). "The Dark Side of Entrepreneurship," *Harvard Business Review*, Nov-Dec, 160-167.
- Kirby, D. A. (2003). *Entrepreneurship*. Berkshire: McGraw Hill Education.
- (2004). "Entrepreneurship Education: Can Business Schools Meet the Challenge?," *Education and Training*, 46(8/9), 510-519.
- Kirzner, I. (1997). *How Markets Work: Disequilibrium, Entrepreneurship and Discovery*: The Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Klapper, R. (2004). "Government Goals and Entrepreneurship Education – an Investigation at a Grande Ecole in France," *Education and Training*, 46(3), 127-137.
- Koh, H. C. (1996). "Testing Hypotheses of Entrepreneurial Characteristics: A Study of Hong Kong Mba Students," *Journal of Management Psychology*, 11(3), 12-25.
- Korunka, C., H. Frank, M. Lueger, and J. Mugler (2003). "The Entrepreneurial Personality in the Content of Resources, Environment, and the Start up Process - a Configurational Approach," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(1), 23-42.
- Kourilsky, M. L. (1995). "Entrepreneurship Education: Opportunity in Search of Curriculum," in *Business Education Forum*. Knasas City, MO: Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.

- Kuratko, D. F. (2003). "Entrepreneurship Education: Emerging Trends and Challenges for the 21st Century," in *Coleman Foundation White Paper Series: U.S. Association of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*.
- (2005). "The Emergence of Entrepreneurship Education: Development, Trends, and Challenges," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(5), 577-598.
- (2007). "Entrepreneurial Leadership in the 21st Century: Guest Editor's Perspective," *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies*, 13(4).
- Kuratko, D. F., and R. M. Hodgetts (2001). *Entrepreneurship: A Contemporary Approach*. Orlando: FL: Harcourt Inc.
- (2004). *Entrepreneurship Theory, Process, Practice*. Mason: OH: Thomson South-Western.
- (2007). *Entrepreneurial: Theory, Process, and Practice*. Mason OH: Thomson South-Western.
- Lee, D., and E. Tsang (2001). "The Effects of Entrepreneurial Personality Background and Network Activities on Venture Growth," *Journal of Managerial Studies*, 38(4), 583-602.
- Leitch, C. M., and R. T. Harrison (1999). "A Process Model for Entrepreneurship Education and Development," *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 5(3), 83-109.
- Lippitt, G. L. (1983). *Putting Life in Perspective*. Bethesda: MD: Development Publications.
- (1987). "Entrepreneurial Leadership: A Performing Art," *Journal of Creative Behaviour*, 21(3), 264-270.
- Lumpkin, G. T., and G. Dess (1996). "Clarifying the Entrepreneurial Orientation Construct and Linking It to Performance," *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.
- Fostering Entrepreneurship through University Education and Training: Lessons from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2002). "Fostering Entrepreneurship through University Education and Training: Lessons from Massachusetts Institute of Technology," paper presented at the 2nd Annual Conference on: Innovative Research in Management, May 9 – 11, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Matlay, H. (2005a). "Entrepreneurship Education in UK Business Schools: Conceptual, Contextual and Policy Considerations," *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 12(4), 627-643.
- (2005b). "Researching Entrepreneurship and Education: Part 1: What Is Entrepreneurship and Does It Matter?," *Education + Training*, 47(8/9), 665-677.
- (2006). "Researching Entrepreneurship and Education: Part 2: What Is Entrepreneurship Education and Does It Matter?," *Education + Training*, 48(8/9), 704-718.
- Matlay, H., and C. Carey (2007). "Entrepreneurship Education in the UK: A Longitudinal Perspective," *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14(2), 252-263.
- McGrath, R. G., and I. C. MacMillan (2000). *The Entrepreneurial Mindset: Strategies for Continuously Creating Opportunities in an Age of Uncertainty*. Boston: MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- McKeown, J., C. Millman, S. K. Sursani, K. Smith, and L. Martin (2006). "Graduate Entrepreneurship Education in the UK," *Education + Training*, 48(8/9), 597-613.
- Miles, G., K. A. Heppard, R. E. Miles, and C. C. Snow (2000). "Entrepreneurial Strategies: The Critical Role of Top Management," in *Entrepreneurship as Strategy: Competing on the Entrepreneurial Edge*. Eds. G. D. Meyer and K. A. Heppard: Sage Publications.
- Mitchell, M. M., and M. I. Poutiatine (2001). "Finding an Experiential Approach in Graduate Leadership Curricula," *Journal of Experiential Education*, 24(3), 179-185.
- Morris, M. H., D. F. Kuratko, and J. G. Covin (2008). *Corporate Entrepreneurship and Innovation*. Mason: OH: Thomson South-Western.
- Mullins, L. J. (2002). *Management and Organisational Behaviour*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

- Neck, C. P., H. M. Neck, C. C. Manz, and J. Godwin (1999). "'I Think I Can; I Think I Can': A Self-Leadership Perspective toward Enhancing Entrepreneur Thought Patterns, Self-Efficacy, and Performance," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14(5/6), 477-501.
- Okudan, G. E., and S. E. Rzasa (2004). "Teaching Entrepreneurial Leadership: A Project-Based Approach," in *34th ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference, Session T2E*. Savannah, GA, 18-23.
- Parks, S. (2006). *How to Be an Entrepreneur*: Pearson Education Limited.
- Pearson, C. A., and S. R. Chatterjee (2001). "Differences and Similarities of Entrepreneurial Characteristics in a Diverse Social Setting-Evidence from Australian and Singaporean Managers," *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 9(3), 273-289.
- Prahalad, C. K. and R. A. Bettis (1986). "The Dominant Logic: A New Link between Diversity and Performance," *Strategic Management Journal*, 7(6), 485-501.
- Robbins, S. P. (1984). *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Robinson, D. A., M. Goleby, and N. Hosgood (2006). "Entrepreneurship as a Values and Leadership Paradigm," in *Business Papers*: Bond University.
- Rost, J. (2000). "Leadership Education in Colleges: Toward a 21st Century Paradigm," *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 7(1), 3-12.
- Rowe, W. G. (2001). "Creating Wealth in Organisations: The Role of Strategic Leadership," *Academy of Management Executive*, 15(1), 81-94.
- Sathe, V. (1985). "Managing an Entrepreneurial Dilemma: Nurturing Entrepreneurship and Control in Large Organisation," *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, 636-356.
- Scherer, R. F., J. S. Adams, S. S. Carley and F. A. Wiche (1989). "Role Model Performance Effects on Development of Entrepreneurial Career Preference," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 13, 53-71.
- Schulz, W. (1999). *Creating Value through Skill-Based Strategy and Entrepreneurial Leadership*. New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Shane, S., and S. Venkataraman (2000). "The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research," *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 217-236.
- Sinetar, M. (1985). "Entrepreneurs, Chaos and Creativity: Can Creative People Really Survive Large Company Structure?," *Sloan Management Review*, 65(5), 57-63.
- Slevin, D. P. and J. G. Covin (1990). "Juggling Entrepreneurial Style and Organisation Structure: How to Get Your Act Together," *Sloan Management Review*, 31(2), 43-54.
- Smilor, R. W. and D. L. Sexton (1996). *Leadership and Entrepreneurship: Personal and Organizational Development in Entrepreneurial Ventures*: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Smith, A. J., L. A. Collins, and P. D. Hannon (2006). "Embedding New Entrepreneurship Programmes in Uk Higher Education Insitutions; Challenges and Considerations," *Education + Training*, 48(8/9).
- Solomon, G. (2007). "An Examination of Entrepreneurship Education in the United States," *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 14(2), 168-182.
- Souder, W. (1981). "Encouraging Entrepreneurship in Large Corporations," *Research Management*, 14(3), 18-22.
- Stevenson, H., and D. Gumpert (1985). "The Heart of Entrepreneurship," *Harvard Business Review* March-April.
- Stewart, W. H., W. E. Watson, J. C. Carland, and J. W. Carland (1998). "A Proclivity for Entrepreneurship: A Comparison of Entrepreneurs, Small Business Owners, and Corporate Managers," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 14, 189-214.
- Streeter, D. H., J. P. Jaquette, and K. Hovis (2002). "University-Wide Entrepreneurship Education: Alternative Models and Current Trends," Cornell University: Department of Applied Economics and Management.

- Sykes, H. B. (1986). "The Anatomy of a Corporate Venturing Program," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1(2).
- Sykes, H. B., and Z. Block (1989). "Corporate Venturing Obstacles and Solutions," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 4(3), 159-167.
- Taffinder, P. (1995). *The New Leaders Achieving Corporate Transformation through Dynamic Leadership*: Kogan.
- Thomas, K. (1976). "Conflict and Conflict Management," in *Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*. Ed. M. D. Dunnette. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Thornberry, N. (2006). "Lead Like the Best Entrepreneurs: Learn How They Innovate, Grow and Profit," in *Babson Insights*.
- Timmons, J. A. (1999). *New Venture Creation: Entrepreneurship for the 21 Century*. Singapore: McGraw Hill International.
- Vecchio, R. P. (2003). "Entrepreneurship and Leadership: Common Trends and Common Threads," *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2), 303-327
- Venkataraman, S., and A. H. Van deVen (1998). "Hostile Environment Jolts, Transaction Sets and New Business Development," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13(3), 231-255.
- Vesper, K. H., and W. B. Gartner (1997). "Measuring Progress in Entrepreneurship Education," *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12(5), 403-421.
- Von Hippel, E. (1977). "Successful and Failing Internal Corporate Ventures: An Empirical Analysis," *Industrial Marketing Management*, 6(3), 163-174.
- Wickham, P. A. (1998). *Strategic Entrepreneurship*: Pitman Publishing.
- Wilson, F., J. Kickul and D. Marlino, D. (2007). "Gender, Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy, and Entrepreneurial Career Intentions: Implications for Entrepreneurship Education," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(5), 577-598.
- Yuki, G. (1989). *Leadership in Organisations*: Prentice-Hall International

Table 1

Topics Covered in Entrepreneurship and Leadership Courses

Topics Covered	Yes		No		Don't know	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entrepreneurship in stand-alone courses	41	80	9	18	0	0
Entrepreneurship embedded in other courses	48	94	3	6	0	0
Leadership in stand-alone courses	38	75	7	14	5	10
Leadership embedded in other courses	47	92	1	2	2	4
Leadership in entrepreneurial courses	33	65	12	24	4	8
Entrepreneurship in leadership courses	17	33	22	43	11	22

Table 2

Essential Design Elements for Entrepreneurial Leadership Teaching Materials

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Leadership theory relevant in entrepreneurial context<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Team-oriented Leadership- Value-based leadership- Neo-charismatic / transformational leadership• Influencing strategies• Communicating a shared vision• Managerial vs Entrepreneurial Leadership• Interpersonal skills• Conflict• Adversity |
|--|

Table 3
Discretionary Design Elements for Entrepreneurial Leadership Teaching Materials

- Corporate Entrepreneurship
 - Creativity and innovation
 - Freedom to perceive and pursue opportunity
 - Support for risk-taking
 - Flat areas of management and organisation structure
 - Availability of resources tangible and intangible
 - Cross-functional teams
 - Learning organisation
 - Entrepreneurial architecture
 - Strategic thinking
- The Dark Side of Entrepreneurial Leadership
 - Confronting risk
 - Stress
 - Lack of self-awareness
- Ethics
- The Entrepreneurial Mindset
- Human Resource Management
- Empowerment
 - Focus on empowerment and empowering job designs
 - Build trust