



# Information Technology and Quantitative Management (ITQM 2017)

## Entrepreneurial Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparative Study of Executives and Non-executives

Prachee Mishra<sup>a,\*</sup>, Rajnish Kumar Misra<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Visiting Faculty, JIIT, A-10 Sector 62, Noida-201309, India

<sup>b</sup>Professor, Jaypee Business School, JIIT University, A-10, Sector 62, Noida, 201309, India

---

### Abstract

The present study focuses upon identifying the determinant of organizational effectiveness with focus on the emerging concept of entrepreneurial leadership. It was hypothesized that executives and non-executives would differ significantly with each other on the variables under study. There would be a significant positive contribution of attributes of entrepreneurial leadership on organizational effectiveness irrespective of organizations' typology. The sample of 410 respondents from both public and private organizations working in the manufacturing sector in India participated in the study. The findings of the study reveal that executives and non-executives of both organizations differ significantly on directed discovery, creative integration of networks and arena building. The quantum of difference in employees of private organizations was low. The findings are important to design interventions on entrepreneurial leadership attributes for enhancing organizational effectiveness.

© 2017 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V.

Peer-review under responsibility of the scientific committee of the 5th International Conference on Information Technology and Quantitative Management, ITQM 2017.

*Keywords:* Organizational effectiveness, Entrepreneurial leadership, Directed discovery, Arena building, Creative integration of networks;

---

### 1. Introduction

The emergence of globalization and liberalization has led to changes in the functioning of various organizations. It has not only led to severe competition among organizations rather it has made the organization's life span shorter. In order to prolong their existence the organizations need to adopt innovations in their work practices to make their processes efficient and effective in the future. These innovations have also led to the growth of newer areas of knowledge management, and information technology management as a tool to succeed and survive. In this context, the role of leaders is critical for success of any organization.

In the changed business scenario where organizations are required to compete globally, benchmarking of

---

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +91-9560206627;

E-mail address: [mprachee@yahoo.co.in](mailto:mprachee@yahoo.co.in)

organizational practices has also become vital. Organizational survival requires not only meeting but also setting global standards. Organizations, therefore have to react fast to learn from their experiences and aim towards achieving world - class excellence through constant learning and innovation. The above business environment challenge propels us to understand the criteria of organizational success and excellence.

## 2. Literature Review - Organizational Effectiveness -

Previous researches conceptualized and measured success of organization in diverse ways. [1]. Cameron and Whetton (1983) posited that organizational effectiveness is a hypothetical abstraction existing in peoples' mind giving meaning to ideas and interpretations about organizational effectiveness. Although the concept of organizational effectiveness is characterized by lack of consensus in definition and its measurement, they are of the view that difference and disagreements over the definition and measurements are inevitable because of its mutable, complex and comprehensive nature. [2] They also emphasized the importance of organizational effectiveness in understanding and improving organizations. [2] While, Connolly, Colon and Deutsch (1980) concluded that organizational effectiveness was a purely theoretical concept. Hence, it cannot be measured. [3] [4] Similarly, Campbell (1977, 1983) also conceived organizational effectiveness as a construct that cannot be operationally define and measure. [5]

The concept of organizational effectiveness can be summarized under three criteria: a) Organizational flexibility b) Absence of intra - organizational strain and c) Productivity. These criteria can be generalized across all organizations (Geogopoulos and Tannenbaum, 1957). [6] While other researchers emphasized upon conflict, role ambiguity, human relations, leadership, role successors, member participation and evaluation as indices of organizational effectiveness.

As Smith (1976), proposed “hard” and “soft” criteria of organizational effectiveness. The hard criteria lies in the official records such as tardiness, production, job levels, and promotions, which are objectively measured. Whereas, soft criteria are obtained from ratings like – job involvement, organizational commitment, attachment, job satisfaction etc., which are largely subjective/ judgmental in nature. [7] The present study focuses upon the people perspective of organizational effectiveness as the degree to which organization scores high on job involvement, organizational commitment, organizational attachment, job satisfaction, consensus, legitimization, need for independence and self-control.

### 2.1 Determinants of Organizational Effectiveness

The people perspective (soft issues) conceptualizations of organizational effectiveness, is important to identify the factors influencing organizational effectiveness and innovation. Previous researches have studied organizational effectiveness and its relationship with other variables. These are employee engagement (Kataria, Rastogi and Garg, 2013); organizational culture (Schein, 1992; Klein et al., 2013), transformational leadership (Bass and Riggio, 2006, Gumusluoglu and Ilsev, 2009; Hsiao et al., 2009; Jung et al., 2003, 2008; Sarros et al., 2008). [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15]. Transformational leadership and culture (Deem et al., 2015; Shiva et al., 2012), visionary leadership (Taylor et al., 2014), supportive leadership (Oldham and Cummings, 1996), participative leadership (Tierney et al., 1999) are also important variables. [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] The present challenge for any organization to survive and compete in the end is to continuously innovate (Mokhber, 2016; Uzkurt et al., 2013). [21] [22] It is imperative to study, how leadership fosters effectiveness in people processes in the organization.

**Leadership Style:** Most of the leadership researches for the past several decades have defined leadership as the ability of the person to influence another group without using force towards the achievement of goals. The leadership studies began with Ohio and Michigan research in 1930's. In last two decades, typology of leadership evolved into transformational and later into visionary leadership. Avolio and Bass (1985) proposed Transformational leadership. According to them, this type of leadership style provides with individualized consideration for the developmental needs of the subordinates, change their awareness of issues by helping them to look at old problems in new ways, able to excite, arouse and inspire them to put extra effort to achieve organizational goals. [23] Similarly, Sashkin (1992) defined another type of leadership called visionary leadership as the ability to create and articulate a realistic, credible, attractive vision of the future of the organization that grows and improves the present state. [24]

Beginning of 21<sup>st</sup> century shifted its focus on entrepreneurial leadership (EL) with opening of world economy and ensuing challenges (Coglister and Bringham, 2004; Ireland, Hitt and Sirmon, 2003; Gupta, McMillan and Surie, 2004; Kuratko, 2007; Surie and Ashley, 2008; Roomi and Harrison, 2011; Greenberg, McKone-Sweet, and Wilson, 2011; Harrison et al., 2015; Leitch, McMullan and Harrison, 2014; Renko et al., 2015). [25] [26] [27] [28] [29] [30] [31] [32] [33] [34] [35] Research on EL began with Cunningham and Lischeron (1991) who posited that EL involves setting clear goals, creating opportunities, empowering people,

preserving organizational intimacy, and developing HR systems. [36] The GLOBE Project led by Robert House and Ian MacMillan focused their attention on the concept of entrepreneurship labelled it as Entrepreneurial leadership style. They defined EL as the extent to which the leaders depict the entrepreneurial attributes. These are directed discovery of opportunities; creative integration of the network of the people and resources; and rapid arena building for serving greatest possible interests, and in the process adds to both monetary (profitability), as well as non-monetary (actualization) benefits enjoyed by the organizational members (McGrath and Macmillan, 2000). [37]

According to McGrath and Macmillan (2000), the first dimension of EL is directed discovery, referred to, as plotting a direction into the uncertain future and redirecting as reality unfolds. It facilitates in capturing the fleeting opportunities based on the sketchy information. This attribute is measured with three elements as suggested by them, ‘framing’, which comprises of attributes like, performance orientation, intuition, ambition and decisiveness. The other important element in directed discovery is, ‘absorbing uncertainty’, which is measured through foresight, vision and confidence building. If it is not present in the leader, he/she will not be able to build confidence among people who have high concern for predictable work environment. Similarly, ‘underwriting’ as an element of directed discovery focuses on attributes of being convincing, diplomatic, effective bargaining, and being informed, and therefore, taking full responsibility for success or failure.

The second dimension of entrepreneurial leadership is creative integration, organizing and optimally utilizing human, as well as, non-human resources for achieving the targets / goals. This effort leads to reducing the temporal or spatial inefficiencies, thereby adding value to the organizations (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000). There are two basic elements to account for it. One is, ‘defining gravity’ that is based on the intellectual stimulation, enthusiasm, positive attitude, and integration. Hence, it is important to specify the real limiting constraints. [38] The other is ‘path clearing’, is like removing the roadblock from the way for success of their people through improvement orientation, encouragement and team orientation. [37]

The third dimension of entrepreneurial leadership is arena building wherein the leader has to focus on the new product development or searching new avenues for their organization. This has been emphasized by Schumpeter (1934) as innovative role of an entrepreneur in discovering new business opportunities. It is captured through self-reliance, risk taking and self-interest within the leader.

Later studies, explained EL where leader is good at identification of opportunities (Chen, 2007; Kuratko, 2007; risk taking beyond security (Kuratko, 2007); sustaining innovation and adaptation in high velocity and uncertain environment (Surie and Ashley, 2008). [39] [28] [29] While in some studies, capacity to communicate vision to engage teams to identify, develop and take advantage of opportunities (Roomi and Harrison, 2011); creating value for the organization (Greenberg, McKone-Sweet and Wilson, 2011); influencing and directing group performance to attain organizational goals through recognizing and exploring opportunities (Renko et al., 2015). [31] [34]

From the above perspectives on leadership attributes, it would be interesting to study the extent of prevalence of entrepreneurial leadership among select Indian organizations, and understanding its importance in predicting organizational effectiveness. The present study considers this concept appropriate in the business environment characterized by rapid change and uncertainty. This style may provide both a guide to energize the organizations to find tomorrow’s opportunities and a set of entrepreneurial attributes to transform themselves to compete with others.

### 2.1 The Goals of the present study

- a) To investigate whether any significant difference exists between the executives and non-executives of manufacturing industries with respect to entrepreneurial leadership style, and organizational effectiveness.
- b) To assess relationship between entrepreneurial leadership style and organizational effectiveness.

### 2.2 HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses were formulated:

- a) There would be significant difference between the executives and non-executives on their perception of entrepreneurial leadership style and organizational effectiveness.
- b) There would be a positive relationship between entrepreneurial leadership style and organizational effectiveness.

## 3. METHOD:

### 3.1 Sample Selection

Four hundred ten executives and non-executives from both public and private organizations in manufacturing sector in India were selected as respondents for the present study using stratified random

sampling technique.

### 3.2 Research Tools

For understanding, the variables under study following tools were used:

- a) Entrepreneurial leadership Style inventory (Gupta, Macmillan & Surie, 2004).
- b) Organizational effectiveness Inventory (Daftuar, 1985).

## 4. RESULTS

Table 1 shows the significant difference on various dimensions of entrepreneurial leadership style, work culture, empowerment, and organizational effectiveness between types of employees (executives and non-executives category) of public sector organizations at 0.05 levels of significance and below. The non – executives' scores were comparatively higher than executives were. They perceived higher degree of creative integration. Similarly, executives and non-executives differ only on their perception of existence of entrepreneurial leadership style in their superior.

Table 1: Comparison Of Mean and SD for Types of Employees of Public Sector organizations

Variables	Type of Employee	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t-test	df
Directed Discovery	Executive	135	58.0667	11.2696	-2.6533	-1.491	208
	Non-executive	75	60.7200	14.1130			
Creative Integration	Executive	135	39.6222	9.7918	-5.0978	-3.420**	208
	Non-executive	75	44.7200	11.2917			
Arena Building	Executive	135	17.6000	4.6716	.8400	1.138	208
	Non-executive	75	16.7600	5.8583			
Entrepreneurial Leadership	Executive	135	115.2889	21.5790	-6.9111	-2.047*	208
	Non-executive	75	122.2000	26.4983			
Organizational Effectiveness	Executive	132	165.6818	20.0257	.2818	.104	205
	Non-executive	75	165.4000	16.1329			

\*\* p <0.01; \* p <0.05

Table 2 shows the significant difference on organizational effectiveness between types of employees (executives and non-executives category) of private sector organizations at 0.05 levels of significance. The non - executives' scores were comparatively higher than executives. They perceived higher degree on entrepreneurial leadership of their superiors, whereas executives were high on perceiving organizational effectiveness.

Table 2: Comparison Of Mean and SD for Types of Employees of Private Sector organizations

	Type of Employee	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t-test	Df
Directed Discovery	Executive	127	61.4252	9.1135	-.2460	-.186	198
	Non-executive	73	61.6712	8.7592			
Creative Integration	Executive	127	44.1654	6.9279	-.6840	-.671	198
	Non-executive	73	44.8493	6.9715			
Arena Building	Executive	127	16.9843	4.7842	-.6459	-.893	198
	Non-executive	73	17.6301	5.1600			
Entrepreneurial Leadership	Executive	127	122.5748	16.4203	-1.5759	-.658	198
	Non-executive	73	124.1507	16.1122			
Organizational Effectiveness	Executive	127	165.5512	16.3827	5.7040	2.291*	197
	Non-executive	72	159.8472	17.7126			

\*\* p <0.01; \* p <0.05

Table 3 shows the significant difference on various dimensions of entrepreneurial leadership between public and private sector organizations at p<0.05 levels of significance and below. The private sector employees scored comparatively higher than the public sector employees on directed discovery and creative integration. They perceived higher degree of creative integration and discovering new and innovative thinking of their superiors. The private sector employees also perceive higher entrepreneurial leadership style in their superiors.

Table 3: Comparison Of Mean and SD on Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style for Both Public and Private Sector organizations

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	T	Df
Directed Discovery	Public	210	59.0143	12.3925	-2.5007	-2.331*	408
	Private	200	61.5150	8.9645			
Creative Integration	Public	210	41.4429	10.6119	-2.9721	-3.340**	408
	Private	200	44.4150	6.9342			
Arena Building	Public	210	17.3000	5.1290	.0800	.161	408
	Private	200	17.2200	4.9217			
Entrepreneurial Leadership	Public	210	117.7571	23.6259	-5.3929	-2.678*	408
	Private	200	123.1500	16.2857			

\*\* p <0.01; \* p <0.05

Table 4 shows that relationship between organizational effectiveness and dimensions of entrepreneurial leadership for both public and private sector organizations, are positively related with some dimensions of entrepreneurial leadership style which are significant at  $p < 0.01$ . Although arena building is slightly negatively related in both public ( $r = -0.012$ ) and private ( $r = -0.030$ ) sectors respectively.

Table 4: Correlation Coefficient of Organizational Effectiveness with Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Leadership For Public and Private Sector Organizations

S. No.		Public	Private
		Organizational Effectiveness	Organizational Effectiveness
1	Directed Discovery	.578**	.433**
2	Creative Integration	.484**	.375**
3	Arena Building	-.012	-.030
	Entrepreneurial Leadership	.516**	.389**
	N	207	199

\*\* p <0.01; \* p <0.05

## 5. DISCUSSION

### 5.1 Comparison of Types of Employees of Both Public and Private Sector Organizations

In public sector organization, executives and non-executives were found to differ significantly on various dimensions of entrepreneurial leadership style and organizational effectiveness. One of the reasons is, the non – executives are having higher score on perception of an entrepreneurial leadership attributes because they feel that their immediate bosses or departmental heads are competent than the executives who perceive their bosses as not that competent to deal with emerging challenges. The other reason is, the non – executives are looking in relation to small reference group, while executives may be looking at broader perspectives and horizon. Sometimes it also happens that if their subordinate's rate bosses as good, they may also be considered as good. Therefore, these differences become relative in nature. This is also true for other outcomes on the dimensions of entrepreneurial leadership like directed discovery and creative integration. The executives are feeling motivated and this motivation gets reflected in higher degree of creative integration leading to higher involvement of people in organizing available resources for the maximum advantage of the organization. The other feature of creative integration is mobilizing people and resources to create network of relationship as well as, helping people in achieving their goals (McGrath and MacMillan, 2000). [37] This may be true because of the introduction of total quality management concepts in these organizations where the role of every member becomes important specially the non-executives. This contradicts the beliefs of the executives that they will lose their power to the non-executives and will become just the rubber seal for various organizational activities.

Public and private sector organizations differ significantly on directed discovery and creative integration dimension of entrepreneurial leadership. These differences are emerging due to the differences in the perception of the employees of private sector organization who view their top management leaders always directed on identifying new ways and means to generate profitability and productivity along with the expanded customer base. This is not so in case of public sector organizations under study as they belong to heavy engineering category have identified customers and a focused market driven technology. The other reason that is attributable to this difference is concern for increased innovation and quality initiatives, with emphasis on reduction of costs. This is possible only if the leader has an entrepreneurial mindset. The present findings corroborates the past research by Gupta et al. (2004) that entrepreneurial leaders must operate in a highly unpredictable atmosphere in which competitive advantage may dissolve any time. [27]

One more aspect that needs to be highlighted here is organizational effectiveness. The perception of

organizational effectiveness among the executives and non – executives were found to differ significantly and executives scored higher than the non – executives. This finding can be explained from the strategy perspective. The executives perceive their organization as an excellent one in relation to other organization. However, the non-executives view their organization from internal perspective (focused within) because they find the organization is facing problems internally. The present study based on soft components, like, job satisfaction, job involvement, innovation etc; shows that the low scores for non-executives means they are not satisfied, involved, and committed as compared to executives.

### 5.2 Relationship between Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness

In public and private sector organizations, directed discovery and creative integration of networks were found to influence organizational effectiveness. As it has been emphasized, that directed discovery facilitates the managers in capturing the slightest opportunities in an unknown future. The relationship was also positive, increase in directed discovery and creative integration leads to enhance organizational effectiveness. McGrath and MacMillan (2000) are also of the view that highly directed discovery helps in reducing uncertainty about the future and prepares the organization for future challenges, thereby increasing performance orientation, intuition, ambition and decisiveness. [37]

Similarly, creative integration is positively related with organizational effectiveness for both public and private sector organizations. This implies that increase in creative integration would lead to organizational effectiveness. The findings symbolize the fact that entrepreneurial leaders have a high degree of creative integration, which helps them in integrating the interest and capabilities of people, and mobilizing their resources and energies for joint directed discovery. As McGrath and MacMillan (2000) had earlier proposed the concept of creative integration depends on two critical elements, defining gravity and clearing the path for sustaining the growth of entrepreneurial venture, by transforming other limits into the core advantages. [37] As suggested by Renko et al. (2015), Surie and Ashley (2014), and Gupta and Surie (2004), an entrepreneurial leader always seeks to identify new ways and means for making the organization perform well. [32] [29] [27] Therefore, prioritizing the opportunities and resources helps both people and organization continue to work synergistically towards meeting the mutual goals. These findings are in consonance with studies by Taylor, Cornelius and Colvin (2014); Rowold and Rohmann (2009); Rodsutti and Swierczek (2002) and Wang and Satow, (1994) that there is a positive relationship between dimensions of entrepreneurial leadership style and organizational effectiveness. [18] [40] [41] [42]

In nutshell, we can say that entrepreneurial leadership attributes must be present in the members of the top management to lead their organizations to do extremely well.

## 6. CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Based on the above findings, we conclude that organizational effectiveness depends upon entrepreneurial leadership attributes inherent in the work force. In future, this study should be extended to include other organizational variables like organizational citizenship behaviour, culture and structural issues more specifically in Indian context, where the business environment has changed overtime and core competence has become the order of the day. As this study focuses upon the cohort group comparison, it would have been appropriate to conduct longitudinal studies to understand the implications of changes in entrepreneurial leadership style and the way organizations excel.

## 8. REFERENCES

- [1] B.E.A. Oghojafor, F.I. Muo, and S.A. Aduloju, "Organisational Effectiveness: Whom and what do we believe?," *Advances in Management & Applied Economics*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 81-108, 2012.
- [2] K. Cameron and D.A. Whetton, *Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models*. NY: Academic Press, 1983.
- [3] P.S. Goodman, "Organizational effectiveness as a decision – making process," in *39th national meeting of the Academy of Management*, Atlanta, 1979.
- [4] T. Connolly, E.J. Colon, and S.J. Deustch, "Organizational effectiveness: a multiple constituency approach.," *Academy of Management Review* , vol. 5, pp. 211-217, 1980.
- [5] J. P. Campbell, "On the nature of organizational effectiveness.," in *New Perspectives on organizational effectiveness*, P.S. Goodman and J.M. Pennings, Eds. San Francisco: Jossey – Bass, 1977, pp. 13-55.
- [6] B.S. Georgopoulos and A.S. Tannenbaum, "A Study of organizational effectiveness," *American Sociological Review*, vol. 22, pp. 534-540, 1957.

- [7] P.C. Smith, "Behaviors, results and Organizational effectiveness: The problem of criteria," in *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, M.D. Dunnette, Ed. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, pp. 745-775.
- [8] A. Kataria, R. Rastogi, and P. Garg, "Organizational effectiveness as a function of employee engagement," *South Asian Journal of Management*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 56-73, Oct-Dec 2013.
- [9] E.H. Schein, *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.
- [10] M. B. Bass and E. G. Riggio, *Transformational Leadership*, 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2006.
- [11] Andrew S. Klein, Joseph Wallis, and Robert A. Cooke, "The impact of leadership styles on organizational culture and firm effectiveness: An empirical study," *Journal of Management & Organization*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 241-254, 2013.
- [12] Lale. L. Gumusluoglu and A. Ilsev, "Transformational leadership, creativity, and organizational innovation," *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 461-473, 2009.
- [13] Hsi-Chi Hsiao and Jen-Chia Chang, "The role of organizational learning in transformational leadership and organizational innovation," *Asia Pacific Educational Review*, vol. 12, pp. 621–631.
- [14] DI Jung, C Chow, and A. W u, "The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation:Hypotheses and some preliminary findings," *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 14, pp. 525-544, 2003.
- [15] J.C. Sarros, B.K. Cooper, and J.C. Santora, "Building a Climate for Innovation Through Transformational Leadership and Organizational culture," *Journal of Leadership and organizational studies*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 145-158, 2008.
- [16] J.W. Deem, Pam J. DeLotell, and Kathryn Kelly, "The relationship of employee status to organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A quantitative analysis," *International Journal of Educational Management*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 563-581, The relationship of employee 2015.
- [17] M. S. A. Mahalinga Shiva and Damodar Suar, "Transformational Leadership, Organizational Culture, Organizational Effectiveness, and Programme Outcomes in Non-Governmental Organizations," *Voluntas*, vol. 23, pp. 684-710, 2012.
- [18] C.,M., Cornelius, C.,J. Taylor and K. Colvin, "Visionary leadership and its relationship to organizational effectiveness," *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 566-583, 2014.
- [19] G. R. Oldham and A. Cummings, "Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 607-634, 1996.
- [20] P., Farmer, S. M. Tierney and G. B. Graen, "An examination of leadership and employee creativity: The relevance of traits and relationships," *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 52, pp. 591-620., 1999.
- [21] Mozhdeh Mokhber, Gi G Tan, Amin Vakilbashi, Nor Aiza Mohd Zamil, and Rohaida. Basiruddin, "Impact of Entrepreneurial Leadership on Organization Demand for Innovation: Moderating Role of Employees' Innovative Self-Efficacy," *International Review of Management and Marketing: Mersin*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 415-421, 2016.
- [22] C Uz Kurt, R. Kumar, H.S. Kimzan, and G. Eminoglu, "Role of innovation in the relationship of organizational culture and firms performance," *European Journal of Innovation Management*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 92-117, 2013.
- [23] B J Avolio and B M Bass, "Transformational Leadership: Charisma and Beyond," School of Management, State University, New York:, Binghamton, Working Paper 14, 1985.
- [24] M. Sashkin, "The Visionary Leadership.," in *Charismatic Leadership*, J.A. Conger and R.N. Kanungo, Eds. NY: Free Press, 1992.
- [25] C. C. Cogliser and K. H. Brigham, "The intersection of leadership and entrepreneurship: Mutual lessons to be learned," *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 771-799, 2004.
- [26] R. D. Ireland, M. A. Hitt, and Sirmon D. G., "A model of strategic entrepreneurship: The construct and its dimensions," *Journal of Management*, vol. 29, pp. 963-989, 2003.
- [27] V Gupta, I.C. MacMillan, and G. Surie, "Entrepreneurial leadership: Developing and measuring a cross-cultural construct," *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 19, pp. 241-260, 20004.
- [28] D. F. Kuratko, "Entrepreneurial leadership in the 21st century," *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies (Baker College)*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1-11, 2007.
- [29] G. Surie and A. Ashley, "Integrating pragmatism and ethics in entrepreneurial leadership for sustainable value creation," *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 81, no. 1, pp. 235-246, 2008.
- [30] C. M. Leitch, C. McMullan, and R. T. Harrison, "The development of entrepreneurial leadership: The role of human, social and institutional capital.," *Br. J. Manage.* vol. 24, no. 3, p. 347, 2013.
- [31] D. Greenberg, K.E. McKone-Sweet, and H.J. Wilson, *The New Entrepreneurial Leader: Developing Leaders Who Shape Social and Economic Opportunity*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2011.
- [32] M. Renko, Ayman, El Tarabishy, Alan. L. Carsrud, and M. Brainnback, "Understanding and measuring entrepreneurial leadership style," *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 54-74, 2015.
- [33] R. Harrison, C. Leitch, and M. McAdam, "Breaking glass: Toward a gendered analysis of entrepreneurial leadership," *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 53, no. 3, p. 693, 2015.
- [34] M.A. Roomi and P. Harrison, "Entrepreneurial Leadership: What Is It and How Should It Be Taught?," *International Review of*

*Entrepreneurship*, vol. 9, no. 3, p. 144, 2011.

- [35] D. Greenberg, K. McKone-Sweet, and H. J. Wilson, *A Review of "The New Entrepreneurial Leader: Developing Leaders Who Shape Social & Economic Opportunity*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler, 2011.
- [36] J. B. Cunningham and J. Lischeron, "Defining entrepreneurship," *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 29, no. 1, p. 45, 1991.
- [37] R.G. McGrath and I. McMillan, *The Entrepreneurial Mindset*.: Harvard Business School Press, 2000.
- [38] Scott Shane and S. Venkataraman, "The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research," *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 217-226, Jan 2000.
- [39] M. Chen, "Entrepreneurial leadership and new ventures: Creativity in entrepreneurial teams," *Creativity and Innovation Management*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 239-249, 2007.
- [40] J. Rowold and A. Rohmann, "Relationships between leadership styles and followers' emotional experience and effectiveness in the voluntary sector," *Nonprofit Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 270-286, 2009.
- [41] M.C. Rodsutti and F.W. Swierczek, "Leadership and organizational effectiveness," *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 250-259, 2002.
- [42] Z. M. Wang and T. Satow, "Leadership styles and organizational effectiveness in Chinese – Japanese joint ventures," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 31-36, 1994.
- [43] C. Daftuar, "Organizational Effectiveness Scale," in *Handbook of Psychological and Social Instruments ND*: , U. Pareek, Ed. ND, India: Tata MacGraw Hill., 1985.
- [44] A. Etzioni, *Modern Organization*. Englewood Cliffs. NJ: Prentice Hall, 1964.
- [45] R.L. Kahn, "The Prediction of Productivity," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 12, pp. 41-49, 1956.
- [46] R.L. Kahn and N.C. Morse, "The relationship of productivity to morale," *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 7, pp. 8-17, 1951.
- [47] E.E. Lawler, *Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological View*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.
- [48] D.M. McGregor, *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.
- [49] D. Katz and R.L. Kahn, *Human Organization and Worker Motivation*, L.R. Tripp, Ed. Wisconsin: Industrial Relation Research Association, 1950.
- [50] D. Katz and R.L. Kahn, *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. NY: Wiley, 1966, 1978.
- [51] Thomas A. Mahoney and William Weitzel, "Managerial models of organizational effectiveness.," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 357-365, 1969.
- [52] S.E. Seashore, "Group Cohesion in the industrial Work group.," University of Michigan, Survey Research Institute of Social Science, Ann Arbor , 1955.
- [53] R.L. Thorndike, *Personnel Selection*. NY: Wiley & Sons., 1949.