



Role of University in Creating Entrepreneurial Attitudes

SUMMARY

Contemporary management education has to face many diverse challenges and, according to many critics, it is taking the wrong direction.¹ We are probably at the time of great changes in the education of future managers.² Excessive specialization in business schools, which Mintzberg³ already noted and criticized four decades ago, and individualization of the educational process⁴ is just one of many phenomena that have led to the moment in which students build a false image of the organizations, resulting in multiple problems. Kostera,⁵ along with other authors⁶ propose to focus on developing imagination among students which have recently been completely side tracked at the expense of the development of technology (and tools) and deep expertise in many diverse areas, including management sciences.

→ **KEYWORDS** – ENTREPRENEUR, TEAMWORK, SKILLS, SOCIAL COMPETENCES

¹ Cf. A.K. Koźmiński, *Koniec świata menedżerów?*, Warszawa 2008; L. D'Andrea Tyson, *On 'Managers not MBAs'*, "Academy of Management Learning & Education" 2005, 4/2, pp. 235-236; Ch. Grey, *Reinventing Business Schools: The Contribution of Critical Management Education*, "Academy of Management Learning & Education" 2004, 3/2, pp. 178-186.

² Cf. M. Kostera, *Organizacje i archetypy*, Warszawa 2010.

³ Cf. H. Mintzberg, *The Nature of Managerial Work*, New York 1973.

⁴ Cf. G. Wieczorkowska, J. Wierziński, B. Michałowicz, *Wyzwanie dla zarządzania edukacją: odmitologizowanie przyjmowanych bezrefleksyjnie założeń*, in: *Aktualne problemy zarządzania – teoria i praktyka*, ed. A.P. Wiatrak, Warszawa 2012, pp. 63-79.

⁵ Cf. M. Kostera, *Organizować z polotem: Wyobraźnia organizacyjna w praktyce*, Warszawa 2013.

⁶ Cf. R. Chia, R. Holt, *The Nature of Knowledge in Business Schools*, "Academy of Management Learning & Education" 2008, 7/4, pp. 471-486; C.W. Mills, *Wyobraźnia socjologiczna*, Warszawa 1959/2007.

STRESZCZENIE

Rola uniwersytetu w kształtowaniu postaw przedsiębiorczych

Współczesna edukacja menedżerska znajduje się obecnie w dość trudnym momencie i musi stawić czoła różnorodnym wyzwaniom. Wielu autorów otwarcie krytykuje kierunek zmian, w jakim podążają polskie uczelnie kształcące menedżerów. Już cztery dekady temu Mintzberg⁷ zauważył i głośno skrytykował nadmierną specjalizację szkół biznesowych oraz indywidualizację procesu nauczania. Jest to zaledwie jedno z wielu niekorzystnych zjawisk, które spowodowały, że studenci kończą uczelnie z fałszywym wizerunkiem organizacji, co generuje liczne inne patologie. Kostera⁸, podobnie jak wielu innych autorów, proponuje skoncentrowanie się na rozwijaniu wyobraźni u studentów, którzy jak dotąd zarzucani byli ogromem wiedzy i specjalistycznych narzędzi w najróżniejszych obszarach wiedzy. Nie pozwala to przyszłym menedżerom na kształtowanie postaw przedsiębiorczych, na które wpływ mają zupełnie inne czynniki, takie jak umiejętności interpersonalne czy kompetencje społeczne, o czym traktuje artykuł.

→ **SŁOWA KLUCZOWE** – PRZEDSIĘBIORCA, PRACA ZESPOŁOWA,
UMIEJĘTNOŚCI, KOMPETENCJE SPOŁECZNE

Introduction

This paper is based on our long-term experience as academic teachers, trainers and researchers. Material from a qualitative research project inspired by ethnography has also been used.

We treat entrepreneurial education as an important part of managerial education. Entrepreneurial competencies are not limited to those who decide to create their own ventures, they are equally important to managers, specialists or almost any employees working in contemporary, rapidly changing organizations. Our aim is to show in what ways university education can support the creation of entrepreneurial propensity. We also want to point out the actions in education which are diminishing students' predispositions to be active in business. Based on entrepreneurship research in Poland we are going to propose some ways of improving

⁷ Cf. H. Mintzberg, *The Nature of Managerial Work*, op. cit.

⁸ Cf. M. Kostera, *Organizować z polotem: Wyobraźnia organizacyjna w praktyce*, op. cit.

university's actions, which may increase entrepreneurial interests among students on every level of learning level.⁹

Management Education

Management education is a young academic discipline as it developed in the early 80s.¹⁰ The following years brought mass education at universities and initiated the formation of numerous business schools. Recently, managerial education has become a popular field at many universities. It has been developing in many diverse directions. Three of them we find essential from the perspective presented in this text: management education, business education and entrepreneurship education. The first term has the broadest meaning and refers to the whole range of subjects essential for the future manager. It embraces both hard and soft knowledge, training skills and social competences. Business education includes mostly hard knowledge typical for business schools such as economics, accounting and finance. Finally, entrepreneurship education consists of "any pedagogical [program] or process of education for entrepreneurial attitudes and skills."¹¹

Business and management schools graduates are expected to possess appropriate knowledge, skills and social competences. In the near future, these graduates will become managers and should guide us through the turbulent world of modern organizations.¹² The modern manager should thus have a set of qualities and skills that allow him to provide security for his organization in such a turbulent environment.¹³

To achieve these objectives it is necessary to verify, or at least discuss, methods of education. Permanent changes in management education enforce reflection on its actual condition and

⁹ Cf. S. Kwiatkowski, *Przedsiębiorczość intelektualna*, Warszawa 2000; B. Glinka, S. Gudkova, *Przedsiębiorczość*, Warszawa 2011.

¹⁰ Cf. A.K. Koźmiński, *Koniec świata menedżerów?*, op. cit.

¹¹ A. Fayolle, B. Gailly, N. Lassas-Clerc, *Effect and Counter-Effect of Entrepreneurship Education and Social Context on Student's Intentions*, "Estudios De Economia Aplicada" 2006, 24(2), p. 702.

¹² Cf. M. Kostera, *Organizacje i archetypy*, op. cit.

¹³ Cf. M. Kostera, M. Śliwa, *Zarządzanie w XXI wieku*, Warszawa 2010.

possible repair actions in this area. According to Koźmiński¹⁴ the main factors strongly influencing the direction of business schools' development are popularization and accessibility. The most disturbing phenomenon is disseminating fields of study not related directly to business. Representatives of the jobs and professions such as art historians, cooks and farmers come to universities for the knowledge about management to become better entrepreneurs or managers. The second phenomenon adversely affecting the future of management education is associated with the first one and concerns the strong specification of the students' needs. This involves creating specializations that Andrzej Koźmiński called "exotic," listing the management of show-business, tourism or art. Another problem, also related to the popularity of business schools, concerns creating schools in those areas where they have low legitimacy in the education of future managers, e.g. poor or developing countries, countries plunged into corruption or into an authoritarian regime. The last obstacle in the proper development of management education is the constant increase of costs. Training future managers becomes an extremely expensive operation that still requires more capital expenditure.

A global tendency of the prolonged world crisis, and the difficult situation on the Polish labor market also strongly affect education in every dimension. These phenomena are the challenges for management education decision-makers. For many years there has been an inadequacy of education in the business schools in relation to the realities of the market.¹⁵ The expectations of students as well as empirical research show that the studies should create an opportunity for young people to find a comfortable place in a difficult environment that the labor market creates. It is well known that not only knowledge is a key element in the managerial education. At least three major areas of teaching and learning should be taken under consideration: knowledge, skills and social competence. It is quite easy to deliver hard, explicit knowledge but there are still serious limitations in teaching various skills and social competencies. Both social competencies and managerial skills require substantial

¹⁴ Cf. A.K. Koźmiński, *The New Revolution in Management Education?*, "Master of Business Administration" 2011, 4/111.

¹⁵ Cf. M.J. Hatch, M. Kostera, A.K. Koźmiński, *The Three Faces of Leadership: Manager, Artist, Priest*, "Organizational Dynamics" 2005, 35/1.

and time-consuming training. The Polish market (and to a much greater extent any other market) for many years has been offering the entire set of courses, workshops and trainings, which were aimed at practicing skills and competencies.¹⁶ However, many of these offers have several weaknesses. First of all, some training activities and workshops are designed rather to satisfy the interests of a training company than to match the interests of a client. Complex and time-consuming research is needed to meet clients' needs – unfortunately they are not only useful but also very expensive.

Universities are also trying hard (sometimes too hard) to keep up with the environmental changes and needs of the market. However, in our opinion the process should work otherwise. An academy should set directions of the development rather than follow. That is why, we decided to raise some important questions: What direction should a management education program follow? How should diverse branches of management be developed? How can a university address all the current market and educational problems?

Current Directions of the Polish Management Education Development

Managerial education in Poland is in the process of continuous change and the direction of these transformations is hard to predict. At first glance, one can say that the general trend is good, because the accessibility of education has been constantly increasing. More and more students of different origins (including education, such as a bachelor's degree in physiotherapy, archeology and art history) may undertake BA or Masters studies in the field of business. A deeper analysis of the trend however allows us to draw the conclusion that it also has negative consequences, and the worst of them is the reduction of the level of teaching at universities¹⁷ – the knowledge offered to students becomes more basic and simple. That is one of the reasons why

¹⁶ Cf. A. Postuła, *Warszawskie plemię: Team-building i szkolenia*, in: *Etnografia organizacji*, ed. M. Kostera, Gdańsk 2011, pp. 25-50.

¹⁷ Cf. A.K. Koźmiński, *The New Revolution in Management Education?*, op. cit.; M. Kostera i M. Śliwa, *Zarządzanie w XXI wieku*, op. cit.

an increasing number of graduates has a strong need to continue education at the PhD or post-graduate level.

Social skills and competencies have become a fashionable field within managerial education not only at business schools and universities, but also in training companies' programs. It may be interpreted as an important shift, as knowledge about hard skills, procedures, specific tools, and ready-made solutions used to (or still do) constitute the mainstream of teaching activities in Poland. Today, more people recognize the importance of soft skills in different areas of business life. Communication skills, cooperation, commitment and loyalty are factors difficult to identify or create in the organizations but they have a strong impact on its functioning.

Skills usually refer to specific tasks performed by the team, while social competencies are an even more elusive term.

The concept of competence refers to the unique combination of business expertise and the ability of the people that give the organization a certain character. In addition, it identifies the company sources of motivation, effort, specialization and cooperation.¹⁸

Top management is interested in the development of appropriate social skills within organizations because it increases competitive advantage, helps to gather new knowledge, develops flexibility and stimulates the emergence of new education systems that fit market needs.¹⁹

As a field of management, entrepreneurship also requires both hard, explicit knowledge, and more intangible social skills and competencies. Within entrepreneurship research and education there has been an ongoing debate over how entrepreneurial individuals come into being:²⁰ are they made or born? This nature versus nurture debate is not over, but most scholars do agree that at least to some extent entrepreneurial competencies are created in the processes of learning, gaining and transforming experiences. We base our article on this assumption and show

¹⁸ M. Kossowska, I. Sołtysińska, *Szkolenia pracowników a rozwój organizacji*, Kraków 2006, p. 12.

¹⁹ Cf. ibidem.

²⁰ Cf. B. Glinka, S. Gudkova, *Przedsiębiorczość*, op. cit.; W.B. Gartner, *Who is an Entrepreneur is the Wrong Question*, "Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice" 1988, 2, pp. 47-68.

selected methods of building propensity to entrepreneurship as well as some competencies and skills.

It is not hard to transfer knowledge, but training skills and competences at university might be challenging. Some limitations are obvious. The main problems are the place, costs, time-consuming character and the teacher who should take the active role of the coach, rather than just a lecturer.²¹ In this paper we hope to identify main entrepreneurial competencies and analyze the possible forms of entrepreneurial education at universities.

Method

All the authors of this paper represent the Faculty of Management (FoM) at Warsaw University. For this reason this paper concentrates on management education at universities. The FoM is a specific place – it is well known for its connections with entrepreneurship in its broadest sense. We develop entrepreneurial students' attitudes as a part of teaching responsibilities, and we also take entrepreneurial actions at university by ourselves. We base our considerations on the analysis of our own experiences within the field of education. To reflect students' perceptions of educational processes we conducted some qualitative research. The main method was an anthropological interview²² with first-year (BA) and last-year (2nd year MA) students from the FoM. 25 interviews have so far been conducted (14 interviews with students from the first group and 11 from the second one). The interviews are transcribed and coded according to ethnographic research regulations.

Entrepreneurs

It is a widely known fact that entrepreneurship plays a crucial role in the world's economy. As a result it has become one of the most popular topics both in research and teaching.

²¹ Cf. A. Postuła, *Rozwój podsystemu kulturowego – rozwój i integracja za pomocą metod budowania zespołów*, in: *Doradztwo organizacyjne. Ujęcie systemowe*, ed. M. Kostera, Warszawa 2013, pp. 145-168.

²² Cf. M. Kostera, *Antropologia organizacji: Metodologia badań terenowych*, Warszawa 2005.

In academic literature there are many definitions of entrepreneurship. Most of them focus on the process of new venture creation and on the unique abilities that an entrepreneur has. Kwiatkowski²³ defines entrepreneurship as the capability of creating material wealth from intangible resources. Timmons²⁴ also draws attention to an entrepreneur's ability to build something from nothing. In his definition, an entrepreneur seizes opportunities and overcomes barriers using all available sources to achieve his goal.²⁵ According to this explanation, one of the crucial elements of success is the ability to choose the right founding team. Thus, the entrepreneur needs to have deep self-knowledge, be able to analyze himself/herself and others, as well as, be able to assign the right people to appropriate tasks.

In the development of entrepreneurship research some important perspectives can be identified:²⁶

1. Contribution of economists to the early theories evolving in the field of entrepreneurship.
2. The search for personality traits ("trait approach"), that allow entrepreneurial personalities to be distinguished from non-entrepreneurial ones.
3. Concentration on external factors. With the rejection of the "trait approach" as of limited use to explain the nature of entrepreneurial activity researchers began to focus on external factors such as social values and norms, the existence of legal and economic institutions, external sources of financing and support offered by governmental and non-governmental agencies to new ventures.
4. Entrepreneurial competencies – these competencies consist of motives, self-efficacy, knowledge (procedural and declarative), and personality characteristics.

Our considerations contribute to the last perspective, namely entrepreneurial competencies.

It should be stressed, that many of the concepts of entrepreneurial competencies refer to leadership or managerial

²³ Cf. S. Kwiatkowski, *Przedsiębiorczość intelektualna*, op. cit.

²⁴ Cf. J.A. Timmons, *New Venture Creation: Entrepreneurship for the 21st century*, Chicago 1999.

²⁵ Cf. ibidem, p. 7.

²⁶ Cf. B. Glinka, *Przedsiębiorczość*, in: *Zarządzanie. Tradycja i nowoczesność*, eds. J. Bogdanienko, W. Piotrowski, Warszawa 2013, pp. 59-75.

competencies theories. The majority of the researchers distinguish three main attributes: pro-activeness, innovativeness, and risk taking.²⁷ Imagination and creativity are conducive to entrepreneurial activity, growth and development. The aforementioned group of qualities is called personal competencies. The second set of specific features is functional competencies. This group allows entrepreneurs to mobilize people to work for them, cooperate with them, communicate entrepreneurial goal or the vision of the company and maintain the willingness to work.²⁸

In our text we use the model presented by Glinka and Gudkova²⁹ (based on studies of R.A. Boyatzis³⁰ and Bird³¹) in which entrepreneurial competencies are defined as: personal features, specific cognitive mechanisms, motives, self-efficacy and knowledge.

The three main characteristics, personal features described by Glinka and Gudkova are the following: achievement-oriented,³² internal locus of control³³ and risk taking propensity.³⁴

²⁷ Cf. V. Gupta, I.C. MacMillan, G. Surie, *Entrepreneurial Leadership: Developing and Measuring a Cross-Cultural Construct*, "Journal of Business Venturing" 2004, 19, pp. 241-260; M.H. Chen, *Entrepreneurial Leadership and New Ventures: Creativity in Entrepreneurial Teams*, "Creativity and Innovation Management" 16(2007)3, pp. 239-249; D.F. Kuratko, *Entrepreneurial Leadership in the 21st Century*, "Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies" 13(2007)4, pp. 1-11.

²⁸ Cf. V. Gupta, I.C. MacMillan, G. Surie, *Entrepreneurial Leadership: Developing and Measuring a Cross-Cultural Construct*, op. cit.

²⁹ Cf. B. Glinka, S. Gudkova, *Przedsiębiorczość*, op. cit., pp. 123.

³⁰ Cf. R.E. Boyatzis, *The Component Manager. A Model for Effective Performance*, London 1982.

³¹ Cf. B. Bird, *Toward a Theory of Entrepreneurial Competency*, in: *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence, and Growth*, eds. J.A. Katz, R.H. Brockhaus, t. 2, Greenwich 1995, pp. 51-72.

³² Cf. D.C. McClelland, *The Achieving Society*, New York 1961; S. Ahmed, *n-Ach, Risk Taking Propensity, Locus of Control and Entrepreneurship*, "Personality and Individual Differences" 1985, 6, pp. 781; J.W. Atkinson, *An Introduction to Motivation*, ed. D. Van Nostrand, Princeton 1964.

³³ Cf. S. Ahmed, *n-Ach, Risk Taking Propensity, Locus of Control and Entrepreneurship*, op. cit.; J.B. Rotter, *Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement*, "Psychological Monographs" 1966, 80, p. 609; R.H. Brockhaus, *The Psychology of the Entrepreneur*, in: *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*, New Jersey 1982, pp. 39-57; D. Paulhus, *Sphere-Specific Measures of Perceived Control*, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology" 1983, 44, pp. 1253-1265.

³⁴ Cf. D.C. McClelland, *The Achieving Society*, op. cit.

Individuals with a high need for achievement enjoy challenging tasks and goals, they aspire to improve their performance and they compare themselves to others.³⁵ The high internal locus of control means that the individuals can positively influence their situation and life events. They are responsible for their success or failure. The external locus of control is the opposite. It relates to the individual's beliefs: what is happening in their lives depends on luck or external agents.³⁶ One's preference for risk means a general tendency to pursue or avoid risk taking.³⁷ Entrepreneurs are more likely to reduce risk perception and make a quick decision based more on intuition than on facts or a database. This is due to their specific cognitive style, which is linked to using cognitive heuristics.³⁸

There are also motives that are specific for entrepreneurs.³⁹ The most basic typology is: "pull" and "push" factors.⁴⁰ A "Push" factor exists when the entrepreneur stands a slim chance of finding a job, and being self-employed as the most advantageous solution for him/her. A "Pull" factor exists when an entrepreneur notices a market opportunity and decides to run his/her own company. Carter et al.⁴¹ divide "pull" factors into six categories: independence, recognition, innovation, roles, self-realization and

³⁵ Cf. *ibidem*.

³⁶ Cf. J.B. Rotter, *Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement*, *op. cit.*

³⁷ Cf. S.B. Sitkin, A. Pablo, *Reconceptualizing the Determinants of Risk Behavior*, "Academic Management Review" 1992, 17, pp. 9-38.

³⁸ Cf. L. Busenitz, J.B. Barney, *Differences between Entrepreneurs and Managers in Large Organizations: Biases and Heuristics in Strategic Decision-making*, "Journal of Business Venturing" 1997, 12, 1, pp. 9-30; H.T. Keh, M.D. Foo, B.C. Lim, *Opportunity Evaluation under Risky Conditions: The Cognitive Processes of Entrepreneurs*. "Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice" 2002, 27, 2, pp. 125-148.

³⁹ Cf. N.M. Carter, W.B. Gartner, K.G. Shaver, E.J. Gatewood, *The Career Reasons of Nascent Entrepreneurs*, "Journal of Business Venturing" 2003, 18, 1, pp. 13-39; Y. Robichaud, E. McGraw, A. Roger, *Toward the Development of a Measuring Instrument for Entrepreneurial Motivation*, "Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship" 2001, 6, 1, pp. 189-202.

⁴⁰ Cf. P.A. Wickham, *Strategic Entrepreneurship*, Prentice Hall 2004.

⁴¹ Cf. N.M. Carter, W.B. Gartner, K.G. Shaver, E.J. Gatewood, *The Career Reasons of Nascent Entrepreneurs*, *op. cit.*

financial success. There are also many other taxonomies concerning entrepreneurial motives.

Entrepreneurs have to believe in their capabilities. They need to know what is available for them, what they need to achieve and what skills they have. This ability is called self-efficacy.⁴² People with high levels of self-efficacy usually have higher aspirations. They can arrange far-reaching plans and can undertake new tasks downplaying the risk, without a high level of stress. They are more determined in their actions and are more willing to overcome obstacles.⁴³

Apart from the characteristic above, there is also a specific cognitive mindset, which describes entrepreneurs.⁴⁴ The cognitive approach explains how entrepreneurs identify market opportunities and what makes their way of thinking unique, i.e. they can be successful in business as opposed to non-entrepreneurs. The entrepreneurial cognitive style is shaped by the environment; individual experiences that are different for different people.⁴⁵ Entrepreneurs use a rather creative style, so they think in a holistic and conceptual way. They do not respect rules, but they enjoy experimentation. Moreover, they are ambitious and achievement-oriented.⁴⁶ They use different set of heuristics, simplifying strategies that people use to judge the situation.⁴⁷ This may lead to both positive and negative consequences⁴⁸ – for example they tend to be over-optimistic about the progress of

⁴² Cf. A. Bandura, *Self-efficacy*, "Harvard Mental Health Letter" 1997, 13, 9.

⁴³ Cf. A. Bandura, *Human Agency in Social Cognitive Theory*, "American Psychologist" 1989, 44, pp. 1175-1184.

⁴⁴ Cf. R.A. Baron, *Cognitive Mechanisms in Entrepreneurship: Why and when entrepreneurs think differently than other people*, "Journal of Business Venturing" 1998, 13(4), pp. 275-294.

⁴⁵ Cf. R.A. Baron, S.A. Shane, *Entrepreneurship. The Process Perspective*, Mason 2008.

⁴⁶ Cf. S. Bridge, K. O'Neil, S. Cromie, *Understanding Enterprise, Entrepreneurship and Small Business* (2nd ed.), Palgrave/Macmillan 2003.

⁴⁷ Cf. A. Tversky, D. Kahneman, *Availability: A Heuristic for Judging Frequency and Probability*, "Cognitive Psychology" 1973, 5, 2, pp. 677-695.

⁴⁸ Cf. R.A. Baron, G.D. Markman, *Cognitive Mechanisms: Potential Differences between Entrepreneurs and Non-entrepreneurs*, in: *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, eds. P.D. Reynolds, W.D. Bygrave et. al., Wellesley 1999.

a company; on the other hand, a pessimistic person would never start his/her company because of the risk entailed.

The knowledge possessed by an entrepreneur has a huge impact on the achievement of success. It allows the entrepreneur to be alert to a market opportunity.⁴⁹ Entrepreneurs search for specific information, which allows them to solve business problems and achieve their goals.⁵⁰ That is why, the education of entrepreneurs is so important for the success of a new venture.⁵¹

Developing Entrepreneurial Competencies

The main question is: how can one develop entrepreneurial skills and competencies? At this point it is worth introducing several ideas that can help in rising entrepreneurial spirit among students. Amid the selected features motivation is the first one to be explained. As the research⁵² indicates, the start-ups created by “pull” factors have a higher rate of survival. It means that academic teachers should concentrate on building the need for independence, recognition, innovation, roles, self-realization and financial success, which are linked to the “pull” factors. In order to stimulate innovation, it is necessary to develop creativity. The manager in an organization is responsible for creating an environment conducive to the development of creative work.⁵³ At the university there are authorities and academics who are responsible for this. Their role is to make an atmosphere of creative work for individual students, whole groups and to build acceptance along with cooperation. This means that the lecturer

⁴⁹ Cf. I.M. Kirzner, *Competition and Entrepreneurship*, Chicago 1973.

⁵⁰ Cf. D.L. Sexton, N.B. Upton, L.E. Wacholtz, P.P. McDougall, *Learning Needs of Growth Oriented Entrepreneurs*, “Journal of Business Venturing” 1997, 12, 1, pp. 1-8.

⁵¹ Cf. S. Postigo, D. Iacobucci, M.F. Tamborini, *Undergraduate Students as a Source of Potential Entrepreneurs: A Comparative Study between Italy and Argentina*, Paper presented at the 2003 IntEnt conference, Grenoble 2003.

⁵² Cf. M. Caliendo, A.S. Kritikos “I want to, but I also need to”: start-up resulting from opportunity and necessity, DIW “Berlin Discussion Papers” 2009(966).

⁵³ Cf. A. Brzozowska, A. Postuła, *Czy informatycy potrzebują wyobraźni?*, in: *Organizować z połotem. Wyobraźnia organizacyjna w praktyce*, ed. M. Kostera, Warszawa 2013, pp. 195-210.

must be very well-prepared for leading (not only lecturing to) the group, and s/he must have knowledge of the group's dynamics.

There are some forms of meetings with students that we can consider as useful or effective. As academics we often prefer different forms of lectures. Some of us feel comfortable; sharing knowledge by telling stories (also stories from the research field or practice). Some of us prefer more interactive forms like workshops or seminars. All of them are beneficial for students. It is important to arrange study programs accordingly in order to achieve a goal, which in our opinion, support entrepreneurial attitudes. In our opinion, interactive forms of learning are more effective. Our research shows that they are also appreciated by students. Such goals as integrating people, learning rules of group cooperation, stimulating involvement, supporting creativity are very difficult or even impossible to achieve during a conventional lecture. It has been proved that active learning, e.g. experiential learning⁵⁴ is not only much more effective but also pleasant for participants/students. Active learning refers to all 3 stages of learning-by-doing: 1) gathering the theoretical knowledge, 2) pure experience, which allows student know how to transfer acquired theory into practice, and 3) the analysis of gathered knowledge and experience through which a student has the opportunity to understand discussed issues more deeply and formulate particular conclusions, inspiring him/her to possible changes in behavior.

Apart from the "pull" factors, we have to turn our attention to competencies that support entrepreneurial attitudes. As teachers we can develop these skills only during active learning methods, i.e. during experiential learning. As already mentioned, motives are an important part of entrepreneurial competencies; they underlie decisions and constitute an important element in shaping attitudes towards entrepreneurship and competition in business. In enterprises – especially micro and small – the motivation, commitment, enthusiasm, passion and determination of the owner, and (also) the main manager determine the company's position in the market. The creation and survival of the company, as well as its development depend on the level of personal commitment

⁵⁴ Cf. M. Minniti, W. Bygrave, *A Dynamic Model of Entrepreneurial Learning*, "Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice" 2001, 25, 3, pp. 5-16; D.A. Kolb, *Experiential Learning Experience as a Source of Learning and Development*, New Jersey 1984.

and determination, combined with passion and vision. All these competencies are elusive parts of the company's success. Supporting and developing them is the real challenge for an academic teacher. Teamwork is an opportunity to meet people, check how they work and build the network. Many western universities (such as Stanford or Cambridge) have their own entrepreneurship networks that gather people interested in being entrepreneurs, giving a chance to keep contacts with classmates. Based on the network support group, students interested in business can exchange their problems and ideas. That can be useful while developing start-ups, as well as solving problems in a creative way within existing organizations.

The preparation of appropriate case studies can help in developing ideas, in recognizing opportunities and self-efficacy. Students gain experience and confidence in perceiving themselves as entrepreneurs, when they analyze other entrepreneur's activities and the consequences of their decisions. This is all without making their own mistakes.

Entrepreneurial education can also influence self-efficacy. There are four sources affecting self-efficacy: experience, modeling based on vicarious experience, social persuasions and physiological factors.⁵⁵ Entrepreneurial socialization helps in developing that skill. To enhance entrepreneurial socialization within the university different solutions may be used. All of them require creating a space (not necessarily physical) in which students may interact with entrepreneurs. For instance, shadowing of entrepreneurs would be a great opportunity for students to observe the daily struggles of entrepreneurs. It is one of the most effective training methods as it involves spending a period of time with entrepreneur and observing his/her work. This allows for building up confidence. It also creates the possibility to learn some procedures and methods used in business situations, that are very difficult to explain during classes but must be learnt by experience. This kind of knowledge we call procedural knowledge and it means that we know how to do something. It

⁵⁵ Cf. A. Bandura, *Self-efficacy*, op. cit.

provides information about a series of steps and actions, which are required to accomplish a goal.⁵⁶

Another possibility is establishing a Business Hub, which offers support services. This kind of activity enables students to learn from experts and develop their business skills. Another idea, which is used in some universities,⁵⁷ is the Business Incubation Centre. This is a place where students may test business ideas and learn from their own experience. Based on the above-mentioned support ideas students are able to assess their knowledge and, under incubation conditions, gain confidence as entrepreneurs.

There are several other ideas to enhance self-efficacy such as the Startup Weekend, which was developed by a Seattle non-profit and is quickly spreading,⁵⁸ currently it is present also in Poland. The main idea of this project was to complete the following task within just 54 hours: using trained facilitators and rapid prototyping help, entrepreneurs were required to go through many exercises to end up with viable business models. Startup Weekend has given birth to hundreds of new companies. Another program, The Launch Pad, founded at the University of Miami, developed an intensive program for undergraduates whose best shot at meaningful work was to start their own businesses. A glass office block in the middle of the campus was adapted to support work on start-ups by juniors and seniors, who receive advice from successful business people (many of them alumni). The Launch Pad is responsible for 65 new companies and 200 new jobs in Miami to date.⁵⁹ All these examples show the diversity of ideas that can support developing entrepreneurial attitudes, mixing academy with the realities of business.

⁵⁶ Cf. L.H. Roediger III, M.S. Weldon, B.H. Challis, *Explaining Dissociations between Implicit and Explicit Measures of retention: A processing Account*, in: *Varieties of Memory and Consciousness: Essays in Honor of Endel Tulvin*, eds. L.H. Roediger, III, F.I.M. Craik, Hillsdale NJ 1989, pp. 3-41.

⁵⁷ For instance, the Faculty of Management at the University of Warsaw has the Center of Entrepreneurship where students meet to discuss current ideas, invite professionals to hear their stories, organize meetings and workshops with entrepreneurs to learn from them in practice etc.

⁵⁸ Cf. C. Schramm, *Expanding the Entrepreneur Class*, „Harvard Business Review” July–August 2012, pp. 40.

⁵⁹ Cf. *ibidem*.

Students' research project can stand for another effective method for bringing "the real world" closer to the academy. Young people (students, Ph.D. students etc.) under supervision may plan and then carry out research on a selected aspect of entrepreneurship. It is also a valuable way of gathering experience and stories directly from the realm of business.

In general, all meetings with practice are beneficial for students for many different reasons. Showing patterns, good practices or using benchmark as an example are the ways of revealing market reality to students. Academy can do it on diverse levels, e.g. organize meetings with practitioners in the form of lectures, seminars, discussions or conferences. It can also be done by gathering students outside the academy and organize meetings, practices or training in particular companies. All of them allow students to develop their own picture of the real business world, coherent with the one presented during lectures.

It is crucial in the training process to pass the knowledge of the growth strategies for business and to give systematic feedback and support at the initial stage of business. These activities allow students to gain knowledge about entrepreneurial process and develop self-efficacy. Introducing entrepreneur education programs to business schools may cause the rise of self-efficacy, and students tend to be more willing to start their own business.⁶⁰ However, it is necessary to pay attention to the effectiveness of entrepreneurial education.⁶¹

Obviously, most of the methods mentioned above require great openness on the part of a university; universities must be willing to cooperate with the business world and have to convince business owners that the cooperation can be beneficial for all parties.

In this paper we discussed how entrepreneurial attitudes among students can be improved in practice. We would like to turn our attention to another aspect of entrepreneurial education, which is not as formal and tangible as the one described above. Some researchers believe that teaching entrepreneurship

⁶⁰ Cf. C.C. Chen, P.G. Greene, A. Crick, *Does Self-Efficacy Distinguish Entrepreneurs from Managers?*, "Journal of Business Venturing" 13(1998), pp. 295-316.

⁶¹ Cf. T.J. Hostager, R.L. Decker, *The Effects of an Entrepreneurship Program on Achievement Motivation. A Preliminary Study*, San Francisco 1992, <<http://www.sbaer.uca.edu/Research/1999/SBIDA/sbi28.htm>>.

is an illusion, a goal impossible to reach.⁶² Many factors indicate that even educational training and programs are not likely to be successful in raising entrepreneurial intentions as students who choose management or business schools already have entrepreneurial intentions. According to some researchers it means, that lectures, training and all other methods play a minor role in shaping entrepreneurial attitudes. However, we do not share this point of view, as we believe that there are various diverse factors that influence the development of entrepreneurial attitudes. Many of them are immeasurable, and usually universal. These include associating people from different fields, eg. students and professors, theorists and practitioners, students who wish to open their businesses and those who did it successfully etc. Exchanging ideas between roles, professions and different fields is indeed valuable. It is common knowledge that such meetings are always beneficial. They allow fresh and open thinking, they generate ideas, and create new relations. They are beneficial for everyone. All activities, when wisely directed to stimulate imagination, are invaluable.⁶³

Conclusions

All the presented forms of developing entrepreneurial attitudes require a very high level of training and pedagogical skills from teachers, as well as understanding the specifics of teamwork and group managing skills. This means that improving entrepreneurial skills is not only a matter of training students but also teachers. Academic teachers who wish to develop the skills discussed in this paper should have access to sources that develop their own teamwork skills and the knowledge of the particular forms of learning and its applications.

To conclude, there is still insufficient training focused on entrepreneurial attitudes and leadership, which is extremely important

⁶² Cf. T.J. Bae, S.Qian, C.Miao & J.O. Fiet, *The Relationship between Entrepreneurship Education and Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Meta-Analytic Review*, "Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice" 2014, pp. 1042-2587.

⁶³ Cf. C.W. Mills, *Wyobrażenia socjologiczna*, op. cit.

for entrepreneurial venturing.⁶⁴ We should emphasize the importance of research focused on the teaching effects of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship teaching programs should be based on local economy and global trends. What is more, the training should not be available only for business students. The entrepreneurial spirit, and other elements of entrepreneurial competencies should be introduced to students of the fields other than management/business. Sometimes they are not aware of the way of using their skills in business or afraid to start their own venture. Thanks to appropriate trainings they can acquire the skill of opportunities recognition and evaluation and be more confident in the labor market. They will have an awareness of being experienced enough to create jobs for themselves.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmed S., *n-Ach, Risk Taking Propensity, Locus of Control and Entrepreneurship*, "Personality and Individual Differences" 1985, 6, pp. 781.
- Atkinson J.W., *An Introduction to Motivation*, D.Van Nostrand, Princeton 1964.
- Bae T.J., Qian S., Miao C., Fiet J.O., *The Relationship between Entrepreneurship Education and Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Meta-Analytic Review*, "Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice" 2014, pp. 1042-2587.
- Bandura A., *Human Agency in Social Cognitive Theory*, "American Psychologist" 1989, 44, pp. 1175-1184.
- Bandura A., *Self-efficacy*, "Harvard Mental Health Letter" 1997, 13(9).
- Baron R.A., *Cognitive Mechanisms in Entrepreneurship: Why and when entrepreneurs think differently than other people*, "Journal of Business Venturing" 1998, 13(4), pp. 275-294.
- Baron R.A., Markman G.D., *Cognitive Mechanisms: Potential Differences between Entrepreneurs and Non-entrepreneurs*, in: *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, eds. P.D. Reynolds, W.D. Bygrave et al., MA: Babson College, Wellesley 1999.
- Baron R.A., Shane S.A., *Entrepreneurship. The Process Perspective*, Thomson South-Western, Mason 2008.
- Bird B., *Toward a Theory of Entrepreneurial Competency*, in: *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence, and Growth*, eds. J.A. Katz, R.H. Brockhaus, JAI Press, t. 2, Greenwich 1995, s. 51-72.
- Boyatzis R.E., *The Component Manager. A Model for Effective Performance*, Wiley, London 1982.

⁶⁴ Cf. M.L. Harris, S.G. Gibson, *Examining the Entrepreneurial Attitudes of US Business Students*, "Education + Training" 50(2008)7, pp. 568-581.

- Bridge S., O'Neil K., Cromie S., *Understanding Enterprise, Entrepreneurship and Small Business* (2nd ed.), Palgrave/Macmillan 2003.
- Brockhaus Sr., R.H., *The Psychology of the Entrepreneur*, in: *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 1982, pp. 39-57.
- Brzozowska A., Postuła A., *Czy informatycy potrzebują wyobraźni?*, in: *Organizować z polotem. Wyobraźnia organizacyjna w praktyce*, ed. M. Kostera, Sedno, Warszawa 2013, pp. 195-210.
- Busenitz L., Barney J.B., *Differences between Entrepreneurs and Managers in Large Organizations: Biases and Heuristics in Strategic Decision-making*, "Journal of Business Venturing" 1997, 12(1), pp. 9-30.
- Callendo M., Kritikos A.S., *"I want to, but I also need to": start-up resulting from opportunity and necessity*, DIW "Berlin Discussion Papers" 2009, 966.
- Carter N.M., Gartner W.B., Shaver K.G., Gatewood E.J., *The Career Reasons of Nascent Entrepreneurs*, "Journal of Business Venturing" 2003, 18(1), pp. 13-39.
- Chen M.H., *Entrepreneurial Leadership and New Ventures: Creativity in Entrepreneurial Teams*, "Creativity and Innovation Management" 2007, 16(3), pp. 239-249.
- Chen C.C., Greene P.G., Crick A., *Does Self-Efficacy Distinguish Entrepreneurs from Managers?*, "Journal of Business Venturing" 1998, 13, pp. 295-316.
- Chia R., Holt R., *The Nature of Knowledge in Business Schools*, "Academy of Management Learning & Education" 2008, 7/4, pp. 471-486.
- D'Andrea Tyson L., *On 'Managers not MBAs'*, "Academy of Management Learning & Education" 2005, 4/2, pp. 235-236.
- Fayolle A., Gailly B., Lassas-Clerc N., *Effect and Counter-Effect of Entrepreneurship Education and Social Context on Student's Intentions*, "Estudios De Economia Aplicada" 2006, 24(2), pp. 509-523.
- Gartner W.B., *"Who is an Entrepreneur?" is the Wrong Question*, "Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice" 1988, no. 2, pp. 47-68.
- Glinka B., *Przedsiębiorczość*, in: *Zarządzanie. Tradycja i nowoczesność*, eds. J. Bogdanienko, W. Piotrowski, PWE, Warszawa 2013, pp. 59-75.
- Glinka B., Gudkova S., *Przedsiębiorczość*, Wolters Kluwer, Warszawa 2011.
- Grey Ch., *Reinventing Business Schools: The Contribution of Critical Management Education*, "Academy of Management Learning & Education" 2004, 3/2, pp. 178-186.
- Gupta V., MacMillan I.C., Surie G., *Entrepreneurial Leadership: Developing and Measuring a Cross-Cultural Construct*, "Journal of Business" 2004, 19, pp. 241-260.
- Harris M.L., Gibson S.G., *Examining the Entrepreneurial Attitudes of US Business Students*, "Education + Training" 2008, 50(7), pp. 568-581.
- Hatch M.J., Kostera M., Koźmiński A.K., *The Three Faces of Leadership: Manager, Artist, Priest*, "Organizational Dynamics" 2005, 35/1, pp. 49-68.

- Hostager T.J., Decker R.L., *The Effects of an Entrepreneurship Program on Achievement Motivation. A Preliminary Study*, ed. SBIDA, San Francisco 1999, CA: Small Business Institute Director's Association (<<http://www.sbaer.uca.edu/Research/1999/SBIDA/sbi28.htm>>).
- Keh H.T., Foo M.D., Lim B.C., *Opportunity Evaluation under Risky Conditions: The Cognitive Processes of Entrepreneurs*, "Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice" 2002, 27(2), pp. 125-148.
- Kirzner I.M., *Competition and Entrepreneurship*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1973.
- Kolb D.A., *Experiential Learning Experience as a Source of Learning and Development*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey 1984.
- Kostera M., *Antropologia organizacji*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2005.
- Kostera M., *Organizacje i archetypy*, Wolters Kluwer, Warszawa 2010.
- Kostera M., *Organizować z polotem. Wyobrażenia organizacyjna w praktyce*, Wydawnictwo Sedno, Warszawa 2013.
- Kostera M., Śliwa M., *Zarządzanie w XXI wieku*, WAiP, Warszawa 2010.
- Koźmiński A.K., *Koniec świata menedżerów?*, WAiP, Warszawa 2008.
- Koźmiński A.K., *The New Revolution in Management Education?*, "Master of Business Administration" 2011, 4/111, pp. 2-6.
- Kwiatkowski S., *Przedsiębiorczość intelektualna*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2000.
- Kuratko D.F., *Entrepreneurial Leadership in the 21st Century*, "Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies" 2007, 13(4), pp. 1-11.
- Mattare M., *Teaching Entrepreneurship: The Case for an Entrepreneurial Leadership Course*, USASBE Proceedings 2008, pp. 78-93.
- Mazurek-Kucharska B., *Psychologiczne podstawy przedsiębiorczości: kompetencje, motywacja i decyzje młodego przedsiębiorcy*, <<http://www.lbs.pl/projekt/dobrepraktyki/files/artykuly/BeataMK.pdf>> (accessed at: 14.03.2014).
- McClelland D.C., *The Achieving Society*, The Free Press, New York 1961.
- Mills C.W., *Wyobrażenia socjologiczna*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1959/2007.
- Minniti M., Bygrave W., *A Dynamic Model of Entrepreneurial Learning*, "Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice" 2001, 25(3), pp. 5-16.
- Mintzberg H., *The Nature of Managerial Work*, Harper and Row, New York 1973.
- Organizować z polotem. Wyobrażenia organizacyjna w praktyce*, ed. M. Kostera, Wydawnictwo Sedno, Warszawa 2013.
- Paulhus D., *Sphere-Specific Measures of Perceived Control*, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology" 1983, 44, pp. 1253-1265.
- Postigo S., Iacobucci D., Tamborini M.F., *Undergraduate Students as a Source of Potential Entrepreneurs: A Comparative Study between Italy and Argentina*, Paper presented at the 2003 IntEnt conference, Grenoble 2003.
- Postuła A., *Warszawskie plemię: Team-building i szkolenia*, in: *Etnografia organizacji*, ed. M. Kostera, GWP, Gdańsk 2011, pp. 25-50.

- Robichaud Y., McGraw E., Roger A., *Toward the Development of a Measuring Instrument for Entrepreneurial Motivation*, "Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship" 2001, 6, 1, pp. 189-202.
- Roediger L.H., III, Weldon M.S., Challis B.H., *Explaining Dissociations between Implicit and Explicit Measures of Retention: A Processing Account*, in: *Varieties of Memory and Consciousness: Essays in Honor of Endel Tulving*, eds. L.H. Roediger, III, F.I.M. Craik, Hillsdale, Erlbaum, NJ 1989, pp. 3-41.
- Rotter J.B., *Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement*, "Psychological Monographs" 1966, 80, no. 609.
- Schramm C., *Expanding the Entrepreneur Class*, "Harvard Business Review" 2012, July–August, p. 40.
- Sexton D.L., Upton N.B., Wacholtz L.E., McDougall P.P., *Learning Needs of Growth Oriented Entrepreneurs*, "Journal of Business Venturing" 1997, 12 (1), pp. 1-8.
- Timmons J.A., *New Venture Creation: Entrepreneurship for the 21st Century*, Irwin, Chicago 1999.
- Tversky A., Kahneman D., *Availability: A Heuristic for Judging Frequency and Probability*, "Cognitive Psychology" 1973, 5 (2), pp. 677-695.
- Wieczorkowska G., Wierzbiński J., Michałowicz B., *Wyzwanie dla zarządzania edukacją: odmitologizowanie przyjmowanych bezrefleksyjnie założeń*, in: *Aktualne problemy zarządzania – teoria i praktyka*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe WZ UW, Warszawa 2012, pp. 63-79.