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Motivated, visionary, energetic, hard working, creative, tough-minded, responsible, inspiring. Do these words describe leaders or entrepreneurs or both? This paper summarizes research conducted in the fields of leadership and entrepreneurship throughout the past 30 years, attempting to identify similarities and differences between female leaders and entrepreneurs. The purpose is to use what is found to develop recommendations and strategies designed to strengthen leadership and entrepreneurship education.

Those of us who teach economics introduce and discuss the factors of production: raw materials, labor, capital, and entrepreneurial ability. The first three are tangible and relatively easy to explain; however, the fourth, entrepreneurial ability, while more difficult to conceptualize in a college classroom, may be the most powerful of the four factors. “Entrepreneurship is the process of creating something different with value by devoting the necessary time and effort . . . and receiving the resulting rewards of monetary and personal satisfaction” (Hisrich, 1990, p. 209). However, does entrepreneurial ability stand alone or is it dependent on leadership skills in order to be effective? Leadership, which has been studied since the time of Aristotle, is about process, influence, and achieving goals (Northouse, 2004). This process includes leaders, followers, and the relationships that emerge and grow through influence tactics displayed within evolving situations. Leadership is adaptive and produces change. It, too, is challenging to conceptualize in the classroom. So, can all leaders be considered entrepreneurs or can all entrepreneurs be thought of as leaders? And, what role, if any, does gender play in this discussion?

Guiding Questions and Intent

Entrepreneurship and leadership disciplines, have long-term, very rich research bases. In order to manage the quantity of information, three questions guided this inquiry. First, are there significant identifiable similarities and/or differences between entrepreneurs and leaders? For example, do these groups share similar traits and competencies? Kirkpatrick and Locke
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(1991) found that “it is unequivocally clear that leaders are not like other people” (p. 59). They argued that leaders possess drive, the desire to lead, honesty, integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, and knowledge of the business. Likewise, a 1996 study conducted by Carland, Carland, and Stewart posited that the thing that set successful entrepreneurs apart was vision, and additionally while, “entrepreneurs are not homogenous, they may well be characterized by need for achievement, preference for innovation and risk-taking propensity” (p. 9). The second question was what role did gender play, if any? And, third, can an understanding of the similarities and differences of each be used to strengthen learning opportunities for both, particularly for women?

Leadership and Entrepreneurship: A Brief Overview

Eyal and Kark (2004) noted that leadership and entrepreneurship are discussed together in the research literature with leadership responsible for clarifying causality, simplifying reality and strengthening control over it (reality) while entrepreneurship is an action that can be related to generating new realities (p. 215). They concluded from their study that “leadership is associated with entrepreneurship; however, this relationship is complex” (p. 228). To understand better the idiosyncrasies of both, the following definitions provide insight into the arenas of leadership and entrepreneurship.

Leadership Defined

As many as 65 classifications have defined leadership differently in the past 50 years (Fleishman, Mumford, Zaccaro, Levin, Korotkin, & Hein, 1991) and Stogdill (1974) wrote that there are “almost as many definitions as there are people who have tried to define it” (p. 7). For the purposes of this paper, the definition of leadership is borrowed from Northouse (2004, p. 3), “Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal.” The components include a process involving influence, which occurs within a group context focusing on an ultimate goal. Leadership style is characterized by the consistent patterns
of exhibited behaviors, attitudes, and values. Environmental or situational forces that are constantly changing or evolving affect these patterns. Some classification style examples include participative, consultative, consen­sus, democratic, autocratic, entrepreneurial, and contingency leadership (Dubrin, 2004). Leadership has been defined as traits, behaviors, influence, persuasion, interaction patterns, role relationships, and as adminis­trative position; and most definitions assume that leadership involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one to others in an at­tempt to guide relationships (Moerer-Urdahl, 2005).

Looking at effective leaders from a traits perspective, Kouzes and Posner (1995) identified a list of best practices characteristics collected in two research efforts eight years apart from 1987 to 1996 and refer to this as “source credibility,” a three-pronged criteria evaluation including: “perceived trustworthiness, dynamism, and expertise” (p. 26). The information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>1995 Respondents % of people selecting</th>
<th>1987 Respondents % of people selecting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward-Moving</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair-Minded</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad-Minded</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight Forward</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courageous</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These percentages represent respondents from four continents: America, Asia, Europe, and Australia with the majority being from the U.S.

presented in Table 1 represents the best of more than 225 values, traits, and characteristics identified by 20,000 managers who they said they would *willingly* follow this type of leader (pp. 20–21).

Clawson (1997) designed a diamond shaped model of leadership, which focuses on four basic elements: the leader, others, task, and organization. Looking beyond the qualities of the leader, Clawson brings together these elements in a synergistic picture with additional considerations being the envisioned strategy, the relationships shared with the followers, and the organizational content that will influence the outcomes. In all, he summarizes that at least 11 essential factors come into play, with examples being: bonding of employees, managing change, thinking strategically, sharing the vision, influencing others; all of which affect the results of effectiveness, efficiency, learning, and growth.

Clawson emphasizes that it is the relationship among the four key components: the leader, a set of strategic challenges or tasks, the followers, and the organization set in an environmental context, that together become the synergistic ingredients to effective leadership (Clawson, 1997.) The relationship among these will determine the outcome. Leadership is all about relationship building and maintenance and it must have a direction and the means to achieve that direction.

**Leadership and Gender**
The question of gender in leadership effectiveness has emerged in the past 30 years as women have slowly earned their way up the corporate ladder (Book, 2000; Chemers, 1997; Helgesen, 1990). In recent years, researchers have posited that in contemporary society, women’s leadership is more effective (Book, 2000; Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1995).

In reviewing contemporary leadership theories, Burns (1978) first articulated a new leadership style, transforming leadership, which was later expanded into transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). Significant studies have indicated that the components of transformational leadership are positively related to leaders’ effectiveness (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Transformational leadership is a process that changes and transforms people and is concerned with:

... emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals and includes assessing followers’ motives, satisfying their needs, and treating them as full human beings... [It] involves an exceptional form of influence that moves followers to accomplish more than what is usually expected of them... incorporates charismatic and visionary leadership (Northouse, 2007, pp. 175–176).

Women exceed men in leadership effectiveness when using the transformational leadership behaviors (Fondas, 1997). These definitions and differences between styles of leading within the gender arena are significant to women’s progress, or lack thereof, in business as women leaders continue to hit their heads on the “invisible” glass ceiling. “The glass ceil-
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ing is a global phenomenon whereby women are disproportionately concentrated in lower-level and lower-authority leadership positions than men (Powell & Graves, 2003, as found in Northouse, 2007, p. 270). One author suggests three explanations, “The first . . . highlights differences in women’s and men’s investments in human capital. The next . . . considers essential differences between women and men. The final type . . . focuses on prejudice and discrimination against female leaders” (Northouse, 2007, p. 270).

A consideration of the effects of gender on leadership has significant implications, according to Northouse (2007). Contemporary approaches to gender and leadership involve questions that directly affect leadership success, such as style and effectiveness differences between men and women and the invisible barriers keeping women out of elite leadership positions. Gender is integral to contemporary notions of effective styles that have morphed from a traditional masculine, autocratic style to a more feminine and androgynous style of democratic and transformational leadership.

Leadership in the Classroom

Since a skill set has been attributed to these styles of leadership, one model designed by Mumford, Zaccaro, Connelly, & Marks in 2000 (as cited by Northouse, 2007, pp. 53–54) contends that by using a map, individuals can develop a learning process to become more effective leaders.

Leadership outcomes are the direct result of a leader’s competencies in problem-solving skills, social judgment skills, and knowledge. Each of these competencies includes a large repertoire of abilities, and each can be learned and developed . . . the [skills] model illustrates how individual attributes such as general cognitive ability, crystallized cognitive ability, motivation, and personality influence the leaders’ competencies. Workers can improve their capabilities in these areas through training and experience.

This literature supports the belief that leadership effectiveness can be developed through learning experiences in the classroom.

Entrepreneurship Defined

As tempting as it is to define entrepreneurship as a function limited to starting a small business, the concept is much broader than that. Empirically, it is understood that situational or individual variables are poor predictors of entrepreneurial activities; however, characteristic and trait analyses continue to be the most prevalent method of describing entrepreneurs (Smith Knopik, 2006, p. 23). One of the most extensive lists of entrepreneurial characteristics, prepared by Pinchot (1985), compared traditional corporate managers, intrapreneurs (corporate employees who are, in fact, very entrepreneurial), and entrepreneurs. Using 19 dimensions, illustrated in Table 2, a picture of an entrepreneur emerged of a goal-oriented, self-reliant and self-motivated individual who valued freedom. He found that entre-
### Table 2
Entrepreneurial Characteristics and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary motives</td>
<td>Wants freedom, is goal-oriented, self-reliant, self-motivated. Adamant. If an entrepreneur has a need, s/he creates it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time orientation</td>
<td>Projects end goals of 5-10 year growth of business, takes action now to move to next step along the way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Gets hands dirty, may upset employees by suddenly doing their work. At times takes action now to move to next step along the way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Knows business intimately. More business acumen than managerial or political skill. Often technically trained if in a technical business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage and Destiny</td>
<td>Tend to be self confident, optimistic, and courageous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>Primarily focused on technology and marketplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Likes moderate risk. Invests heavily, but expects to succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market research</td>
<td>Creates needs. Creates products that often can't be tested with research—potential customers don't yet understand them. Talks to customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and forms own opinions. (Intuitive market evaluation.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Happy sitting on an orange crate if job is getting done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure and Mistakes</td>
<td>Deals with mistakes and failures as learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is served</td>
<td>May rapidly advance in a system, then, when frustrated, rejects the system and forms his/her own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward the system</td>
<td>Escapes problems in large and formal structures by leaving and starting over on own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving style</td>
<td>Tends to be entrepreneurial, small business, professional, or farm background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family history</td>
<td>Often has had absent father or poor relations with father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with parents</td>
<td>Lower-class background in some early studies, middle-class in more recent ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic background</td>
<td>Transactions and deal making are basic relationship foundation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

entrepreneurs followed a private vision, were decisive, action-oriented, and did not have a problem getting their hands dirty. With goals extending five to ten years into the future, they were often very competent in their areas of expertise; they dealt with mistakes and failures as learning experiences, and liked moderate risk, but expected to succeed. They tended to be very intuitive and they created needs (Pinchot, 1985, pp. 54–56).

While there has been disagreement within the discipline regarding entrepreneurial characteristics and motivations, Carland et al. (1996) believe that the one common thread throughout entrepreneurial research literature is that of entrepreneurial vision. Whether it is called innovation or creativity, the commonality appears to be the ability to “see what is not there” (p. 5).

Entrepreneurship, then, is defined in this paper as a way of thinking that emphasizes opportunities over threats (Krueger, Jr., Reilly, & Carsrud, 2000, p. 411). It implies having a curiosity about the world as well as the ability to innovate, to recognize opportunities, and to assess risk. It means being intuitive, intentional, and visionary. “Translated literally,” according to Baumol (2006), “entrepreneur means one who undertakes—one of life’s doers” (p. 1).

However, the studies cited previously did not differentiate between men and women in terms of characteristics, motivations, intent, or environment, and gender may play a significant role in entrepreneurial activities. Entrepreneurship also appears to be heavily influenced by national cultural and social norms. According to Minniti and Bygrave (2004), who conduct an annual assessment of global entrepreneurial activity, “the national culture determines the extent to which existing social and cultural norms encourage or do not discourage individual actions that can lead to new ways of conducting business” (p. 24). They continued, “Traditionally, the culture of the United States is one of seeking opportunities and taking risks” (p. 24), which explains why the United States ranks higher than any of the developed nations in entrepreneurial activities rank. Kreiser, Marino, and Weaver (2002) support this observation, “Researchers have long realized that societies vary in their ability to create and sustain entrepreneurial activity” (p. 2), perhaps due to culture. It is likely, then, that societal culture also affects women in many aspects of their lives, including careers.

Because self-employment has traditionally been the benchmark for measuring entrepreneurship, most studies have focused on this element. Therefore, the following studies cite entrepreneurial activity as measured by small business development and ownership.

Entrepreneurship and Gender
According to Bender (2002), “The past decade has emerged as the era of women entrepreneurs. Such women no longer command attention because they are unusual but because they are important. They are no longer seen as followers, but as leaders; they are no longer viewed as confined to certain businesses, but as innovators across the full range of business and commerce. Nowhere is this phenomenon more profound than in the United
States where women are starting businesses faster than in other countries” (p. 2). However, she also found that women leave corporate positions due to frustration, citing the *glass-ceiling* phenomenon, the perceived, albeit invisible, barriers preventing women from reaching top administrative positions (Wall Street Journal, 1986). While they leave positions because “they are not taken seriously by their employers,” they find “that once they become [business owners] their employees, customers, and/or the philanthropic organizations they support do not take them seriously” (Bender, Abstract), either.

The good news for women, according to Minniti and Arenius (2003), is that “women’s entrepreneurship has been studied by the United Nations as a means of economic development, women’s empowerment and gender equality” (p. 19). They go on to say, “Entrepreneurship is opening up non-traditional areas of work for women and linkages to trade opportunities. Actions have been recommended at the legislative and policy development level to help increase women’s roles in decision making, access to training and networking” (p. 19) [around the world].

In a U.S.-based study examining male/female motivations for self-employment, Caudron (1999) found fundamental differences between men and women regarding the self-employment decision. “For men, variables such as race, ethnicity, age, and income sources affect nearly every decision. For women, the presence of small children affects every decision. For both men and women, marital status has a strong effect as do education, spouse’s work hours, spouse’s housework hours, and parents’ education” (p. 166).

Bird, Sapp, and Lee (2001) examined self-employment in rural Iowa and found “scant evidence supporting sex differences in personal characteristics” (p. 2) but that “men’s social networks often were more conducive to small business financial success than were women’s” (p. 2) as was access to and use of [financial] credit, type of industry, and size of business (p. 3). They noted that “social structures influence behavior by affecting how individuals interact and what they perceive and value” (p. 4) and that “social relations are embedded in [culturally] gendered social structures” (p. 4).

In two German-based studies, Georgellis and Wall (1999, 2004) found that “men are more responsive to the wage differential . . . liquidity constraints are more important to men . . . and that the link between father’s self-employment status and the probability of self-employment is stronger for men” (p. 1). They went on to say, “Taken together, these results suggest that, for women, self-employment is a closer substitute for part-time work and labour-market inactivity than it is for men. We attribute such differences to the different labour market opportunities and occupational strategies of women” (p. 1). Further, in a 2000 study focusing on the United States, they found, “Because men and women face vastly different costs and benefits to self-employment relative to other labor market options, the self-employment decisions of men and women differ a great deal”
They cited issues such as differences in labor-market opportunities due to discrimination, experience, and skill differentials as well as child-care concerns (p. 15). There were also differences in the occupations and industries that attract men and women (p. 22) that affected decisions and ultimate success as self-employed business owners.

**Entrepreneurship in the Classroom**

Beyond inherent characteristics, the literature appears to imply that experience enhances entrepreneurial abilities. For example, some individuals recognize and/or exploit particular opportunities more easily than do others due to access to relevant information and the cognitive ability to evaluate the information (Alsos, Ljunggren, & Pettersen, 2003, p. 437). In fact, it appears that “much of what we consider ‘entrepreneurial’ activity is intentionally planned behavior” (Krueger, Jr., et al., 2000, p. 413). If this is accurate, it follows that these abilities can be learned and that business-related education and experience enhance success (Bird, et al, 2001). Henderson and Abraham (2004) point out that knowledge has become the new premium fuel for economic growth in the 21st century, “It fuels new ideas and innovations, boosting productivity and creating new products, new firms, new jobs, and new wealth” (p. 71).

These observations have implications for business programs within higher education if, in fact, entrepreneurship consists of a package of learned skills. Kuratko (2005) wrote, “It is becoming clear that entrepreneurship, or certain facets of it, can be taught” (p. 580). Kuratko also noted that, “Peter Drucker, recognized as one of the leading management thinkers of our time has said that . . . the entrepreneurial mystique is not magic, it’s not mysterious, and it has nothing to do with the genes. It’s a discipline. And, like any discipline, it can be learned” (p. 580).

**Discussion and Findings**

The objective of this study was to learn from existing literature about leaders and entrepreneurs—the differences and similarities between them, whether or not gender matters, and if this knowledge can be used to strengthen leadership and entrepreneurship education, particularly for women.

**Similarities**

After reviewing the literature, it became apparent that there were similarities between successful entrepreneurs and leaders. These similarities included being visionary, goal-oriented, determined, competent, focused, and courageous. One researcher coined the term, *entrepreneurial leader*, and described this individual as possessing “strong achievement drive, sensible risk taking, high degree of enthusiasm and creativity, tendency to act

Collaborative leaders (who work together toward common goals) promote and safeguard the collaborative process by inspiring commitment, working with others as peers, building broad based-involvement, and sustaining hope and participation in the process. As a collaborative leader, the civic entrepreneur orchestrates the development of a civic infrastructure . . . They do share five common traits: an ability to see opportunity; an entrepreneurial personality; an ability to provide collaborative leadership; a long-term, broad, community motivation; and an ability to work in teams (p. 3).

Other similarities that emerged were a high level of industry knowledge and competency, the ability to create needs, the cognition to recognize mistakes as learning experiences, being visionary and able to set goals.

**Differences**

However, one of the challenges of examining and comparing the literature was that of definition of terms. For example, was “visionary” as used in entrepreneurship literature used the same in leadership research? This dichotomy is illustrated by the following observations.

Entrepreneurship is not planning by groups or management decisions by corporate bodies, but the exploitation of perceived opportunity by individuals based solely on personal judgments and visions that others either don’t see or can’t bear the risks of acting on. (Formaini, 2001, p. 2).

Conversely, “Leaders have to learn to thrive on the tensions between their own calling and voice of the people” (Kouzes & Posner, 1995, p. 28). In short, leadership depends on a *shared vision*; entrepreneurship, on a *private vision*.

Further confusion resulted from descriptions that could describe either entrepreneurs or leaders. For example, regarding entrepreneurs:

Organizations are as organic in their nature as the individuals who constitute them. Business organizations can be regenerative if they have the ability to support ongoing innovation. The seeds of regeneration are sown in the earliest stages of the organization’s existence and have four key attributes:

- Acute awareness
- Excellent skills
- Inspired motivation
- Supportive infrastructure
The first three relate to qualities in people that can be nurtured, shaped, and honed through experience. (These characteristics can exist in individuals and do not depend on a group.) A supportive infrastructure is a purely exogenous factor—it is enabling (Price, 2007, p. 8).

Likewise, leadership literature focuses on the power of purpose. Purpose, according to Mourkogiannis (2007), is powerful in its orientation because “it is founded on deeply held ideas about what is right and what is worthwhile (p. 27). He suggests that four moral ideas exist, motivating people and creating successful businesses worldwide—discovery (those who discover, never rest), excellence (those who focus on the supreme good aspire to highest quality), altruism (those who care about and maximize others’ well being), and heroism (those who earn respect through strength and effectiveness). He states:

A shared sense of purpose helps with the key aspects an organization that depends on people:

- **Morale** (by creating a strong sense of direction and belonging),
- **Innovation** (by reducing risk aversion and encouraging leaders to make radical decisions),
- **Relationships** (by underpinning trust and making individuals more sensitive to each other’s needs),
- **Leadership** (by providing direction and a source of inspiration) (p. 31–32).

Therefore, after much discussion, it was the consensus of the authors (of this study) that, while the characteristics and traits of leaders and entrepreneurs may be similar, it is focus (internal versus external) and the context of the environment that may be different. For example, purpose for leaders appears to be focusing on including and inspiring others while heading in the right direction. Purpose for entrepreneurs appears to be the successful realization of an idea resulting in desired outcomes for themselves (although they often need other people to help them achieve it). These observations have been summarized in Table 3 and will guide the recommendations presented by this paper.

A sense of purpose is the driving force within the 21st century workplace. “Here’s the big ‘aha’ about leadership,” shared Merrick-Bakken (2005, p. 48), “Leadership isn’t about the leader. It’s about the relationships between the leader and all of the people around him or her. Effective leaders build a shared focus, an aligned infrastructure, and a supportive underlying culture.” She asks the question, “How do leaders drive both satisfaction and productivity? They create a sense of purpose. They prioritize goals (instead of trying to do everything), provide consistent recognition and support, and provide continuing coaching and feedback. And they create a sense of team, both within their units and across units. Leaders build their culture around relationships and performance” (p. 50).
Further, according to Kiyosaki (2007) in comments about his leadership learning experiences at a military academy, "Though academics were important... They took a secondary position to leadership training... Our priorities were [clear]... first was the mission, second was the team, and personal interests came last" (p. 148).

Conversely, as indicated in Table 2, not only are entrepreneurs focused on serving themselves and customers (no mention of employees), it is clear they follow a private vision. This, of course, does not mean that entrepreneurs do not struggle to build a support team as, according to Taylor (1988), "successful entrepreneurs... built strong teams of associates" (p. 152) and "they made friends with their bankers and suppliers" (p. 153). It is just that it is not as important to entrepreneurs that everyone be committed to the vision, only that the work gets done well.

Influence on Gender
Gender appears to add another dimension to these observations:

The female brain has tremendous unique aptitudes—outstanding verbal agility, the ability to connect deeply in friendship, a nearly psychic capacity to read faces and tone of voice for emotions and states of mind, and the ability to defuse conflict. All of this is hardwired into the brains of women (Brizendine, 2006, p. 8).

"The degree to which males and females are expected to behave differently, are treated differently, or valued differently has little to do with sex (biology) and everything to do with gender (learned beliefs)" (Northouse, 2004, p. 266). He goes on to say, "The pervasiveness of the attitudes associated with sex and gender has resulted in workplaces becoming gendered" (p. 266). Both leadership and entrepreneurship literature recognize that cultural and social environments (in which organizations exist) are gendered—often to the extent that it may not be noticed, even though this reality actually drives the hierarchical design, communication structures and management decisions of the organizations. This often results, according to Northouse (2004), in organizational barriers (higher standards of performance and effort for women or inhospitable corporate culture); interpersonal barriers (male prejudice, stereotyping, and preconceptions or exclusion from informal networks); and personal barriers (lack of political savvy or homework conflict), all obstacles to women’s advancement (pp. 275–276). Women continue to face disadvantages relative to men due to gender-specific barriers associated with education, child rearing, socialization practices, family roles, and the possible lack of business contacts (Minniti & Arenius, 2003, 12).

Relevance in the Classroom
Higher education, specifically business administration programs that offer leadership and/or entrepreneurship programs, is perfectly positioned to
Table 3
Priorities of Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Mission of organization (strategic vision shared w/inspired followers)</td>
<td>#1 Personal interests (private vision; innovation and competitive advantage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Team (communication &amp; motivation)</td>
<td>#2 Team (logistics &amp; job completion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Personal interests (intrinsic motivation)</td>
<td>#3 Mission of organization (business plan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

meet some of these needs. Based on the professional teaching experience of the authors, it is believed that by using the information presented in Table 3, a curriculum could be developed that synthesizes the best elements of both leadership and entrepreneurship for purposes of strengthening each.

**Conclusion**

As the business world has become increasingly more global, the scarcity of financial resources has been replaced with the lack of

... knowledge, entrepreneurship (an element of risk), and more generally human capital. Strategy, structure, and systems thinking will be replaced with purpose, process, and people-thinking—getting people to help define and then align with purpose, developing the processes to accomplish the purpose, and then attracting and maintaining the people to push the processes. (Nowicki & Summers, 2007, p. 118).

According to Kuratko (2005):

Entrepreneurship has emerged over the last two decades as arguably the most potent economic force the world has ever experienced. With that expansion has come a similar increase in the field of entrepreneurship education. The number of colleges and universities that offer courses related to entrepreneurship has grown from a handful in the 1970s to over 1,600 in 2005 (p. 577).

On the other hand, “...in spite of the high level of interest, leadership education has not been readily available from accredited universities” (Liberty & Prewitt, 1999, p. 155). They continue, “Perhaps universities and colleges have been reluctant to attempt leadership education because they fear failure” (p. 155). They conclude their study: “While current, U.S.-based leadership education “has not yet settled into a recognizable format, its roots seem firmly based in the social sciences including the behavioral sciences and the humanities” (p. 161).
It is the opinion of the authors (of this study) that excellent leaders are entrepreneurial, that successful entrepreneurs are leaders, and that innovative business administration programs could be developed to combine the two disciplines very effectively. It is also believed that such programs developed specifically for women would be both beneficial and successful.

This, then, leads to recommendations for future studies:

• Validation through research, the observations listed in Table 3;
• The role of human capital within dynamic organizations and how it can be harnessed and developed by female leaders and/or entrepreneurs;
• Implications of social capital on the success of women leaders and female entrepreneurs within a business environment;
• How to determine the existence of a gendered environment and leadership strategies for neutralizing the barriers;
• Identification of entrepreneurs within organizations and strategies for developing innovation; and
• Further pursuits of entrepreneurial leadership concept.

The environment in which business is conducted is one of constant change and diversity of global proportions. Bringing the best of entrepreneurship with its innovative and optimistic perspective together with the strengths of leadership (shared vision, influence, and communication) can only enhance the effectiveness of professional women and their ability to recognize, adapt to, and effect change.
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