



UWS Academic Portal

The role of the entrepreneurial leader

Omeihe, Ibiyemi; Harrison, Christian; Simba, Amon; Omeihe, Kingsley

Published in:
International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business

Accepted/In press: 11/03/2020

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Omeihe, I., Harrison, C., Simba, A., & Omeihe, K. (Accepted/In press). The role of the entrepreneurial leader: a study of Nigerian SMEs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*.
<https://www.inderscience.com/info/ingeneral/forthcoming.php?jcode=ijesb>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact pure@uws.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Leading the way: the entrepreneur or the leader?

Abstract

Purpose: Researchers seem to focus overwhelmingly on entrepreneurial leadership as seen in recent studies in the leadership literature. This situation becomes more complex as research draw on parallels between leadership and entrepreneurship. This has led to an ongoing debate on the veracity of entrepreneurship as a distinct field of study. The elusive nature of both concepts has further complicated the efforts made by researchers at integrating these fields in order to achieve a consensual understanding on the status of entrepreneurship within the field of leadership. The purpose of this paper is to explore these independent fields of study so as to provide a clear understanding of its close association, peculiarities and the theoretical considerations.

Design/methodology/approach: This study is based on a critical review of the extant literature on leadership, entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial leadership. The literature review focused on the existing theories and perspectives and attempts were made to draw parallels within the domains of leadership, entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial leadership.

Findings: Entrepreneurial leadership though a distinct field of study within the domain of leadership is deeply embedded in the positive integration of the fields of leadership and entrepreneurship. Parallels were drawn from the theoretical considerations shaping these three fields of study respectively. This close association was further reinforced by similarities and in some instances the replication of some attributes and skills within all the three fields.

Originality/value: This study brings additional insights to the parallels that exist within the field of leadership and entrepreneurship particularly in proposing an integrative model for entrepreneurial leadership based on the positive integration of entrepreneurship and leadership.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurial leadership, Leadership, Attributes and Skills.

Introduction

Over time, scholars from the fields of leadership and entrepreneurship have made attempts to define these concepts independently yet both remain elusive till date. This has led to ongoing debates about the veracity of entrepreneurship as a distinct field and subject (Vecchio, 2003; Carlsson et al., 2013). This allusion is further complicated by its close proximity and association with other fields such as strategy and leadership. Accordingly, Vecchio (2003) argues that entrepreneurship should be appraised as a variant of leadership. This has influenced Vecchio's (2003) definition of entrepreneurship, which describes entrepreneurship as a kind of leadership, in a narrower context. Thus, lending precision to the argument that entrepreneurship is a subset of the leadership field (Shane, 2010). This past decade has witnessed a rapid growth in the leadership literature with recent empirical findings and parallels drawn between both concepts (Cogliser and Brigham, 2004; Fernald *et al.*, 2005).

This paper acknowledges a convergence of the two fields; leadership and entrepreneurship. As in wider literature, this paper further builds on the existing aspects of leadership literature that describes entrepreneurship as a form of leadership termed entrepreneurial leadership. It has been suggested that there is an overlap between the two fields (Cogliser and Brigham, 2004). This supports the proposition that entrepreneurial leadership is a form of leadership that has emerged from a positive integration of both fields. Given the strong links between entrepreneurship and leadership, entrepreneurial leadership is examined as a convergence of the two fields (Cogliser and Brigham, 2004). However, this paper argues that entrepreneurial leadership is a distinct form of leadership which highlights the importance of managing challenges and opportunities within the entrepreneurial context (Bagheri *et al.*, 2013). Consequently, the paper will examine leadership and entrepreneurship from three main perspectives. The extant literature shaping both fields will be appraised and the positive associations in the evolution of the concepts and theories will be examined. Therefore, justifying the assertion that entrepreneurial leadership is a distinct field of leadership that describes the approach of leaders in the entrepreneurial context.

Defining leadership and entrepreneurship perspectives

There have been several definitions of leadership, yet there is still a lack of consensual meaning. For instance; Yukl (1999) defines leadership as the influence and persuasion, which captures the role of a leader within a group. Similarly, Pierce and Newstrom (2003) describe leadership as a process which frames the interaction of leaders and followers within a specific context. These definitions acknowledge a leader's ability to mobilise support

towards the attainment of set goals (Kouzes and Posner, 2002). These definitions are underpinned by the activities of the followers and their relevance to the leadership process, though extant literature suggests that leaders are primarily defined by their capabilities and not the processes.

In an attempt to provide a focused review on leadership, a number of scholars have explored several leadership dimensions. For instance, Rost (1993) reviewed 221 definitions of leadership, while Barker (2002) reviewed definitions of leadership to provide an integrated description and definition. Rost (1993) reports that definitions of leadership are based on perceptions which captures divergent approaches. In a similar vein, Barker (2002) proposed that leadership is based on two main outlooks; behaviours and processes. Ciculla (1995) however points to an overlap in definitions of leadership, as key themes of action, motivation and influence have been acknowledged to contribute to the attainment of goals and objectives. Interestingly, the lack of consensus across definitions of leadership, has been viewed as an optimistic indication for further studies which will stimulate a richer understanding of the concept (Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2003).

Similarly, entrepreneurship is a complex field at an abstract level, which has been plagued with theoretical as well as empirical challenges (Drucker, 1985). Consequently, the evaluation of the existing literature will not undertake a collective approach which attempts to harmonise existing theories. This is because the field is new and lacks a coherent theoretical underpinning (Morris *et al.*, 2011). This paper will, however, appraise the concept of entrepreneurship from a holistic approach, which considers multiple perspectives in an attempt to achieve a comprehensive outlook (Clark and Harrison, 2019). This approach is also consistent with Gartner's (2001) suggestion that the field can exist as an amalgamation of divergent perspectives. Similar to the field of leadership, it is worth noting that the conceptual proximity to other fields like leadership and strategic management expands the rigour in proposing entrepreneurship as a separate field of discourse (Clark and Harrison, 2019). What comes under the heading of entrepreneurship is diverse in character, however a critical factor in the economic growth of nations (Beck and Cull, 2014). It seems consistent to argue that these differing perspectives have played a key role in keeping this field unstructured and have consequently limited the emergence of an integrated theory (Clark and Harrison, 2019).

Entrepreneurship as a concept has been defined based on attributes, function and motivation for actions (Bygrave and Hofer 1991; Clark and Harrison, 2019). For instance, Doyles (1992) defines entrepreneurship as an economic process of wealth creation, recognising risk taking and innovation as key success factors. Similarly, Binks and Vale

(1990) define entrepreneurship as a consolidation of economic resources with the aim of making profit. Consistent with this, Acs and Szerb (2007) define entrepreneurship as the creation of a new enterprise to exploit opportunities. This highlights the components of entrepreneurship such as exploitation of opportunities, risk awareness and envisioning. This is consistent with Douglas and Shepherd (2002) view that assert entrepreneurship as the process of envisioning a new path for a business by exploiting information and knowledge in a context plagued with uncertainty.

Given the strengths of these definitions above, Baumol and Strom (2007) asserts that the activities of entrepreneurs account for the expansions within organisations. There is then a strong case for describing entrepreneurship as a set of attributes and behaviours exploited by individuals in an entrepreneurial process.

Leadership and entrepreneurship theories

Several theories on leadership have emerged in parallel to the practical demands of the society. Thus, to make sense of the vast body of literature, Clark and Harrison (2018) recommend a critical appraisal and categorisation of extant literature to frame divergent perspectives. Other researchers have attempted to categorise these theories based on evolution of the concept. Thus, when explored together, this provides a framework that captures a significant amount of extant and relatively new theories on leadership (King, 1990; Alimo-Metcalfe, 2013; Clark and Harrison, 2018).

Perspectives on leadership

Leadership began with a premise that was embedded in the leaders and not followers. Thus, studies on leadership commenced with the observation and appreciation of heroic leaders (Northouse, 2010). Further studies transitioned to the behaviours and attributes of leaders (Bass and Bass, 2009; Northouse, 2010). Similarly, other dimensions of leadership emerged which focused on the leadership process, leader- follower exchange and influence; however, vision is currently at the core of leadership (Northouse, 2010). The existence of leadership void has led to the need for individuals with vision who can create a sense of purpose and direction for the followers. In attempt to harmonise extant leadership theories, Aksel's (2008) approach to the evolution of leadership theories, illustrates several leadership perspectives. These perspectives are divided into three main eras' which are the Great man, traditional and modern perspectives respectively. The traditional and modern perspectives are further subdivided to capture the diversity of the emergent leadership theories.

Great Man perspective

An early enthusiasm for the concept of leadership can be traced to the Great man theory developed by Carlyle in 1840. This theory suggests that greatness was a symbol for leadership (Perruci and McManus, 2012). It was based on the perspective that leadership was intuitive, with great men such as Julius Caesar and Napoleon reinforcing this perspective (Northouse, 2010; Pierce and Newstrom, 2003). However, this theory did not consider the role of leadership in business as context was not appraised in any sense. Secondly, Harrison (2018) suggests that this perspective on leadership did not consider gender as the name great man did not recognise the contribution of great women. In this vein, leadership is perceived as synonymous to masculinity (Spector, 2016). Nonetheless, a limitation of this theory assumes that leadership is only vested in an individual, which is contrary to Hambrick's (1987) view that leadership may be provided by a group of people.

Traditional leadership perspectives

The traditional leadership perspectives are further subdivided into three categories namely: trait theory, behavioural theory, situational and contingency theories respectively. These theories are discussed under the respective headings:

Trait theory: The trait theory emerged from the limitations of the Great man theory. It developed to become a prevalent and influential theory in the nineties (Stogdill, 1948; 1974). This perspective captured the traits of great leaders by proposing an endless list of traits (McClelland, 1961; Bass and Bass, 2009; Northouse, 2010). The perspective proved relevant as it captured the core attributes essential for existing and successful leadership. However, the multiplicity of traits proved to be limiting and confusing, raising concerns over the importance of specific attributes (Germain, 2012). Scholars have demanded a definite list of traits which can be explored by potential leaders (Clark and Harrison, 2018). Hence, the trait theory failed to describe the role of leadership in fostering firm coherence (Harrison, 2018). Furthermore, the possession of some of these traits does not make you a leader, as social contexts of leadership suggests that traits may be socially constructed (Northouse, 2010; Gill, 2011).

Behavioural theory: The behavioural theory turned attention to the social context by focusing on the actions of leaders. Specifically, Blake and Mouton's (1964) influential model laid the foundations for the understanding of this approach as it appraised leadership adequacy from the task and people perspective (Harrison, 2018). Other notable contributions include Lewin *et al.*'s (1939) leadership styles, while McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Theory Y

draws attention to various managerial leadership styles. In the light of earlier constraints of the great man and trait theories, which were predictive and similarly did not enhance leadership, the behavioural theory is recognised to promote the imitability of leadership actions (Clark and Harrison, 2018). This provides empirical evidence for leadership in relation to their actions. Indeed, the development of managerial grid by Blake and Mouton (1964) has proven to be an invaluable tool in current leadership trainings. However, the model failed to recognise contextual influences (Northouse, 2010; Gill, 2011) which has led to inconsistent results during adoption and application.

Situational and contingency theory: It has been argued that the situational theory proposed by Fiedler (1978) and updated by Blanchard et al. (1993), assumes that there is no best kind of leadership. Scholars have since validated this view by suggesting that in practice, the situation determines the most effective style of leadership to be adopted (Northouse, 2010). This theory recognised the demands made on leadership based on the nature of group structure, tasks and other facets of the situation. It observes leaders in different circumstances, taking the most essential position in relation to context. Fiedler's (1965) measurement tool called the least preferred worker (LPC) scale proves to be an invaluable tool used to measure leadership style, though followers are excluded from this measurement process. However, the results from the application of the tool is plagued with inconsistencies (Yukl, 2010) as it is further suggested that the LPC tool in itself is yet to be validated. At the same time, the contingency theory emphasises the importance of situation in leadership behaviour. This theory proposes that you need to get a leader whose style fits the situation. They both agree (Fiedler, 1978; Blanchard et al., 1993) that the situation determines the leadership style.

Modern leadership perspectives

The modern leadership perspectives are further subdivided into two categories namely post – heroic and modern theories. These two categories of theories are further subdivided and are discussed accordingly:

Post-heroic theories: The proliferation of failed leadership from high profile scandals led to the demand for ethical leadership (Perruci and McManus, 2012). This led to the evolution of several theories which promoted accountability, fairness and inclusion (Alimo-Metcalfe, 2013). An example of a post-heroic theory is the authentic leadership theory.

Authentic leadership theory: This perspective is focused on integrity and ethics in leadership (Avolio and Gardner, 2005). The theory evolved from the limitations of transformational leadership which recognised the manipulative capability of leaders (Howell and Avolio, 1992). Though the theory is still at the early formative stage, it is acknowledged to be underpinned by ethics (Caza and Jackson, 2011). The theory identifies essential attributes of authentic leaders which include self-knowledge and discipline (Harrison, 2018). It also focuses on the leader, who is plagued with the entire responsibility of a successful outcome in the leadership process (Eagly, 2005). Nonetheless, it does not explain how these outcomes will be achieved. As an emerging theory, there is a lack of empirical evidence to validate these impressions of authenticity which suggests self-awareness, but the comparable behaviour is seen as inconsistent (Kernis, 2003). Furthermore, as Eagly (2005) argues that this perceived authenticity of the leader must be validated by the followers, only then can it produce positive results thus reiterating its two-dimensional nature.

Modern theories: These are emergent theories, which are focused on solving organisational challenges and driving business success. They developed in direct response to organisational needs that required new kinds of leadership. Examples of modern theories is the transformational leadership theory and skill theory.

Transformational leadership theory: In the early 1980s' the focus of leadership changed due to the turbulence faced by organisations. This led to the development of transformational leadership, a theory which focused on leading change effectively within organisations (Northouse, 2010; Harrison, 2018). This theory assesses how leaders inspire followers to attain organisational goals despite self-interests (Bass, 1985; Diaz-Saenz, 2011).

More importantly, scholars have attempted to redefine transformational leadership by including vision (Kouzes and Posner, 2002). However, there is lack of empirical evidence to reflect relevance in organisational performance (Dionne *et al.*, 2004) as some studies argue that transformational leaders may lack ethics, thus followers can be manipulated in achieving organisational objectives. Furthermore, another limitation of this theory is that it is solely focused on the leader excluding other variables which are critical elements of success such as the followers and the context (Diaz-Saenz, 2011).

Skill theory: An attempt to understand the acquisition of specific skills and competencies led to the emergence of the skill perspective. Leadership traits as opposed to skills perspective has been at the heart of leadership research for over 100 years though only recently is skill receiving more attention (Yammarino, 2000). This broader approach according to Katz (1955, 1974) suggests that although leadership skill is acquisition driven, it is however

underpinned by the trait perspective (Northouse, 2010). Therefore Northouse (2010) asserts that skills are required to succeed in leadership roles. In this vein, skill is synonymous to competence, as skills support learning and development. Hereafter, a plethora of skills emerged and are grouped together into three main categories, administrative, interpersonal and conceptual skills (Katz, 1974; Yukl, 2010). This theory is however, plagued with inconsistencies in distinguishing traits from skills as a key component of Mumford's *et al.* (2000a, 2000b) study is still based on traits and more importantly most of these skills emerged from a military context (Mumford *et al.*, 2000a, 2000b; Northouse, 2010).

From the above, it is evident that the study of leadership is dynamic and continuous. The definitions and conceptualisations will remain as researchers gain additional insights on this field. Fiedler (1996) lends his voice to this argument by suggesting that a critical lesson over the past 40 years is, that leadership is a complex interaction between an individual, social environment and the specific tasks to be achieved (Pierce and Newstrom, 2003). This view suggests that as interactions between leaders and followers evolve, the study of leadership will evolve in parallel. The following section will examine entrepreneurship theories in detail.

Perspectives on entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurs cut across all sectors of business and social life as they offer multiple possibilities to situations. Thus, the differing aspects to the study of entrepreneurship (Peverelli and Song, 2012). This reiterates the suggestion that, it is interdisciplinary, therefore several perspectives will increase one's understanding of the field (Sarasvathy, 2004). Equally, the uncertain, dynamic and evolving conditions that entrepreneurs operate in, require further exploration to aid understanding of specific contexts. Therefore, the human experience of entrepreneurship is essential in developing additional insights. It transcends whether you are an entrepreneur or not based on qualities to a deliberation of the extent or degree to which an individual responds in an entrepreneurial environment (Dees, 2001).

It is perhaps worth emphasising, that there exists an overlap of the conceptual meaning of entrepreneurship and the entrepreneurship process. This overlap lends support in the understanding of the concept further as the process consist of the entrepreneur, opportunities, identification, innovation and exploitation. Against this background, Clark and Harrison (2019) have adopted a holistic model, that combines Cunningham and Lischeron's (1991) six schools of entrepreneurship, underpinned by the diverse characteristics of the entrepreneur; Miller's (2007) three entrepreneurial processes (opportunity recognition, discovery, creation); and Bygrave and Hofer's (1991) description of the entrepreneurial

process of creating opportunities in new and existing organisations. Indeed, consistent with Clark and Harrison (2019) model and synthesis of these perspectives, the next section examines the five schools of entrepreneurship, given its strong links with the intent of the paper.

Schools of entrepreneurship

The five schools of entrepreneurship described below include 'Great Person' school, the psychological school, the classic school, the intrapreneurship school and the leadership school (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991). It should be noted, however that this perspective, neglects the motivation for entrepreneurship (Clark and Harrison, 2019). The schools are discussed below:

The 'Great Person' school: The great person theory assumes the attributes of the entrepreneur are inherent, giving the basis for such referral and association (Wickman, 2006). This thematic notion is similar to the great man theory in leadership, which suggests that leaders are born (King, 1990). However, the great person theory of entrepreneurship expands the scope to include intuition (Baran and Velickaite, 2008) also called the sixth sense. Koh (1996) recognises other key qualities such as vigor and persistence for entrepreneurship. In the same vein, the theory suggests entrepreneurs have inherent entrepreneurial attributes. While this seems plausible, it is argued that the theory fails to consider the negative traits associated with entrepreneurship (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991). A fundamental criticism is the lack of empirical evidence to the contribution of attributes to entrepreneurial success (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991).

The psychological school: The psychological theory argues that entrepreneurial behaviour is based on traits that are assumed to be innate (McClelland, 1961; Carland *et al.*, 1984). The theory addresses the mental and emotional factors that influence the entrepreneurial individual. The core of this approach is the possession of inherent traits by the individual entrepreneur, which sustain entrepreneurial activities (Van Praag, 1999). These traits are seemingly unique to the personality and are non-transferrable though capable of development in early life (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991). Interestingly, McClelland (1961) further suggests that five characteristics which include (1) risk taking and decisiveness; (2) energy and innovation; (3) responsibility; (4) knowledge and (5) planning and organisational skills are associated with the entrepreneurial role (Clark and Harrison, 2019). However, the veracity of these attributes is contested (Brockhaus, 1987; Carter 2006). For instance, Brockhaus (1987) argues that risk taking is an inherent attribute, as managers are also inclined to risk taking.

The classical school: This heart of the classical theory is innovation (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991; Van Praag, 1999) and underpinned by exploitation of opportunity. However, it is an emergent association to the entrepreneurship field as noted by Clark and Harrison (2019) and it requires further exploration. According to Cunningham and Lischeron (1991), entrepreneurial attributes are associated with three main concepts; creativity, discovery and innovation. These broadens the initial suggestions of Schumpeter (1949) that focuses on creative destruction through innovation consequently neglecting the managerial capabilities of the entrepreneur (Carlsson *et al.*, 2013). Furthermore, there are deliberations on the Schumpeter's (1949) assertion that the capacity to create opportunity by the entrepreneur does not take into cognisance the fluidity of the market, hence neglecting market preparedness and direction (Carter, 2006). This in turn casts a shadow on the proposition of the lone entrepreneur with innovative abilities that engages in new enterprises as envisioned by Schumpeter (1949). A notable criticism of this school is the recognition that entrepreneurs engage in new organisations and existing enterprises.

The intrapreneurial school: Intrapreneurship theory describes the entrepreneurial experience within an organisation. This is relevant as researchers argue that entrepreneurship is not limited to new organisations (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000). The theory evaluates change agents within existing organisations often called the intrapreneurs (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2003). These intrapreneurs drive and grow the competitive advantage of the organisations based on opportunity recognition and their subsequent actions (Baruah and Ward 2015). Miller (2007) identifies a core difference in context of the entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial environment, which is the element of risk. Furthermore, it is argued that risk is controlled in this environment compared to the recognition and exploitation of opportunities in the entrepreneurial process. In line with this observation, Ireland *et al.* (2003) argues for its relevance in large organisations. A limitation of this approach is the lack of recognition of differences in organisational sizes and which impacts the sphere of influence of the intrapreneurs (Clark and Harrison, 2019).

The leadership school: The thrust of this perspective is built on the capacity of the entrepreneur to motivate and create value through leadership (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991; Metcalfe, 2006). Leadership is considered as one of the competencies of an entrepreneur, though ambiguous due to the complexities and interdependence of both fields (Ensley *et al.*, 2000). The school is focused on the lone entrepreneur often referred to as the lead entrepreneur. This lead entrepreneur is plagued with the responsibility of creating the vision and inspiring the team to action. An important aspect of this perspective is the identification of characteristics of an entrepreneur which include drive, skill, confidence etc. (Ensley *et al.*, 2000). The forms of leadership within this perspective include transformational

and entrepreneurial leadership based on core themes of vision and followership (King, 1990). This school argues that entrepreneurs employ the transformational leadership approach, which impacts the performance of the organisation (Mumford and Fried, 2014). Cunningham and Lischeron's (1991) however argues that other leadership models be adopted to expand the scope of this school. Thus, recognising the diverse followership expectation and requirements (Gartner *et al.*, 1992).

Evolution path of leadership and entrepreneurship

A careful consideration of the theories of leadership and entrepreneurship shows a similar trajectory on that path of evolution. In the first instance, leadership field advanced the great man theory while the entrepreneurship field similarly advanced from the great person school. These separate theories share a basic tenet, which is the assumption that leadership and entrepreneurship capabilities are innate (Cunningham and Lischeron 1991). These theories though different in nature and from separate fields, are imbedded in the assertion that these leaders and entrepreneurs are born with these capabilities. Table 1 illustrates these similarities in evolution.

Insert Table 1

The evolution path of these two-independent field of studies seem to evolve in similar directions. Though leadership literature is wider and applicable to almost every facet of life, the entrepreneur only exists and functions within the entrepreneurial environment. Thus lending precision to the argument that leadership within the entrepreneurial environment is a variant form of leadership style termed entrepreneurial leadership.

Entrepreneurial leadership: the integration of entrepreneurship and leadership

This paper is rooted in the convergence perspective of entrepreneurship and leadership proposed by Fernald *et al.* (2005). The positive integration between the two fields led to the emergence of entrepreneurial leadership. The nature of entrepreneurial leadership in itself suggests a close interaction between the fields of entrepreneurship and leadership. In a similar vein, Cogliser and Brigham (2004) suggests there is an overlap between the two fields, which lend further support to the suggestion that entrepreneurial leadership emerged

from a positive integration of both fields. Thus Vecchio's (2003) description of entrepreneurship as a kind of leadership, in a narrower context.

Entrepreneurial leadership is distinct as it highlights the importance of managing challenges and opportunities within an entrepreneurial environment (Bagheri *et al.*, 2013). There are several definitions of entrepreneurial leadership, yet it lacks a consensual definition (Fernald *et al.* 2005). These definitions have explored the concept from diverse perspectives, emphasising key components and success factors. For example, Gupta *et al.* (2004) defines entrepreneurial leadership as leadership that creates visionary perspectives, which inspire followers to committed action in the creation of a preferred future.

To date, entrepreneurial leadership has been appraised from diverse perspectives but with emphasis on what the entrepreneur does, how these tasks are performed and the competencies that support successful outcomes (Renko *et al.*, 2015). Harrison (2018) defines entrepreneurial leadership as a kind of leadership that recognises and exploits opportunities within the entrepreneurial context. Given the contextual elements in the definition, Harrison *et al.*, (2016a) argues that entrepreneurial leadership is a dynamic concept which supports the exploration of leadership activities and functions within the entrepreneurial environment. This suggest that entrepreneurial leadership styles vary within contexts which supports extant leadership literature.

The psychological and behavioural profile of entrepreneurial leaders

The entrepreneurial leadership literature has placed a great deal of attention on identifying the characteristics and attributes that are essential to entrepreneurial leaders (Gupta *et al.*, 2004; Karanian, 2007). This has led to the identification of a plethora of competencies. For instance, Karanian (2007) proposes five core attributes which include connection, imagination, family and cultural background, an expectation for confrontation, and a unique gift of character. Similarly, scholars have made several attempts to categorise attributes in terms of importance to business performance for instance, several studies have identified risk taking as a critical attribute for an entrepreneurial leader. Bagheri and Pihie (2009) appraises entrepreneurial leadership based on the creativity, risk-taking and innovation of students. Risk taking is also recognised by Lippitt (1987) as one of the essential characteristics of an entrepreneurial leader and suggests entrepreneurial leaders should take minimal risks. However, scholars are yet to agree on the appropriate level of risk that stimulates creativity and drives business performance (Vecchio, 2003).

Entrepreneurial leadership skills

The literature on entrepreneurial leadership has expanded its focus from the attributes of leaders to the skills which have the capacity to be developed (Freeman, 2014). Thus, affirming that entrepreneurial leaders are unique and require relevant attributes, skills and competencies to exploit opportunities and manage challenges concurrently (Harrison *et al.*, 2018). Lippitt (1987) initiated studies into this perspective by recognising six characteristics of an entrepreneurial leader namely, risk taking, divergent thinking, sharp focus, personal responsibility, economic orientation, and learning from experience. Given the strong links to the trait perspective in leadership literature, Harrison *et al.* (2016b) suggests that this approach is widely criticised.

Paradoxically, though the literature on entrepreneurial leadership skill is sparse, the skill perspective is well established in leadership literature. Studies have drawn inspiration from Katz skill-based model for empirical studies within the field of entrepreneurial leadership (Harrison *et al.*, 2018). This skill-based model proposed by Katz is a universally accepted framework further developed by Yukl (2010). Furthermore, Katz (1955; 1974) argues in favour of three core skills; technical, human, and conceptual which he suggested are essential for leadership. The prevalence of the adoption of this framework to entrepreneurial leadership skills reiterates its relevance to the field of entrepreneurial leadership. For instance, Harrison *et al.* (2018) adopts the framework for their study and identifies a new skill set namely opportunity identification, opportunity exploitation, and risk management. Thus, reiterating its embeddedness within the field of leadership.

Conclusion

The significance of leadership in organisational effectiveness has broadened over the years. Interestingly, research has supported the premise that the success of businesses is underpinned largely by the kind of leadership adopted by the entrepreneur or manager. Given the strong links between entrepreneurship and leadership, entrepreneurial leadership is examined as a convergence of the two fields (Cogliser and Brigham, 2004). The nature of entrepreneurial leadership in itself suggests a close interaction between the domains of entrepreneurship and leadership. Entrepreneurial leadership emerged as a paradigm, from the convergence of leadership and entrepreneurship (Fernald *et al.*, 2005). Although, these two fields have been subjects of research over decades, they remain elusive concepts (Stogdill, 1974; Harrison, 2018). To date, academic interest has increased in the concept of entrepreneurial leadership as an approach for gaining sustainable competitive advantage (Mgeni, 2015). This is due to its importance in the growth of enterprises.

Arguably, it has been demonstrated that entrepreneurial leaders identify opportunities, manage failures and exploit limited resources in the pursuit of success (Renko *et al.*, 2015). Thus, it is a recognised leadership approach geared towards achieving strategic value creation (Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2003). However, despite the increased attention, most of the studies on entrepreneurial leadership demand further insights (Harrison, 2018). To date, entrepreneurial leadership has been appraised from diverse perspectives but with emphasis on what the entrepreneur does, how these tasks are performed and the competencies that support successful outcomes (Renko *et al.*, 2015). Harrison *et al.*, (2016a) argue that entrepreneurial leadership is a dynamic concept, which supports the exploration of leadership activities and functions within the entrepreneurial environment. In conclusion, this paper recognises the positive interaction between leadership and entrepreneurship. Therefore, advocates for an integration of both fields to advance the domain of entrepreneurial leadership.

References

- Acs, Z. J. and Szerb, L. (2007), "Entrepreneurship, economic growth and public policy", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 28 No. 2-3. pp. 109 -122.
- Aksel, I. (2008), "Leadership theories", in Serinkan, C. (Ed.), *Leadership and Motivation*, Nobel Academic Publishing, Ankara, pp. 33-61.
- Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (2013), "A critical review of leadership theory", in *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Leadership, Change, and Organizational Development*, John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, UK:, Ltd, pp.15-47.
- Alvesson, M. and Sveningsson, S. (2003), "The great disappearing act: difficulties in doing "leadership", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.14 No.3, pp. 359 -381.
- Antoncic, B. and Hisrich, R. D. (2003), "Clarifying the intrapreneurship concept", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 7-24.
- Avolio, B. J. and Gardner, W. L. (2005), "Authentic leadership development: getting to the root of positive forms of leadership", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.16 No.3, pp. 315-338.
- Bagheri, A. and Pihie, Z. A. L. (2009), "An exploratory study of entrepreneurial leadership development of university students", *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 177-190.
- Bagheri, A., Lope Pihie, Z. A. and Krauss, S. E. (2013), "Entrepreneurial leadership competencies among Malaysian university student entrepreneurial leaders", *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 493-508.

Baran, D. and Velickaite, R. (2008), "Building the theoretical framework of entrepreneurship" In *5th International Scientific Conference/Business and Management*, Faculty of Business Management, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Lithuania.

Barker, C. (2002), *The Heart and Soul of Leadership*, McGraw-Hill, Australia.

Baruah, B. and Ward, A. (2015), "Metamorphosis of intrapreneurship as an effective organizational strategy", *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, Vol.11 No. 4, pp.811-822.

Bass, B. M. (1985), *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, Free Press, New York.

Bass, B. M. and Bass, R. (2009), *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, 4th ed. Simon and Schuster, New York.

Baumol, W. J. and Strom, R. J. (2007), "Entrepreneurship and economic growth", *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol. 1 No.3-4, pp. 233-237.

Becherer, R. C., Haynes, P. J. and Helms, M. M. (2008), "An exploratory investigation of entrepreneurial marketing in SMEs: The influence of the owner/operator", *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 44-63

Beck, T. and Cull, R. (2014), "SME finance in Africa", *Journal of African Economies*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 583-613.

Binks, M. and Vale, P. A. (1990), *Entrepreneurship and Economic Change*, McGraw-Hill, London.

Blake, R. and Mouton, J. (1964), *The Managerial Grid: The Key to Leadership Excellence*, Gulf Publishing, Houston.

Blanchard, K. H., Zigarmi, D. and Nelson, R. B. (1993), "Situational leadership after 25 years: a retrospective", *Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 21-36.

Brockhaus, R. H. (1987), "Entrepreneurial folklore", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 1-6.

Carland, J. W., Hoy, F., Boulton, W. R. and Carland, J. A. C. (2007), "Differentiating entrepreneurs from small business owners: a conceptualization", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 354-359.

Carlsson, B., Braunerhjelm, P., McKelvey, M., Olofsson, C., Persson, L. and Ylinenpää, H. (2013), "The evolving domain of entrepreneurship research", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 913-930.

Carter, M. (2006), "Entrepreneurship and marketing", in Casson, M. Yeung, B. Basu, A. and Wadeson, N. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 114-137

Caza, A., and Jackson, B. (2011), "Authentic leadership", in Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*, Sage, London, pp. 352-364.

Ciulla, J.B. (1995), "Leadership ethics: mapping the territory", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 5-28.

Clark, K. E. and Clark, M. B. (1996), *Choosing to Lead*, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, North Carolina.

Clark, C. and Harrison, C. (2018) "Leadership: the complexities and state of the field". *European Business Review*, Vol. 30 No. 5, pp. 514- 528

Clark, C. and Harrison, C. (2019) "Entrepreneurship: an assimilated multi-perspective review". *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 43-71

Cogliser, C. C. and Brigham, K. H. (2004), "The intersection of leadership and entrepreneurship: mutual lessons to be learned", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 15 No 6, pp. 771-799.

Cunningham, J. B., and Lischeron. J. (1991), "Defining entrepreneurship." *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 29 No.1, pp. 45–61.

Dees, J. G. (2007), "Taking social enterprise seriously", *Society*, Vol. 44 No. 3, pp. 24–31.

Diaz-Saenz, H. R. (2011), "Transformational leadership. in Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*, Sage, London pp. 299–310.

Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Atwater, L. E. and Spangler, W. D. (2004), "Transformational leadership and team performance", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 17 No.2, pp.177–193.

Douglas, E.J. and Shepherd, D.A. (2002), "Self-employment as a career choice: attitudes, entrepreneurial intentions, and utility maximization", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 81-90.

Doyles, P. (1992), *Management of Small Scale Business*, McGraw Hill, New York.

Drucker, P. F. (1985), "Entrepreneurial strategies", *California Management Review*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 9-25.

Eagly, A. H. (2005), "Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: does gender matter?" *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 16 No.3, pp. 459–474.

Ensley, M. D., Carland, J. W. and Carland, J. C. (2000), "Investigating the existence of the lead entrepreneur", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 59–77.

Fernald, L. W Jr., Solomon, G. T. and Tarabishy, A. (2005), "A new paradigm: entrepreneurial leadership", *Southern Business Review*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 1-10.

Fiedler, F. E. (1978), "The contingency model and the dynamics of the leadership process", in Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), *Advances in the Experimental Social Psychology*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 59–112.

Fiedler, F. E. (1965), "A contingency model of leadership effectiveness", in Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), *Advances in the Experimental Social Psychology*, Academic Press, New York, pp. 149–190.

Fiedler, F.E. (1996), "Research on leadership selection and training: one view of the future", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 41 No. 1996, pp. 241-250.

Freeman, D. (2014), "Entrepreneurial leadership across contexts: unique challenges and skills", *Journal of Leadership studies*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 40-41.

Gardner, J. W. (1990), *On Leadership*, Free Press, New York.

Gartner, W. B. (2001), "Is there an elephant in entrepreneurship? Blind assumptions in theory development", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 25 No.4, pp. 27–39.

Gartner, W. B., Bird, B. J. and Starr, J. A. (1992), "Acting as If: differentiating entrepreneurial from organisational behaviour", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* Vol.16 No.3, pp. 13–31.

Germain, M. L. (2012), "Traits and skills theories as the nexus between leadership and expertise: reality or fallacy? *Performance Improvement*, Vol. 51 No. 5, pp. 32-39.

Gill, R. (2011), *Theory and Practice of Leadership*, 2nd ed., Sage, London.

Gupta, V., MacMillan, I. C. and Surie, G. (2004), "Entrepreneurial leadership: developing and measuring a cross-cultural construct", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 241–260.

Hambrick, D.C. (1987), "The top management team: key to strategic success", *California Management Review*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 88-108.

Harrison, C., Paul, S. and Burnard, K. (2016a), "Entrepreneurial leadership: a systematic literature review", *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 14 No.2, pp. 235-264.

Harrison, C., Paul, S. and Burnard, K. (2016b), "Entrepreneurial leadership in retail pharmacy: developing economy perspective", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp.150 -167.

Harrison, C. (2018), *Leadership Theory and Research: A Critical Approach to New and Existing Paradigms*, Palgrave MacMillan, Switzerland.

Howell, J. M., and Avolio, B. J. (1992), "The ethics of charismatic leadership: submission or liberation?" *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 43–54.

Ireland, R. D., Hitt, M. A. and Simon, D. G. (2003). "A model of strategic entrepreneurship: the construct and its dimensions", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 29 No. 6, pp. 963–989.

Karanian, B. (2007), "Entrepreneurial leadership: a balancing act in engineering and science", *American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE), AC 2007-2804: Entrepreneurial Leadership and Transformational Change Global Colloquia*, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Katz, R. L. (1955), "Skills of an effective administrator", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 33-42.

Katz, R. L. (1974), "Skills of an effective administrator", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 52 No. 5, pp. 90–102.

Kernis, M. H. (2003), "Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem", *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol.14 No.1, pp.1–26.

King, A. S. (1990), "Evolution of leadership", *Vikalpa*, Vol. 15 No.2, pp. 43–54.

Koh, H. C. (1996), "Testing hypotheses of entrepreneurial characteristics. a study of Hong Kong MBA students", *Journal of Managerial Psychology* , Vol. 11 No. 3, pp.12–25.

- Kouzes, J. M. and Posner, B. Z. (2002), *The Leadership Challenge*, 3rd ed., Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Lewin, K., Lippert, R. and White, R. K. (1939), "Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates", *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 271–301.
- Lippitt, G. L. (1987), "Entrepreneurial leadership: a performing art", *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, Vol. 21 No.3, pp. 264 -270.
- Lussier, R. N. and Achua, C. F. (2001), *Leadership: Theory, Application and Skill Development*, South Western College Publishing, Thomson learning, Ohio.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961), *The Achieving Society*, The Free Press, New York.
- McGregor, D. (1960), "Theory X and theory Y", *Organization Theory* Vol. 1. No. 358 pp. 374.
- Metcalfe, J. S. (2006), "Entrepreneurship: an evolutionary perspective" in Casson, M. Yeung, B. Basu, A. and Wadeson, N. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 91–113.
- Mgeni, T. O. (2015), "Impact of entrepreneurial leadership style on business performance of SMEs in Tanzania", *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Organisation Management*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 1-9.
- Miller, K. D. (2007), "Risk and Rationality in Entrepreneurial Processes." *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol.1 No. 1–2, pp. 57–74.
- Morris, M. H., Kuratko, D. F., Schindehutte, M. and Spivack, A. J. (2011), "Framing the entrepreneurial experience", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 11-40.
- Mumford, M.D. and Fried, Y. (2014), "Give them what they want or give them what they need? Ideology in the study of leadership", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol 35 No. 5, pp. 622-634.
- Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Harding, F. D., Jacobs, T. O. and Fleishman, E. A. (2000a), "Leadership skills for a changing world solving complex social problems", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp.11–35.
- Mumford, M. D., Marks, M. A., Connelly, M. S., Zaccaro, S. J., and Palmon, R. (2000b), "Development of leadership skills: Experience and timing", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.11 No. 1, pp. 87–114.
- Northouse, P. G. (2010), *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 5th ed., Sage Publications, Los Angeles, CA.
- Perruci, G. and McManus, R. M. (2012), "The state of leadership studies", *Journal of Leadership Studies*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 49-54.
- Peverelli, P.J. and Song, J. (2012), *Chinese Entrepreneurship: A Social Capital Approach*. Springer, London.
- Pierce, J. L. and Newstrom, J. W. (2003), *Leaders and the Leadership Process*, McGraw-Hill, Irwin.

Renko, M., El Tarabishy, A., Carsrud, A.L. and Brännback, M. (2015), "Understanding and measuring entrepreneurial leadership", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 53 No. 1, pp. 54-74.

Rost, J. C. (1993), *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*, Praeger, New York.

Roomi, M. A. and Harrison, C. (2011), "Entrepreneurial leadership: What is it & how should it be taught?" *International Review of Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 1-44.

Sarasvathy, S. D. (2004), "Making it happen: beyond theories of the firm to theories of firm design", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 28 No. 6, pp. 519-531.

Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S. (2000), "The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 217-226.

Spector, B. (2016), *Discourse on Leadership: A Critical Appraisal*, University Press, Cambridge.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948), "Personal factors associated with leadership: a survey of the literature", *Journal of Psychology*. Vol. 25, pp. 35-71.

Stogdill, R.M. (1974), *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*, Free Press, New York.

Van Praag, C. M. (1999), "Some classic views on entrepreneurship", *De Economist* Vol. 147 No. 3, pp. 311– 335.

Vecchio. R. P. (2003), "Entrepreneurship and leadership: common trends and common threads", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 303–327.

Wickman, P. A. (2006), *Strategic Entrepreneurship*, 4th ed., Pearson Education, Essex.

Yammarino, F. J. (2000), "Leadership skills: introduction and overview", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 5–9.

Yukl, G. (1999), "An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 10 No.2, pp. 285-305.

Yukl, G. (2010), *Leadership in Organisations*, 7th ed., Pearson Education Limited, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.