

Article

# Can the nexus entrepreneur-leader shape the transformational, entrepreneurial leader? An overview of the conceptual and gendered interdisciplinarity

Iuliana CHITAC<sup>1</sup> (Romania)

Daniela AGHEORGHIESEI<sup>1</sup> (Romania)

**Citation:** Chitac I., Agheorghiesei D. (2023). Can the nexus entrepreneur-leader shape the transformational, entrepreneurial leader? An overview of the conceptual and gendered interdisciplinarity. *Cross-Cultural Management Journal*, XXV, Issue (1/2023), 49-58.

Received: 29 April 2023

Revised: 1 June 2023

Published: 3 June 2023



**Copyright:** © 2023 by the authors. Published by SEA Open Research.

This article is an open access article

distributed under the terms and

conditions of the Creative Commons

Attribution (CC BY) license ([https://](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

[creativecommons.org/licenses/by/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

4.0/).

**Abstract:** Entrepreneurship is a key engine of economic growth, and entrepreneurial leadership (EL) is a crucial element of entrepreneurship. Yet, its investigation continues to be debated, and its assimilation into the greater leadership literature is limited. Although transformational leadership (TL) theory remains understudied and underappreciated, some suggest that EL is a different construct from existing leadership approaches. In addition, the relationship between TL and EL is ambiguous because TL is typically used to evaluate entrepreneurial leaders. Our research intends to contribute to the existing body of knowledge by elucidating the distinction and overlap between the two leadership philosophies and their gendered perspective. This article contributes to the nascent transformational, entrepreneurial leadership literature by reviewing the present body of knowledge addressing the interdisciplinarity of the emerging concept of entrepreneurial leadership.

**Keywords:** transformational, entrepreneurial leadership, gender, interdisciplinary;

**JEL Classification:** J16; L26

<sup>1</sup> Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi

The country of origin of each author is specified in parentheses

## INTRODUCTION

Prior studies have identified leadership as one of the most influential organisational elements in entrepreneurial activity (Ensley et al., 2006; Harrison et al., 2018). Nonetheless, a handful of scholars have explicitly linked leadership with entrepreneurship (Chitac, 2022; Gupta et al., 2004; Van Hemmen et al., 2013; Vecchio, 2003). Furthermore, the presumption that gender is a pre-established societal order has been replaced by a new emphasis on developing their own "untapped entrepreneurial and leadership potential" (Kamberidou, 2020:3) instead of striving to catch up to the "ideal male entrepreneur" (Villares-Varela, 2018; Villares-Varela & Essers, 2019; Voda & Florea, 2019).

This article draws on the literature intersecting at the nexus of leadership and entrepreneurship to discuss the key debates residing at the heart of the nascent interdisciplinary scholarship of transformational, entrepreneurial leadership. Furthermore, their gendered perspectives are reviewed, giving a glimpse into future opportunities for research, and its significance for practice and policies.

*As such it addresses questions around the emergence of entrepreneurial leadership at the entrepreneurship-leadership interdisciplinary nexus, its shared transformational potential, and gendered perspective.*

The remainder of this article is structured as follows: The existent literature on entrepreneurship and leadership is reviewed in light of their disciplinary meanings and the interdisciplinary nexus between the two key concepts which came together to form entrepreneurial leadership is discussed.

The following section presents and critically assesses the transformative or transformational edge of entrepreneurial leadership which is the primary focus of this article, which aims to explore the theoretical overlap between entrepreneurship, leadership, and gender, which could drive transformative change.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### **From leadership to entrepreneurship**

The scientific foundations of leadership have been the subject of a great deal of research and study. Great man theories of the 1840s and trait models of the 1940s were the starting point (Tead, 1935; Cawthon, 1996). In recent years, leadership literature has made great progress in focusing on the behavioural attributes of leaders. These styles of leadership range from the transactional cost-benefit

exchange with followers that rely on authority to transformational styles that inspire followers to take action in response to being inspired by the leader (Bass, 1990; Burns, 2012; 1978).

Despite Rost's (1993) acknowledgment of a paradigm change beginning with Burns' (1978) notion of transformational leadership, in which he defines leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motivations—the wants, needs, aspirations, and expectations—of both leaders and followers, he concludes that four essential elements must be present if leadership exists or is occurring: the persons invoking (Rost, 1993). Leadership is just "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (Rost 1993, p. 102). He eventually changed his social philosophy to emphasise that "followership is an obsolete concept that is dysfunctional and even destructive in a postindustrial environment" (Rost 2008, p. 54) and advocated for leaders and collaborators. Leader-centric definitions, such as those by Burns (2012; 1978) and Rost (1993), are instances of a tripod ontology of leadership, where leaders, followers, and shared goals characterise leadership (Bohl, 2019; Drath et al. 2008).

Notwithstanding the lack of agreement on what leadership is and should imply and the abundance of theories surrounding it, it is time for scholars and practitioners alike to treat leadership as more than a unit of organisational analysis (Kelly, 2014) or a mere "linguistic term, (occupying) a curious position in an everyday talk in that it is a signifier that has multiple possible signifieds. Likewise, the term can slip and slide along a sign system to also become either signifier or signified – to exist as both means and end; cause and effect." (Kelly 2014, p. 914). Instead, to better understand what leadership is, the concept needs to be explored as an everyday organizational phenomenon and an individual experience (Bohl, 2019).

The ontological perspective raises two fundamental questions concerning leadership's existence: why leadership exists, and how leadership exists. Kan & Parry (2004) recognised four characteristics of leaders: the ability to effect change, influence others, foster productive group dynamics, and see projects through to completion. These four traits are consistent with Rost's (2008) key elements of significant change, influential connections, and common goals. If we interpret leader-follower or similar leader-centric language as an admission of leadership's importance for engaged groups of people, then it is conceivable to argue that heroic and post-heroic theories of leadership share the same

definitional foundation. There, people might discover they have something in common and decide to band together to make a change (Bohl, 2019).

Leader-centric theories focus on what makes a strong leader, whereas leadership process theories emphasise leadership as "always happening in situ and developing across time" (Simpson, 2016, p. 113). Furthermore, when leadership is portrayed as practice, it becomes a "process of meaning-making that perpetually generates something new" (Simpson, 2016, p. 168).

This new way of looking at the world necessitated a change in epistemology, and the focus shifted from positivism in organisational leadership to leadership as a dynamic process of social interaction and development. In his proposal for an epistemology of leadership based on process learning informed by the interplay of cognition, situated, and social learning, as scholars have laid the groundwork for this emerging social perspective on leadership and thus its untapped transformational potential, leaders' identities have been portrayed through the lens of their behaviours and experiences (Bohl, 2019).

Leadership has always played a significant role in entrepreneurship because it is the fundamental job of an entrepreneur to steer the process of identifying and developing chances, as well as to take advantage of those chances and bring them to market.

Some may argue that the only difference between leadership and entrepreneurship is the context in which they are exercised (Vecchio, 2003). According to Venkataraman (1997), a common definition of the entrepreneurial environment is the pursuit of an opportunity to create novel products and services. Schumpeter (1934) made a distinction between managers and entrepreneurs based on the fact that entrepreneurs engage in creative and disruptive innovation, whereas managers control and impose order. He defined entrepreneurship as a subset of leadership (social leadership), distinguishing it from other types of leadership in that it is rooted in the establishment of a new business as opposed to the management of an existing one.

As Covid and the Ukraine war demonstrate, entrepreneurial leadership is vital (Audretsch & Tamvada, 2022). This leader represents the company and broader social interests. In today's global socioeconomic difficulties, strong leadership is essential. If entrepreneurs do not go beyond market economics, which prioritises profit, they risk aggravating global challenges (Tamvada & Chowdhury, 2022). Pandemics are an excellent example. To maximise short-term profits, a number of online marketplace entrepreneurs overcharged for

necessities. Instead of investing in drug development to stop the pandemic, others prioritised narrow goals such as space exploration, which will excite the wealthy in the distant future (The Guardian, 12 June 2021). If business owners do not take charge in times of crisis, normalcy is unlikely to return. To address these socioeconomic difficulties, leadership and entrepreneurship must come together in this framework (Audretsch, & Tamvada, 2022). Furthermore, modern society's concerns and difficulties inspire entrepreneurial leadership to look beyond the firm's walls for opportunities to create value for society. It paves the way for the positive results associated with transformative leadership (Goodwin et al., 2011), increasing employees' dedication to the organisation and immediate community and motivating them to think out-the-box (Amankwaa et al., 2022).

This is a radical departure from the standard operating procedure. New theories, such as TRY, are constantly being developed in the area of responsible leadership (Voegtlin et al., 2020). The TRY (Trust – Respect - You) leadership model highlights trust, respect, and genuine concern for co-workers/society as crucial attributes for entrepreneurs to develop to become effective leaders inside their firms and in the wider society (Audretsch, & Tamvada, 2022).

In addition, it is vital to differentiate between *de facto* and *de jure* leadership to comprehend the leadership-entrepreneurship link. If formal leadership is associated with the behaviour of someone whose leadership obligations and rights are socially accepted by those in authority, then *de jure* leadership alone is neither sufficient nor necessary (and, practically speaking, of only secondary interest). *De jure* qualities refer to how things appear to be, as shown in the organisational chart, bylaws, job descriptions, and policy manual. In contrast, the *de facto* qualities of leadership pertaining to the actual condition of affairs, are the method in which things are conducted in the real world, which is governed by the actual location of duty and rights, or more precisely, power. It is possible that appearance and reality might not coincide (Audretsch, & Tamvada, 2022).

The leadership style and philosophy closest to the ethos of entrepreneurs is transformational leadership. As charismatic leaders, transformational leaders are admired for their natural ability to bring about change (Burns, 1978) and their ability to motivate and inspire followers to exceed their expectations for the good of the organisation or beyond (Avolio et al., 2009). Leaders that inspire their people to stretch beyond their comfort zones and do new things are an example of the visionary

and innovative (Gupta et al., 2004) traits of entrepreneurial leaders, as noted by Burns (1978). The four pillars of transformational leadership—idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualised consideration—need to be examined to better clarify the commonalities (Ravet-Brown et al., 2023). Specifically, the idealised leader inspires trust, respect, and morality in their followers. Inspirational motivation induces drive by painting an intriguing, demanding, and compelling picture of a shared objective. The third component, intellectual stimulation, involves developing one's own and one's followers' ability to approach issues in new, innovative, and powerful ways. Ultimately, a leader must listen, coach, and advise each subordinate to help achieve their potential (Avolio, 2010). Treating each follower as an individual with unique needs and abilities is crucial. These elements together have a major impact on the organization and broader society (Ravet-Brown et al., 2023).

Even though the relationship between leadership and entrepreneurship has been established, entrepreneurial leadership is still a young field of study (Leitch & Volery, 2017) that lacks research clarity and depth, particularly in the debate over which behavioural traits and characteristics are inherent in entrepreneurial leadership (Harrison et al., 2015). Yet, the interdisciplinary journey that brought these two concepts together has resulted in a variety of theories (Vecchio, 2003), including that leadership concepts migrated into entrepreneurship, whilst others have claimed the opposite (Kuratko, 2007). Specifically, though there is growing evidence to support the entrepreneurship-leadership interdisciplinary nexus, there is still vigorous debate over where the emerging field of entrepreneurial leadership originated, with some scholars arguing that leadership is the antecedent of entrepreneurship and that more and more leaders are taking on entrepreneurial roles (Felix et al., 2019; Stephan & Pathak, 2016). On the other hand, some researchers claim that the entrepreneur is the leader (Harrison et al., 2016; Leitch and Volery, 2017) since entrepreneurs are characterized by leadership since continually face uncertainty and risk.

However, to expand the study agenda of this interdisciplinary concept, scientists have rejected the absolutist distinction and highlighted that entrepreneurship and leadership are influencing each other, so defining the newly emergent notion of entrepreneurial leadership (Kimbu et al., 2021).

### **The transformational edge of entrepreneurial leadership**

Research into entrepreneurial leadership (EL) focuses on people who take the initiative to better their lives by starting businesses (Hensellek et al., 2023) and who assemble a team of committed followers to help them achieve their goals (Liu et al., 2022).

Entrepreneurial leaders are primarily concerned with the entrepreneurial energy and self-assurance of their followers. They empower followers with confidence in their business talents and abilities and a desire for creativity and innovation (Bandura 1986; Cardon et al. 2009). The key to understanding entrepreneurial leadership is a focus on leaders' and followers' opportunity-oriented behaviours.

According to Fløistad (1991), entrepreneurial leadership (EL) helps people achieve their goals, improve their careers, and build a more self-sufficient society. Some researchers suggest that entrepreneurial and transformational leadership are two distinct styles of leadership, while others advocate for transformational, entrepreneurial leadership (Pan et al., 2021). Transformational leaders care about their followers' careers and personal success (Zaman, 2020). Although the EL model lacks individualised attention, contingent rewards can help followers reach their full potential under transformational leadership (Al-Ghazali, 2020). Both entrepreneurial and transformational leadership share an emphasis on intellectual stimulation. In terms of charismatic role modelling and inspirational motivation, however, there are significant distinctions. Entrepreneurial leaders, unlike transformational leaders, may not be described as charismatic or inspirational by those they lead (Podsakoff et al. 1990). On the one hand, an entrepreneurial leader, whether charismatic or not, functions as a role model in entrepreneurial conduct, encouraging imitation. On the other hand, a transformational leader employs charisma, inspirational appeals, theatrical PR symbolism, or other forms of impression management to elicit these responses (Renko et al., 2015).

Burns' (1978) concept of transforming, which evolved into transformational leadership, has been contested, leading to the distinction between transformational and transformative leadership (Shields, 2013). "Toned down" socially oriented transformational leadership focuses on "raising the commitment and effort of organisational members towards the achievement of organisational goals" (Sun & Leithwood, 2012, p. 388). "Organisational members give power to whoever can inspire their commitments to common ambitions," according to this view (Sun & Leithwood, 2012, p. 204).

Transformational leadership involves direction-setting, individual development, and structural change. Hence, transformational leadership alters or improves the present.

The key differences between the two leadership styles are captured in table no. 1.

### **Entrepreneurial leadership's dimensions**

Despite the increased attention, the definition and theory of entrepreneurial leadership are still in their infancy (Leitch & Volery, 2017). How entrepreneurial leadership is evaluated is also a point of contention (Bagheri & Harrison, 2020). While many researchers have explored entrepreneurial leadership from a single perspective (Bagheri, 2017; Bagheri & Akbari, 2018; Miao et al., 2018), others have shown the many facets that make up this notion (Bagheri & Harrison, 2020; Kim et al., 2017).

The understanding of its dimensions is anchored into understanding that the entrepreneurial leadership is distinct from other leadership styles, as it demonstrated its critical role in contexts defined by high competition for limited resources (Harrison et al., 2018). Built on the assumption that leaders are born not made and on the psychological, behavioural, and skill-based perspectives underpinning entrepreneurial leadership research (Harrison et al., 2018). The handful of studies which formulated scales to measure entrepreneurial leadership focused on strategy, communication, motivation, and personal factors and ignored the role played by these leaders in nurturing innovation and opportunity (Hejazi et al., 2012; Renko et al., 2015) or played down the importance of context and followers (Harrison et al., 2018).

In the past decade, entrepreneurial leadership has been measured using dimensions such as: *framing the challenge* (i.e., entrepreneurial leaders' ability to define challenging goals and standards for the performance of individuals and the business); *managing uncertainty* (i.e., entrepreneurial leaders' abilities in developing a vision and nurturing followers' confidence by demonstrating their confidence in achieving the vision); and *building commitment* (i.e., developing shared values and a sense of belonging); *defining gravity* (i.e. encouraging organisational cohesion by developing shared vision and goals and by inspiring followers to innovate and formulate creative, empowering solutions) (Bagheri & Harrison, 2020). The entrepreneurial leadership's dimensions are captured in table no. 2.

Although there is growing evidence that highlights the multifaceted nature of entrepreneurial leadership, further exploration is warranted to examine additional dimensions, including those

related to cultural and economic contexts. These dimensions underscore the interdisciplinary nature of the concepts and their relative novelty within their respective disciplines (Bagheri & Harrison, 2020).

### **Entrepreneurship, leadership, and then gender**

According to the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (2023), females comprise 51% of the overall population in Europe. The current female employment rate has exhibited an upward trend, reaching 67.3%. However, the proportion of self-employed women is considerably lower, at 34.4%. Among those who are engaged in start-up entrepreneurship, the percentage of women is even lower, at 31%. The representation of female start-up founders is limited to 14.8%. Consequently, the female demographic in Europe represents a significant untapped potential in terms of entrepreneurship and leadership.

According to the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (2023), cited above, the debate around gendered entrepreneurship and leadership gains momentum and starts to be prioritized by policymakers, acknowledging women's role as socio-economic drivers and important change agents whose untapped entrepreneurship and leadership potential is recognized as a driver for socio-economic growth (Vershina et al., 2020).

Leadership and entrepreneurship, whether studied separately or jointly, have been plagued by gender bias (Tlaiss & Kauser, 2019). This gender prejudice is based on the idea that gender is a pre-established social order. Now, women are encouraged to pursue their "untapped entrepreneurial and leadership potential" (Kamberidou, 2020:3). Women are now following their "untapped entrepreneurial and leadership potential" rather than aiming to match the "ideal male entrepreneur" (Villares-Varela, 2018; Villares-Varela & Essers, 2019; Voda & Florea, 2019). This legacy of masculine normativity and patriarchy damaged women's business and leadership potential for decades (Kakabadse et al., 2018).

This perspective reinforced female gender as a biological attribute rather than a manner of "doing business" (Phillip & Knowles, 2012), contrasting pre-established social roles and masculine performance evaluation (Ahl & Marlow, 2012). Hence, entrepreneurs or leaders, or entrepreneurial leaders, continue to be depicted as subordinates, "trailing wives" (Lassalle & Shaw, 2021), and "silent contributors" (Dhaliwal, 1998) compared to the "omniscient (male) exemplars" (Harrison et al., 2015, p.706). The continuance of such restricted ideas denies the multiplicity of entrepreneurial leaders outside masculine hegemony (Figuroa-

Domecq et al., 2020b), which further impacted the universalism contained in policies and research (Vertovec, 2020). This restrictive and limited approach, with huge socio-economic ramifications that have been compounded by the recent Covid problems and the war in Ukraine, has spurred scholars and practitioners to pay more attention to the nexus between entrepreneurship, leadership, and gender (Kimbu et al., 2021; Tlaiss & Kauser, 2019). It is not surprising that the majority of studies on entrepreneurial leadership are Anglo-Western (Figueroa-Domecq et al., 2020a), and that the Global North sparked a discussion on the topic of gender and leadership in business (Tlaiss & Kauser, 2019). There are a few research on women business leaders in Lebanon (Tlaiss & Kauser, 2019) and Kazakhstan (Kakabadse et al., 2018), but none found on Eastern European women business leaders.

#### CONTRIBUTION, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This article aims to enhance the emerging field of entrepreneurial leadership by examining the intersection between entrepreneurship and leadership from an interdisciplinary perspective. It seeks to elucidate the distinctions and similarities between the two leadership ideologies, as well as their gender-specific perspectives. The work specifically addresses the pertinent discussions surrounding gender and primary disciplinary foundations that have fostered the interdisciplinary nexus. The article prompts the reader to contemplate the significance and development of the central notion of "entrepreneurial leadership" and the suitability of integrating transformational potential, as the entrepreneur-leader broadens the influence of their enterprise beyond the realm of economics to effectuate constructive social transformation.

It is important to acknowledge the theoretical contribution of this article while also recognising its limitations. Specifically, it should be noted that this article serves as an overview of current literature and could potentially serve as a foundation for a more comprehensive interdisciplinary literature review, accompanied by relevant empirical evidence. As such, it highlights the challenges associated with defining and measuring entrepreneurial leadership, a topic that has been extensively discussed in academic literature. Drawing on previous literature reviews (Renko et al., 2015), the authors emphasise the need to address these challenges, as they remain unresolved. (Bagheri & Harrison, 2020). Through the explication of the notion of entrepreneurial leadership and its interrelatedness with analogous

concepts such as transformational leadership, future studies have the potential to address these epistemological lacunae.

This paper posits that there exists a reciprocal relationship between leadership and entrepreneurial activity, and thus, it is imperative for entrepreneurs to acquire leadership skills just as leaders must develop entrepreneurial acumen (Harrison & Roomi, 2018; Leitch & Harrison, 2018). The article underscores the significance of adopting a contextual perspective in comprehending the interdisciplinary notion of entrepreneur-leadership. It concurs with other scholars that the socio-cultural milieu significantly influences the performance of entrepreneurial leaders' duties (Stephan & Pathak, 2016).

#### Acknowledgments

This work was co-funded by the European Social Fund, through Operational Programme Human Capital 2014-2020, project number POCU/993/6/13/153322, project title << Educational and training support for Ph.D. students and young researchers in preparation for insertion into the labor market >>

#### REFERENCE LIST

- [1] Ahl, H., & Marlow, S. (2012). Exploring the dynamics of gender, feminism, and entrepreneurship: Advancing debate to escape a dead end? *Organization*, 19(5), 543–562. doi:10.1177/1350508412448695.
- [2] Al-Ghazali, B. M. (2020). Transformational leadership, career adaptability, job embeddedness, and perceived career success: a serial mediation model. *Leadership, Organisational Development Journal*, 41, 993–1013. doi: 10.1108/LODJ-10-2019-0455
- [3] Amankwaa, A., Susomrith, P., & Seet, P. S. (2022). Innovative behavior among service workers and the importance of leadership: evidence from an emerging economy. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 47(2), 506–530.
- [4] Audretsch, D. & Tamvada, P.J. (2022). From entrepreneurship to leadership. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, doi.org/10.1007/s10961-022-09956-8.
- [5] Avolio BJ (2010). *Full range leadership development*. SAGE Publications, New York City
- [6] Avolio, B., Walumbwa, F., & Weber, T. (2009). *Leadership: Current Theories, Research, and*

- Future Directions. *The Annual Review of Psychology*, 60(1), 421-449.
- [7] Bagheri, A. & Harrison, C. (2020). Entrepreneurial leadership measurement: a multi-dimensional construct. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 27(4), 659-679, DOI 10.1108/JSBED-01-2019-0027.
- [8] Bagheri, A. (2017) The impact of entrepreneurial leadership on innovation work behavior and opportunity recognition in high-technology SMEs. *The Journal of High Technology Management*, 28 (2), 159-166.
- [9] Bagheri, A. and Akbari, M. (2018) The impact of entrepreneurial leadership on nurses' innovation behaviour. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 50(1), 28-35.
- [10] Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [11] Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision." *Organizational dynamics*, 18(3), 19–31.
- [12] Bohl, K.W. (2019). Leadership as Phenomenon: Reassessing the Philosophical Ground of Leadership Studies, *Philosophy of Management*, 18, 273–292, doi.org/10.1007/s40926-019-00116-x.
- [13] Burns, J. M. G. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- [14] Burns J. M. G. (2012). *Leadership*. Open Road Integrated Media.
- [15] Cardon, M. S., Wincent, J., Singh, J. & Drnovsek, M. (2009). The Nature and Experience of Entrepreneurial Passion," *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3), 511–532
- [16] Cawthon, D. L. (1996). Leadership: The great man theory revisited. *Business Horizons*, 39(3), 1–4.
- [17] Chitac, I. (2022). Romanian migrants' journeys as transformational entrepreneurs in London, *CES Working Papers – Vol. XIV* (2).
- [18] Dhaliwal, S. (1998) Silent contributors – Asian female entrepreneurs and women in businesses,' *Women Studies International Forum*, 21, 463–474.
- [19] Drath, W. H., McCauley, C.D., Palus, C.J. Van Velsor, E. O'Connor, P.M.G & McGuire, J.B. (2008). Direction, alignment, commitment: Toward a more integrative ontology of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19 (6), 635–653.
- [20] Ensley M. D., Hmieleski K. M., & Pearce C. L. (2006). The importance of vertical and shared leadership within new venture top management teams: Implications for the performance of startups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 217-231.
- [21] European Institute of Innovation and Technology (2023) Women Entrepreneurship and Leadership Accessed on 20th of March: <https://eit.europa.eu/our-activities/entrepreneurship/women-entrepreneurship-and-leadership>.
- [22] Felix, C., Aparicio, S, & Urbano, D. (2019). Leadership as a driver of entrepreneurship: an international exploratory study." *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 26 (3), 397-420, DOI 10.1108/JSBED-03-2018-0106.
- [23] Figueroa-Domecq, C., de Jong, A., & Williams, A. (2020a). Gender, tourism, and entrepreneurship: A critical review. *Annals of Tourism Research Online First*: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102980>.
- [24] Figueroa-Domecq, C., de Jong, A., & Williams, A. (2020b). Sustainability through the tourism entrepreneurship journey: A gender perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1831001>.
- [25] Fløistad, G. (1991). Entrepreneurial leadership. *Leadership, Organizational Development Journal*, 12, 28–31, DOI 10.1108/EUM0000000001168.
- [26] Fontana, A. and Musa, S. (2017). The impact of entrepreneurial leadership on innovation management and its measurement validation", *International Journal of Innovation Science*, 9(1), 2-19.
- [27] Goodwin, V. L., Whittington, J. L., Murray, B., & Nichols, T. (2011). Moderator or mediator? Examining the role of trust in the transformational leadership paradigm. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 4, 409–425.
- [28] Guardian News and Media. (2021, June 12). *Rocket men: Bezos, Musk, and Branson Scramble for Space Supremacy*. *The Guardian*. [www.theguardian.com/science/2021/jun/12/branson-bezos-musk-space-commercial-flight](http://www.theguardian.com/science/2021/jun/12/branson-bezos-musk-space-commercial-flight)
- [29] Gupta, V., MacMillan, I.C. & Surie, G. (2004). Entrepreneurial leadership: developing and measuring a cross-cultural construct. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19 (2), 241-260.
- [30] Harrison, C., Burnard, K. & Paul, S. (2018). Entrepreneurial leadership in a developing economy: a skill-based analysis. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 25(3), 521-548.
- [31] Harrison, P. & Roomi, M.A. (2018). Islamic insights on entrepreneurial leadership. in

- Harrison, R.T. and Leitch, C.M. (Eds), *Research Handbook on Entrepreneurship and Leadership*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 106-129.
- [32] Harrison, R., Leitch, C., & McAdam, M. (2015). Breaking glass: Toward a gendered analysis of entrepreneurial leadership." *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(3), 693–713.
- [33] Harrison, C., Paul, S., & Burnard, K. (2016). Entrepreneurial Leadership: A Systematic Literature Review. *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, 14(2).
- [34] Hejazi, A.M., Maleki, M.M. & Naeji, M.J. (2012). Designing a scale for measuring entrepreneurial leadership in SMEs", *International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research*, 28 (1), 71-77.
- [35] Hensellek S, Kleine-Stegemann L, & Kollmann T (2023). Entrepreneurial leadership, strategic flexibility, and venture performance: does founders' span of control matter? *Journal of Business Research*, 157, 113544, doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113544
- [36] Huang, S., Ding, D. & Chen, Z. (2014). Entrepreneurial leadership and performance in Chinese new ventures: a moderated mediation model of exploratory innovation, exploitative innovation, and environmental dynamism", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 23(4), 453-470.
- [37] Kakabadse, N., Tatli, A., Nicolopoulou, K., Tankibayeva, A., & Mouraviev, N. (2018). A gender perspective on entrepreneurial leadership: Female leaders in Kazakhstan. *European Management Review*, 15, 155–170
- [38] Kamberidou, I. (2020) 'Distinguished' women entrepreneurs in the digital economy and the multitasking whirlpool. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 9(3). DOI: 10.1186/s13731-020-0114-y.
- [39] Kan, M. M., & Parry, KW. (2004). Identifying paradox: A grounded theory of leadership in overcoming resistance to change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15 (4): 467–491.
- [40] Kelly, S. (2014). Towards a negative ontology of leadership." *Human Relations*, 67 (8): 905–922. Doi.org/10.1177/0018726713503177.
- [41] Kim, M.Y., Park, S.M. & Miao, Q. (2017). Entrepreneurial leadership and organizational innovation: improving attitudes and behaviours of Chinese public employees. in Jing, Y. and Osborne, S.P. (Eds), *Public Service Innovations in China*, Springer, Singapore.
- [42] Kimbu, A. N., de Jong, A., Adam, I., Ribeiro, M. A., Afenyo-Agbe, E., Adeola, O., & Figueroa-Domecq, C. (2021). Recontextualising gender in entrepreneurial leadership. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 88, 103176.
- [43] Kuratko, D. (2007). Entrepreneurial leadership in the 21st century. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13(4), 1–11.
- [44] Lassalle, P. and Shaw, E. (2021). Trailing wives and constrained agency among women migrant entrepreneurs: An intersectional perspective.' *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 00(0), 1–26, DOI: 10.1177/1042258721990331.
- [45] Leitch, C., & Volery, T. (2017). Entrepreneurial leadership: Insights and directions. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship.*, 35(2), 147–156.
- [46] Leitch, C. M., & Harrison, R. T. (2018). The evolving field of entrepreneurial leadership: An overview. *Research Handbook on Entrepreneurship and Leadership*, 3-34.
- [47] Liu J, Zhou X, & Wang Q (2022). The influence of entrepreneurial leadership on employee improvisation in new ventures: based on cognitive-affective processing system framework. *Kybernetes*, doi.org/10.1108/K-10-2021-0933.
- [48] Miao, Q., Newman, A., Schwarz, G. & Cooper, B. (2018). How leadership and public service motivation enhance innovative behaviour", *Public Administration Review*, 78(1), 71-81.
- [49] Pan, Y., Verbeke, A., & Yuan, W. (2021). CEO transformational leadership and corporate entrepreneurship in China. *Management Organizational Review*, 17, 45–76. doi 10.1017/mor.2020.59.
- [50] Phillips, M. and Knowles, D. (2012) Performance and performativity: undoing fictions of women business owners. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 19. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.2010.00528.
- [51] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R. H & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142.
- [52] Ravet-Brown, T.É., Furtner, M. & Kallmuenzer, A. (2023). Transformational and entrepreneurial leadership: A review of distinction and overlap. *Review of Managerial Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-023-00649-6>.
- [53] Renko, M., Tarabishy, A., Carsrud, A.L. & Brannback, M. (2015) Understanding and measuring entrepreneurial leadership. *Journal*



- of *Small Business Management*, 53(1), 54-74, doi: 10.1111/jsbm.12086.
- [54] Rost, J.C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- [55] Rost, J.C. (2008). Followership is an outmoded concept. In The Warren Bennis signature series. *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations*, ed. R.E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, and J.Lipman-Blumen, 53–64. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [56] Schumpeter, J. (1934). *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, 14. New York: Harper and Row.
- [57] Shields, C. M. (2010). Transformative leadership: Working for equity in diverse contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46, 558-589.
- [58] Shields, C.M. (2013). *Transformative leadership in education: Equitable change in an uncertain and complex world*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- [59] Simpson, B. (2016). Where is the agency in leadership-as-practice? In *Leadership-As-Practice: Theory and Application*, ed. Joseph A. Raelin. London: Routledge.
- [60] Stephan, U. & Pathak, S. (2016) Beyond cultural values? Cultural leadership ideals and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(5), 505-523.
- [61] Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2012). Transformation school leadership effects on student achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 11, 418-451.
- [62] Tamvada, J. P., & Chowdhury, R. (2022). The Irrationality of Rationality in Market Economics: A Paradox of Incentives Perspective. *Business & Society*, DOI: 00076503221101888.
- [63] Tead, O. (1935). *The Art of Leadership*. McGraw Hill, New York.
- [64] Tlaiss, H. A., & Kauser, S. (2019). Entrepreneurial leadership, patriarchy, gender, and identity in the Arab world: Lebanon in focus. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(2), 517-537.
- [65] Van Hemmen, S., Urbano, D., & Alvarez, C. (2013). Charismatic leadership and entrepreneurial activity: an empirical analysis.” *Innovar*, 3(50), 53-66.
- [66] Vecchio, R.P. (2003) Entrepreneurship and leadership: common trends and common threads. *Human Resource Management Review* 13(2): 303–327.
- [67] Venkataraman, S. (1997). The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research: An editor's perspective. *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence, and growth*, 3, 119-138.
- [68] Vertovec, S. (2020). Afterword: The Work of ‘Integration’. *Digesting Difference: Migrant Incorporation and Mutual Belonging in Europe*, 251-266.
- [69] Vershinina N., Rodgers, P., Tarba, S., Khan, Z., & Stokes, P. (2020). Gaining legitimacy through proactive stakeholder management: The experiences of high-tech women entrepreneurs in Russia. *Journal of Business Research*, 119, 111-121.
- [70] Villares-Varela, M. (2018). Negotiating class, femininity, and career: Latin American migrant women entrepreneurs in Spain. *International Migration*, 56(4), 109-124.
- [71] Villares-Varela, M. and Essers, C. (2019) Women in the migrant economy. A positional approach to contextualize gendered transnational trajectories. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 31 (3-4), 213–225. DOI 10.1080/08985626.2018.1551789.
- [72] Voda, A. I., & Florea, N. (2019). Impact of personality traits and entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intentions of business and engineering students. *Sustainability*, 11(4), 1192.
- [73] Voegtlin, C., Frisch, C., Walther, A., & Schwab, P. (2020). Theoretical development and empirical examination of a three-roles model of responsible leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167, 411-431.
- [74] Zaman, U. (2020). Examining the effect of xenophobia on “transnational” mega construction project (MCP) success: Moderating role of transformational leadership and high-performance work (HPW) practices. *Engineering, Construction, and Architectural Management*, 27(5), 1119-1143.

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table No 1  
**Transformational vs transformative leadership**

<b>Transformational leadership characteristics</b>	<b>Transformative leadership characteristics</b>
Inspirational motivation	Deconstruction and reconstruction of the knowledge frameworks that generate inequity
Individualized consideration	Acknowledgment of power and privilege
Intellectual stimulation	Emphasis on both individual achievement and the public good
Idealised influence	A focus on liberation, equity, and justice

*Source: Shields, (2010, 2013) and Sun & Leithwood, (2012)*

Table No 2  
**Entrepreneurial leadership dimensions**

<b>Author</b>	<b>Entrepreneurial leadership's dimensions</b>
Bagheri & Harrison (2020)	Framing the challenge, defining gravity and orientation towards learning, managing uncertainty, building commitment, and opportunity identification and exploitation.
Fontana & Musa (2017)	Strategic, communicative, and motivational
Kim et al. (2017)	Managing uncertainty and overcoming limitations and building commitment
Huang et al. (2014)	Framing the challenge, managing uncertainty, and building commitment
Gupta et al. (2004)	Framing the challenge, managing uncertainty, building commitment, and defining limits.

*Source: Bagheri & Harrison, (2020)*