

- performance and financial performance: A stakeholder theory perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 32(2), 143–156.
- Sauer, D. A. (1997). The impact of social-responsibility screens on investment performance: Evidence from the domini 400 social index and domini equity mutual fund. *Review of Financial Economics*, 6(2), 137–149.
- Schröder, M. (2007). Is there a difference? The performance characteristics of SRI equity indices. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, 34(1–2), 331–348.
- Selekman, B., (1959). *A moral philosophy for business*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Sen, A. (1988). *On ethics and economics*. London, England: Blackwell.
- Shane, P., & Spicer, B. (1983). Market response to environmental information produced outside the firm. *Accounting Review*, 58(3), 521–538.
- Sharpe, W. F. (1964). Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk. *The Journal of Finance*, 19(3), 425–442.
- Simon, H. B. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1), 99–118.
- Simpson, W. G., & Kohers, T. (2002). The link between social and financial performance: Evidence from the banking industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 35(2), 97–109.
- Soppe, A. (2004). Sustainable corporate finance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53, 1–2, 213–224.
- Soskolne, C. (Ed.). (2007). *Sustaining Life on Earth*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Statman, M. (2000). Socially responsible mutual funds. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 56(3), 30–39.
- Swanson, D., (1995). Addressing a theoretical problem by reorienting the CSP model. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 43–64.
- Treynor, J. L., (1962). Toward a theory of market value of risky assets [unpublished manuscript]. A final version was published in 1999. In Robert A. Korajczyk (Ed.), *Asset Pricing and Portfolio Performance: Models, Strategy and Performance Metrics* (pp. 15–22). London, England: Risk Books.
- Ullmann, A. (1985). Data in search of a theory: A critical examination of the relationship among social performance, social disclosure, & economic performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 450–477.
- Waddock, S. A., & Graves, S. B. (1997). The corporate social performance-financial performance link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(4), 303–319.
- Wartick, S. L., & Cochran, P. L. (1985). The evolution of the corporate social performance model. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 758–769.
- Wokutch, R. E., & Spencer, B. A. (1987). Corporate saints and sinners: The effects of philanthropic and illegal activity on organizational performance. *California Management Review*, 24(2), 62–77.
- Wood, D. (1991). Corporate social performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 691–718.
- Wood, D. J., & Jones, R. E. (1995). Stakeholder mismatching: A theoretical problem in empirical research on corporate social performance. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 3, 229–267.
- Ziegler, A., & Schröder, M. (2009). What determines the inclusion in a sustainability stock index? A panel data analysis for European companies. *Ecological Economics*. Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Economics Working Paper 09/121.

CHAPTER 8

THE DARK SIDE OF THE ENTREPRENEUR

Aligning Dreams and Business Ideas Through Education

Rocco Agrifoglio, Paola Briganti, Concetta Metallo
University of Naples "Parthenope"

Lorenzo Mercurio
University of Cassino and Lazio Meridionale

How do entrepreneurs formulate a business? What affects the way they realize their business ideas? According to managerial literature, the idea that drives an entrepreneur could be influenced by several factors, such as personality, background and experience, emotions, cognitive psychological determinants of business ideas, and even company strategies. The literature is divided about which factors are most important in encouraging people to establish new entrepreneurial initiatives. Research aimed at understanding entrepreneurs is similarly inconclusive.

More generally, the determinants of entrepreneurs' attitudes and behaviors have been investigated by many scholars from various countries and

fields, with a view to explaining the phenomenon from different perspectives. For instance, Simpeh (2011) summarized previous research on the topic and identified six different theories used to explain the phenomenon. These were economic, psychological, sociological, anthropological, opportunity-based, and resource-based entrepreneurship theories. Here, we use a psychological perspective to overcome the problems of the traditional behavioral-cognitive approach. Some types of cognition are suitable for explaining entrepreneurs' attitudes and behaviors, and distinguishing them from other people, but this approach stresses the relevance of feelings, affect, emotion and passion in the entrepreneurship process. In particular, the psychoanalytic perspective enables us to explain the determinants of entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors. It stresses Freudian and Jungian views of dream interpretation, to help us understand how entrepreneurs convert their dreams into business ideas. Most psychoanalytic studies in organizational research have investigated how group dynamics, leadership, power dysfunctions, and emotional human subjectivity affect organizations (Fotaki, Long, & Schwartz, 2012). We, however, stress the psychoanalytic approach to explore mutual influences among dreams, business ideas and education.

Based on the Freudian and Jungian psychoanalytic theories on dreams, previous studies have investigated the conscious and unconscious processes of entrepreneurs and used them to explain how entrepreneurs formulate and implement their business ideas (Ulrich, 2007). Ulrich (2007) described organizations as the effect of conscious and unconscious entrepreneurial dreams. There are two main types of dreams. The first is day-dreams, which symbolize hopes and aspirations and define where people want to go. For entrepreneurs, this implies the direction in which their organization is headed. The other type of dream is the subconscious element, night-time dreams.

These dreams often deal with the implicit challenges we face and give our mind a way to ponder those challenges and concoct ways to deal with them through our dreams. So by analysing our nighttime dreams, we can begin to accomplish our daytime visions. (Ulrich, 2007, p. 1)

The relevance of the psychological perspective in explaining entrepreneurial business ideas has only recently been recognized in managerial literature. We believe, however, that the link between conscious and unconscious entrepreneurial processes and business idea development needs to be developed using this perspective, alongside a cognitive one. This study therefore emphasizes the key role of entrepreneurship education in helping entrepreneurs to realize their dreams, and encouraging awareness of their "dark" or unconscious side, as part of developing self-knowledge.

Education allows entrepreneurs to acquire specific abilities, skills, attitudes and orientation, which they need to succeed. Understanding the

role of education in entrepreneurs' dream-building is crucial to identifying training programs that allow potential entrepreneurs to express their inner goals. Business and management education often tends to create standardized targets that suppress creativity and the alignment between dream and entrepreneurial action.

The structure of this chapter is as follows. First, we introduce the theoretical background. In particular, after reviewing the different theoretical perspectives that explain how entrepreneurs formulate and realize their business ideas, we provide a psychoanalytic view of entrepreneurial dreams and emphasize the contribution of entrepreneurship education. We then describe the main features of the managerial and entrepreneurial education system, looking at specialized, rational and standardized commodity programs. We consider how spiritual education can help potential entrepreneurs to integrate conscious and unconscious aspects to improve their awareness and management of deeper characteristics and values that may help or hinder in the realization of their business dreams.

HOW DOES THE ENTREPRENEUR FORMULATE AND REALIZE HIS BUSINESS IDEA?

Defining the business idea, and explaining the factors leading towards its realization, is an interesting topic that has attracted the attention of many scholars from various disciplines. According to Normann (1977), a business idea is an aggregate of elements, such as products/services, knowledge, competencies, market, and technologies, which form a complex pattern. These elements come together to enable entrepreneurs to run the necessary business to deliver the idea. Grandi and Grimaldi (2005) separated the business idea into two characteristics, market attractiveness and idea articulation. The first is "the capacity of the business idea for looking attractive to potential customers, either because it appears to satisfy the requirements of an already existing market demand or because it shows the potential of creating a new one that are necessary" (Grandi & Grimaldi, 2005, p. 826). The second, instead, looks at the business idea as a predictor of new venture success. It considers "the degree of detail of the Business Idea and the extent to which it communicates effectively its mission and objectives" (Grandi & Grimaldi, 2005, p. 827). The authors suggested that both the market attractiveness and the articulation of the business idea are crucial in establishing new entrepreneurial initiatives. In the remainder of this study, we will focus on factors leading individuals to develop their business ideas.

The literature is divided on the factors leading people to establish new entrepreneurial initiatives. Scholars from different fields have focused on the determinants of entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors, contributing

to explaining the phenomenon from different perspectives. The entrepreneurial business idea could be influenced by several factors such as a new innovation, the cultural context, an opportunity that arises, and socio-psychological determinants. Simpeh (2011) identified six theories to explain the phenomenon. These are: (a) economic, (b) psychological, (c) sociological, (d) anthropological, (e) opportunity-based, and (f) resource-based entrepreneurship theories.

Economic entrepreneurship theories have focused on the economic factors that enhance entrepreneurial behavior. Both classical and neoclassical economic theories have shown the directing role of the entrepreneur in the production and distribution of goods in a competitive marketplace. The focus of these studies is mainly on rational resource allocation and efficiency-based performance, to improve profit. Another set of studies, known as the Austrian Market process, focused on human action in the context of an economy of knowledge (Schumpeter, 1934). Prices, market, innovation, competitors and customer behaviors provide a substantial source of information and thus of knowledge available to entrepreneurs. This knowledge enables them to create new goods or services, or to establish new initiatives. Entrepreneurs are therefore given an incentive to use episodic knowledge (that is, knowledge that may not have been seen before and will never be used again) to generate value. Building upon Schumpeterian thinking, the opportunity-based approach provides a wide-ranging conceptual framework for entrepreneurship research (Drucker, 1985; Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). This approach states that entrepreneurs do not cause change, but exploit the opportunities that change creates (Drucker, 1985). An entrepreneur is therefore someone who searches for change and exploits it as an opportunity. The opportunity is one of the motives that leads people to establish new entrepreneurial initiatives. The resource-based theory of entrepreneurship also argues that access to resources is the crucial factor in developing business ideas. This approach stresses that the founding of new firms is more common when people have access to financial, social and human resources (Aldrich, 1999).

The sociological entrepreneurship theory provides further explanation for the factors leading people to develop business ideas and establish new firms. This approach focuses on the social context relating to the entrepreneurial opportunity (Landstrom, 1998; Reynolds, 1991). The level of analysis under this theory is society, and the focus is on how society influences entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors. Social relationships, previous life experience, social background (such as ethnic group), and environmental factors (such as political system or regulation) are considered crucial 'push' factors in becoming an entrepreneur.

Another possible lens through which to view and interpret entrepreneurship is the anthropological theory of entrepreneurial behavior. This

focuses on the role of culture in determining human attitudes and behaviors. Mitchell and colleagues (2002) suggested that culture reflects particular ethnic, social, economic, ecological, and political complexities in individuals. Different cultural environments therefore produce different entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors (Shane & Eckhardt, 2003).

Finally, other contributions on this topic use the psychological entrepreneurship theories, emphasizing personal characteristics that define entrepreneurship. The level of analysis here is the individual. These studies therefore search for explanatory factors for human behavior in individual attitudes and beliefs. According to Simpeh (2011), personality traits, need for achievement, and locus of control are three of the most widely-used psychological theories in explaining individual entrepreneurial behavior. Personality traits are the habitual patterns of behavior, thought, and emotion characterizing an individual. Openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, and agreeableness are some of the most common personality traits identified in psychological literature.

Personality traits are the enduring inborn qualities (or potential qualities) of individuals that naturally make them into entrepreneurs. Different personality traits produce different behaviors. The idea of need for achievement is that human beings have a need to succeed, accomplish, excel or achieve (McClelland, 1961). According to this theory, entrepreneurs are driven by this need to achieve and excel. Finally, the locus of control refers to individual perceptions of the underlying causes of life events (Rotter, 1966). The locus of control has two parts: internal, when outcomes arise from our own behavior, and external, when outcomes arise from events outside our personal control. Entrepreneurial outcomes result from the entrepreneur's own abilities together with contingent external events.

Other recent research in the psychological field has adopted the psychoanalytic view to investigate the determinants of business ideas, emphasizing the role of cognitive processes in entrepreneurship (Baron, 1998, 2007; Baron & Ward 2004; Boucknooghe et al., 2005; Krueger, 2003; Mitchell et al., 2002; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000; Van den Broeck, Vanderheyden, & Cools, 2003). Unlike the earlier behaviourist approach (Skinner, 1953; Watson, 1924), these studies sought to explain entrepreneurial behavior by stressing the mental processes that occur as individuals interact with other people and their environment (e.g., Shane & Venkataraman, 2000; Mitchell et al., 2002). Cognitive style is the way an individual perceives environmental stimuli, and organizes and processes information and experience (Messick, 1984; Van den Broeck, Vanderheyden, & Cools, 2003). It influences how people look for information in their environment and how they interpret this information to guide their actions (Hayes & Allinson, 1998). Within organizations, cognitive style is a critical factor in determining individual and organizational attitudes and behaviors. It enables us to

WHAT BIG FIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS MADE STEVE JOBS AND BILL GATES SUCCESSFUL?

Openness refers to imagination and creativity of people. Individuals with high levels of openness are curious, open to emotion, and willing to try new things.

Conscientiousness concerns to self-discipline and acting responsibly. Conscientious people are generally more thoughtful, careful and tidy, and tend to plan ahead a task for doing it better.

Extraversion is the degree to which an individual is socially engaged with the external world. Extroverted people are generally friendly, enthusiastic and full energized when they have others around them.

Neuroticism, well known as emotional instability, is the degree to which an individual tends to negative feelings. Unlike emotional stable people, individuals with high degree of neuroticism are generally emotionally reactive and vulnerable to stress.

Agreeableness is the degree to which people tend to favor social harmony. Agreeable individuals are generous, helpful are strongly interested with others.

Please enter a brief description of Steve Jobs' and Bill Gates' attitudes and/or behaviors that may result from the following Big Five dimensions.

Dimensions	Characteristics	Steve Jobs	Bill Gates
Openness	Imaginative, curious, original		
	Dull, unimaginative, literal minded		
Conscientiousness	Careful, neat, dependable		
	Impulsive, careless, irresponsible		
Extraversion	Gregarious, energetic, self-dramatizing		
	Shy, unassertive, withdrawn		
Neuroticism	Stable, confident, effective		
	Nervous, self-doubting, moody		
Agreeableness	Warm, tactful, considerate		
	Independent, cold, rude		

Source: Hellriegel and Slocum, 2010.

explain why employees with similar abilities, knowledge, and skills perform in different ways (Sadler-Smith & Badger, 1998; Van den Broeck, Vanderheyden, & Cools, 2003). As Mitchell and colleagues (2002) suggested, the possession of information does not explain why some people become entrepreneurs and others are not able to discover and exploit entrepreneurial opportunities. In the entrepreneurial literature, cognition properties necessary to exploit information are recognized as crucial determinants of individual action (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Unlike previous studies on entrepreneurial cognition (Baron, 1998, 2007; Baron & Ward 2004; Boucknooghe et al., 2005; Krueger, 2003; Mitchell et al., 2002; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000; Van den Broeck, Vanderheyden, & Cools, 2003), however, this chapter uses the psychoanalytic perspective, and Freudian and Jungian views of dream interpretation, to understand how entrepreneurs convert their dreams into business ideas.

A PSYCHOANALYTIC VIEW OF THE ENTREPRENEUR'S DREAM

Although push factors to entrepreneurship can be analyzed from different perspectives, our research uses psychoanalytic theories to explain how entrepreneurs formulate business ideas. Previous research has focused on the complex "inner theatre" of entrepreneurs who have chosen to be treated through psychoanalysis (Kets de Vries, 1996). The continuity in observation provided by this type of treatment led to the identity of a number of psychoanalytically relevant characteristics common among entrepreneurs, and which are strongly linked to the successful development or failure of their early business ideas. These include need for control, sense of trust or distrust, desire for applause and appreciation, and primitive defensive mechanisms, such as splitting, denial, projection, flight into action (manic defence), and narcissistic reactions reflecting difficulties in the regulation of self-esteem (Kets de Vries, 1996). The behavior of entrepreneurs with specific psychoanalytic inner dynamics therefore appears to have a predictable cyclothymic quality (Greiner, 1997; Scott & Bruce, 1987).

Running a business is not necessarily a rational process. In many cases, in practice, the process appears to be a retrospective "rationalizing" of decisions already made unconsciously by the entrepreneur. It could therefore be interesting to analyze three psychoanalytic themes which affect most successful entrepreneurs: dreams (Freud, 1899), projections and archetypes (Jung, 1959).

Dreams are a narcissistic phenomenon, because they are linked to the most narcissistic of mental states—sleep. They therefore seem to be entirely intrapsychic, and of intrinsic interest only for analytic treatment. There are,

however, communicative elements within dreams and the behavioral effects of dreams that are very important for more than therapy. If we consider a dream as a tendency within the dreamer to establish contact with reality, in line with Freud's theoretical formulation of dream psychology (Freud, 1899), we can state that each individual unconsciously tends to transform their nocturnal dreams into reality during daily life. Individuals can therefore become aware of their most authentic and deepest desires through the psychoanalysis of these dreams (Kanzer, 1955).

Listeners or observers too can appreciate these unconscious aspects of dreams by analyzing the dreamer's actions during the day. These are deeply affected by unconscious nocturnal dream drivers: most behavior can be said to be guided by the unconscious mind through dreams (Kanzer, 1955).

These concepts were inspired by Freud and his theories about dreams. At the beginning of the 20th century, Freud said that people experience two atavistic impulses during night-time dreams. These impulses, which he called Eros and Thanatos, can be considered instincts of life and death. When conscious, individuals repress these impulses, often completely forgetting night-time dreams, because it is too difficult to integrate them into social intercourse. People therefore tend to project these impulses onto other individuals and objects (Freud, 1899).

Freud stated that desires are initially repressed, and that later leads to projection. There are two types of unconscious repression processes: initial and later. The initial repression is in response to libidinal demands (a tabooed intense wish for sexual fulfillment). Later repressions involve anxiety avoidance as a signal of an earlier situation of danger. It is these that lead to projection (Grunbaum, 2001). Adding to prior knowledge of the fundamental drivers, instincts, and efforts of human nature, on the basis of real clinical cases, Freud also explored the nature of these dynamic processes. He preferred to call these forces "dynamisms" rather than "mechanisms", because the second term, commonly used in psychoanalytic phraseology, did not sufficiently indicate their how they worked. Freud's thinking therefore led to the description of fundamental manifestations of human behavior commonly understood as, for example, "sublimation," "identification," "projection," "symbolization," and "displacement" (Healy, 1939).

Projection is the effect of repressing later desires and allows individuals to transfer onto an external subject or object the internal repressed forces. People therefore tend to attribute to these objects and subjects the internal repressed desires and characteristics that they do not give themselves permission to experience directly. If they could be conscious of these forces and integrate them into their subjective psychic reality, they would be able to develop different beliefs about themselves, other people, and the world. They would also feel able to experience different challenging emotions, thoughts and actions that they automatically transfer to others. They could

therefore produce original and innovative results (Freud, 1922, 1920, 1913, 1905, 1899).

A famous student of Freud, Carl Gustav Jung, added to the psychological theory of dreams and projections through examining archetypes and individual psychological orientation. This enabled him to describe possible causes and effects of unconscious processes in the mind (Jung, 1959, 1928). Archetypes and the collective unconscious were introduced by Jung in an earlier study about occult phenomena, and, in particular, in his analysis of the fantasies of an hysterical medium. His subsequent writings were a gradual and tentative reformulation of these original statements until he was able to develop a validated theory. This described specific archetypes with particular characteristics, which unconsciously operate within each individual, and, at the same time, affect the collective psyche as a whole (Jung, 1959).

Freud focused on personal unconsciousness, stating that it depends on personality and life experiences of individual. This gives increased significance to the functional process of subjective forgotten and repressed content. Jung described a deeper layer of the unconscious, called the collective unconscious. This does not derive from personal experience and acquisitions, but is universal rather than individual, in spite of the personal psyche. The collective unconscious is therefore inborn, and characterized by more or less the same content and modes of behavior in everyone (Jung, 1959).

Archetypes are elements of unconscious content. They are altered by becoming part of the conscious mind and by being perceived. They adopt different forms depending on the individual or group consciousness frameworks in which they happen to appear. They are therefore revealed and perceived by different consciousness elaboration structures and constructions: for example, we can think about dreams and visions, or about myths and esoteric symbols. Jung therefore articulated a difference between "archetypes" and "archetypal ideas." Archetypes are hypothetical and unrepresentable models at a metapsychology level, like patterns of behavior in biology. Archetypal ideas, however, are the conscious translation, interpretation, and pictures of archetypes in a superficial psychological layer, rather than the real, deep, elements of the archetype or the collective unconscious (Jung, 1959).

According to Jung, the unconscious is generally considered the source of evil thoughts, as it is the area controlling anger and sensual weakness, but this is only how the unconscious looks when observed from the conscious side. Following Freud's theories and many religious ideas, people imagine the unconscious as a ferocious beast, which gets trapped in a suffocating atmosphere of uncontrollable egocentric subjectivity, in a cavern of the psychic underworld. This, effectively, is what people see in a mirror. Reality is behind the mirror, and behind the actor's "mask," or "persona," which allows individuals to avoid integrating apparently negative hidden psychic

parts of themselves, projecting them onto the environment.¹ Individuals who recognize negative parts of themselves when they are projected outside can recover their personal unconscious dimension. People who tend to integrate these parts through an identification process can truly discover who they are, feel that the self is the world, and understand intuitively that the collective unconscious is the opening to the whole world, not an encapsulated system with no exit (Jung, 1969).

Finally, Jung stated that each individual can experience extroverted or introverted uses of psychic energy. They can tend towards the use of different primary and secondary psychological functions, which can cross each other through two levels: thought and feeling (primary functions), and sensing and intuition (secondary functions). People attempting to understand rational determinants and the effects of experience, who pay attention to visible and material details of situations, can be said to use thought and sensing functions. Individuals who immediately judge the positive or negative value of situations, based on insights, are using the feeling and intuition functions (Jung, 1969). This can explain differences in how individuals identify and discover personal and collective unconsciousness.

Some authors (e.g., Bowles, 1990, 1991; Denhardt, 1981) investigated the human issues that affect organizations, focusing on the role of deep

STEVE JOBS AND "DREAM BIGGER"

Steve Jobs can truly be said to have inspired others to dream bigger and think greater in every aspect of life and business. The CEO and co-founder of Apple and of Pixar Animation Studios, believed in dreaming big.

If you are working on something exciting that you really care about, you don't have to be pushed. The vision pulls you.

Steve Jobs was told over and over again that he would never achieve his dreams. His response was "Why not?" He triggered the imagination of his followers to show them a world in which they dreamt of living.

In Steve Jobs' Commencement Address to Stanford University's graduating class of 2005, he urged young graduates to pursue their dreams through the phrase, "Stay hungry! Stay foolish!"

Your time is limited, so don't waste it living someone else's life. Don't be trapped by dogma—which is living with the results of other people's thinking... And most important, have the courage to follow your heart and intuition. They somehow already know what you truly want to become.

Source: Steve Jobs's Commencement Address at Stanford University (June 12, 2005). Retrieved at <http://news.stanford.edu/news/2005/june15/jobs-061505.html>

psychological processes, and irrational forces in particular, in determining organizational action. The entrepreneurial process can be considered as the projection of the "dark" or unconscious side of entrepreneurs, through which they convert their dreams in business ideas.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

We think that an individual's dream of creating a firm should be considered the first stage of the entrepreneurial process. Bygrave (2003) described the entrepreneurial process as "all the functions, activities, and actions associated with perceiving opportunities and creating organizations to pursue them" (p. 2). Here, we focus on how entrepreneurship education can support entrepreneurs to realize their dreams, encouraging the process of projecting the "dark" or unconscious side of entrepreneurs.

Fayolle and colleagues (2006) defined entrepreneurship education as "any pedagogical [program] or process of education for entrepreneurial attitudes and skills" (p. 702), that is, education to develop entrepreneurial attitudes and skills. For example, entrepreneurship education offers courses that normally include the development of the business plan, idea protection, and sources of venture capital (e.g., Vesper & McMullen, 1988). According to Obisi, Gbajumo-Sheriff, and Uche (2003), education enables individuals to develop and acquire specific capabilities, skills, attitudes, knowledge and orientation, which entrepreneurs need.

Entrepreneurship education is growing rapidly in universities and colleges (Kuratko, 2005) because several scholars have shown that it is an important way to increase entrepreneurial attitudes (Potter, 2008) and develop more able entrepreneurs (e.g., Gorman, Hanlon, & King, 1997; Katz, 2007; Pittaway & Cope, 2007). There is great variety among universities on the nature, scope, and structure of entrepreneurial education. There are, for example, different types of entrepreneurship education targeted toward particular stages of the entrepreneurial process (Gorman, Hanlon, & King, 1997; Liñán, 2004, 2007). Liñán (2007) distinguished between education for awareness, education for start-up, continuing education for entrepreneurs, and education for entrepreneurial dynamism. Education for awareness is for students with no experience of starting a business, such as university-level programs. Education for start-ups would be centred on the specific practical aspects related to the start-up phase. These courses are usually selective. Continuing education for entrepreneurs would be a specialized version of adult education in general, designed to allow improvement of existing entrepreneurs' abilities (Weinrauch, 1984). Education for entrepreneurial dynamism would favour dynamic entrepreneurial behaviors after the start-up phase.

Many scholars have claimed that entrepreneurship can be taught, or at least encouraged, by entrepreneurship education (Chen, Greene, & Crick, 1998; Goran & Hanlon, 1997; Gorman, Hanlon, & King, 1997). However, there is little empirical evidence to support these claims and many studies have reported contrasting findings (Lorz, Volery, & Müller, 2011). Some studies found that entrepreneurship education had a positive impact on a variety of entrepreneurship outcomes (e.g., Fayolle, Gailly, & Lassas-Clerc, 2006; Tkachev & Kolvereid, 1999). For example, it encouraged entrepreneurs to start a business (e.g., Kolvereid & Moen, 1997), and influenced entrepreneurial perceptions and intentions (Bae, Qian, Miao, & Fiet, 2014; Galloway & Brown, 2002; Liñán, 2008; Martin, McNally, & Kay, 2013). Conversely, Oosterbeek and colleagues (2010) found that entrepreneurship education negatively affected entrepreneurial intentions to start a business. This negative impact of entrepreneurship education courses or programs on the intention to become an entrepreneur could be because of “a more realistic view of what is needed to start [one’s] own business” (Oosterbeek, Van Praag, & Ijsselstein, 2010, p. 452). Hills (1988) showed that “traditional academic programmes of entrepreneurship courses can “kill the dreams of students”, because they are based on disseminating knowledge and truth” (p. 113). Other studies have also shown that exposure to an entrepreneurship program can be negatively related to entrepreneurial performance (e.g., Honig & Karlsson, 2004). Unger and colleagues (2011) highlighted that knowledge and skills do not derive automatically or uniformly from human capital investments. Individuals of different innate capacities may enrol on the same course in entrepreneurship and extract different assets. Several studies have found that entrepreneurs’ family background affects the relationship between entrepreneurial education and intention to become an entrepreneur (e.g., Bae, Qian, Miao, & Fiet, 2014; Zellweger, Sieger, & Halter 2011). Bae and colleagues (2014) defined entrepreneurial family background as “those people whose parent(s) or family member(s) is (are) involved in self-employment” (p. 224). Studies examining the impact of family background on entrepreneurship have explored the extent to which having a parent who is self-employed can affect entrepreneurial propensity in offspring (Cooper & Dunkleburg, 1987; Duchesneau & Gartner, 1988). Zellweger and colleagues (2011) showed that entrepreneurship education has less effect on entrepreneurial intentions among students who come from such backgrounds.

Recent studies have investigated pre-education entrepreneurial intentions, focusing on the role of beliefs prior to enrolling in entrepreneurship courses (Bae, Qian, Miao, & Fiet, 2014; Oosterbeek, Van Praag, & Ijsselstein, 2010; von Graevenitz, Harhoff, & Weber, 2010). These studies have highlighted that entrepreneurship education cannot affect a student’s entrepreneurial intentions, but beliefs held before enrolling can play a key

role (Bae, Qian, Miao, & Fiet, 2014). In particular, Bae and colleagues (2014) showed that pre-course entrepreneurial intentions appeared to be a major source of inconsistent results in previous studies on the effects of entrepreneurial education and intention to start a business.

Pre-education entrepreneurial intentions, or rather beliefs and dreams, seem to be the strongest factor influencing the entrepreneurial process. The key issue is whether entrepreneurship education can support entrepreneurs to realize their dreams, encouraging the process of projecting the “dark” or unconscious side. We believe that entrepreneurial education can facilitate the conversion of dreams into business ventures but some entrepreneurship courses and certain teaching methods are more successful than others in preparing students for an entrepreneurial career. Entrepreneurship education could therefore be a crucial tool in the entrepreneurial process. Kuratko (2005) suggested that entrepreneurship, or certain facets of it, can be taught, or at least encouraged, by entrepreneurship education. The positive outcome of entrepreneurship courses could therefore be increased awareness of cognitions, feelings, and emotions, and an appropriate reflection on the unconscious experiences of life.

BUSINESS EDUCATION AND ENTREPRENEURIAL DREAMS: A COMPLICATED RELATIONSHIP

In the last few decades, there have been considerable attempts to update the content and methods of university and higher education. The current training system, however, according to Mintzberg, is still stuck in the models of 1908, adopting strategies from the 1960s (Chareanpunsirikul & Wood, 2002), and focused on standardization and homogenization in managerial and entrepreneurial practices and procedures.

The education system often suggests codified and explicit rules, and analytical and rational decision-making frames to solve highly-structured problems with a low level of urgency (Dane & Pratt, 2007; Sadler-Smith & Shefy, 2007). As a result, potential managers and entrepreneurs are driven to focus on gathering and analysis of hard data to solve problems in a rational way. However, for poorly structured and urgent problems, intuitive decision-making patterns are required (Klein, 2003).

The business educational system is influenced by three fundamental forces: the process of transformation of knowledge into specialist commodities wanted by companies to control the decision-making patterns of their employees; the commodification of knowledge implemented by schools to meet the needs of companies; and the expectation of participants in educational programs that they will improve their professional condition through higher earnings and job opportunities created by holding formal

certificates and diplomas. This approach leads training programs to give priority to standardized content, such as conflict management, negotiation techniques, and team building, led, in most cases, by profit maximization.

Some courses in recent years have included modules on ethics and sustainability, driven by a societal need for greater integrity among those with large economic and financial liability (Wankel & Stachowicz-Stanusch, 2012). It is evident, however, that this evolution in business education is still in its early stages. The education system tends not to take into account that subjective feelings and emotions are an important source of data for decision-making (Hogarth, 2001). These courses are therefore often ineffective for the development of the unconscious side, and risk alienating potential entrepreneurs from their inner dreams. To address the lack of attention in the traditional education system to deeper unconscious drivers, and help themselves move towards the realization of their dreams, potential entrepreneurs may move into the narrow trail between training paths that kill their dreams and those that try to transform and falsify the dreams. The first step is to become aware of personal unconscious drivers that will help the realization of the original business dream. This may be, for instance, through education paths that support development of spiritual integrity (Cashman, 1998). Cutcliffe (2008) stated that individuals end their awareness at surface thoughts about their cognitions, emotions and feelings. They stall at the tip of the iceberg of potential human perceptions, as Jung noted at the beginning of the last century. Lipton (2005) underlined that 95% of personal activities are unconscious and people are aware of just 5% of causes and consequences of their actions, relying primarily on cognitive perceptions.

To let entrepreneurial dreams become reality in a way that is healthy for entrepreneurs and for others, entrepreneurs can go deeper and explore the shadow side of the iceberg underlying their personal actions. This may be through participation in educational practices that are consistent with the latest findings on brain functioning, and enhance reflection on their unconscious experiences of life to develop a higher level of awareness of determinants, content and consequences of their actions. This will help to ensure that entrepreneurial dreams can be realized (Schwartz, Stapp, & Beauregard, 2005).

Education on spiritual integrity is focused on the recognition of personal unconsciousness and the development of awareness about personal transference dynamics and defence mechanisms. It goes beyond the traditional analysis of consciously perceived thoughts, emotions and sensations (De Vries & Miller, 1984). The most common techniques in the field of education on spiritual integrity are based on confrontation and awareness of subjective projections, designed to bring out entrepreneurs' unconscious experiences. Learners tend to develop awareness of their own moral

principles; consistency and uprightness of those moral principles in action; and understanding of the wholeness of themselves, the perception of integrity of their inner and outer personae (Pavlovich, 2012).

Dyer and Handler (1994) proposed a psychoanalytic model of entrepreneurship, stating that entrepreneurial personality characteristics are significantly affected by an entrepreneur's family and education. Entrepreneurs who faced poverty, insecurity and neglect in their family, perhaps through absent fathers, grew confused about their motives, goals and desires and showed irrational and impulsive reactions. They often perceived the world as hostile. Through formal education, they were able to develop a business orientation. Their personal need for control and to influence decision-making and employee activities in their own firms was a way to overcome their unconscious inner belief and feelings of being threatened. Other parents, however, encourage the entrepreneurial behaviors of their children through financial support or transfer of business experience, resulting in a nurturing climate based on an adequate education that favours entrepreneurial success (Dalton & Holdaway, 1989; McClelland, 1973). Even in managerial education systems, it is therefore desirable to help entrepreneurs to identify their unconscious motives. This makes possible to align dreams and business models, increase the level of awareness and therefore probably improve the entrepreneur's chances of success. The recent work of Hoyer and Steyaert (2015) provides an interesting point of view. "At the intersection between narrative and psychoanalytic theory", we can find tools to allow entrepreneurs to feel comfortable with their dreams and unconsciousness.

A way of explaining their dreams can therefore help potential entrepreneurs to deal with a more conscious development of their business ideas. Conscious entrepreneurs can improve their leadership skills and act in line with a higher level of spiritual integrity.

SUMMARY

This chapter has tried to explore how entrepreneurs formulate and realize their business ideas. The existing literature has developed different approaches to understanding the factors behind entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors. We have emphasized the psychoanalytic perspective, because it is recognized as more suitable for investigating individual action in a social context. This approach mainly focuses on cognitive style, as a critical factor in determining individual and organizational attitudes and behaviors. However, contrary to psychoanalytic research on entrepreneurial cognitive style, our study moves toward Freudian and Jungian thinking on dream interpretation, to understand the conscious and unconscious processes (or

“dark” side) of entrepreneurs, which may better explain how they develop their business ideas.

This chapter also linked the psychoanalytic perspective to education literature, to explain entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors. In particular, it emphasized the crucial role of education in the relationship between the entrepreneur’s dream and the business idea. We believe that the dream contributes to explaining the business idea through education. Entrepreneurship education plays a key role in the realization of entrepreneurs’ dreams by affecting the process of projecting the “dark” or unconscious side of entrepreneurs. Training programs focused on spiritual integrity could encourage awareness and management of unconscious drivers in potential entrepreneurs. This would enrich traditional entrepreneurial education systems, based mainly on rational decision-making and problem-solving issues.

NOTE

1. Jung preferred to call Freudian projection “introjections,” because he said that the human psyche introduced many dogmatic beliefs introduced by religion and environment, which gradually increase the despiritualization of nature, avoiding the natural talent that people have to recognize their personal unconscious and intuitively feel the collective unconscious.

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, H. E. (1999). *Organisations evolving*. London, England: SAGE.
- Bac, T. J., Qian, S., Miao, C., & Fiet, J. O. (2014). The relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions: A meta-analytic review. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(2), 217–254.
- Baron, R. A. (1998). Cognitive mechanisms in entrepreneurship: Why and when entrepreneurs think differently than other people. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, 275–294.
- Baron, R. A. (2007). Behavioral and cognitive factors in entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurs as the active element in new venture creation. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1–2), 167–182.
- Baron, R. A., & Ward, T. B. (2007). Expanding entrepreneurial cognition’s toolbox: Potential contributions from the field of cognitive science. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(6), 553–573.
- Bouckennooghe, D., Van den Broeck, H., Cools, E., & Vanderheyden, K. (2005). In search for the heffalump: An exploration of the cognitive style profiles among entrepreneurs. Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School Working Paper Series 4, Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School.
- Bowles, M. (1990). Recognizing deep structures in organizations. *Organizational Studies*, 13(3), 395–412.
- Bowles, M. (1991). The organization Shadow. *Organization Studies*, 12(3), 387–404.
- Bygrave, W. D. (2003). The entrepreneurial process. In W. D. Bygrave and A. Zacharakis (Eds.), *The Portable MBA in Entrepreneurship*, 3rd ed. (pp. 1–26). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Cashman, K. (1998). *Leadership from the inside out*. Minneapolis, MN: TCLG.
- Chareanpunsirikul, S., & Wood, C. (2002). Mintzberg, managers and methodology: Some observations from a study of hotel general managers. *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 551–556.
- Chen, C., Greene, P., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, 295–316.
- Cooper, A. C., & Dunkleburg, W. C. (1987). Entrepreneurial research: Old questions, new answers and methodological issues. *American Journal of Small Business*, 11(93), 219–234.
- Dalton, G. W., & Holdaway, F. (1989). Preliminary findings—entrepreneur study. Working paper. Brigham Young University, Utah, USA.
- Dane, E., & Pratt, M. G. (2007). Exploring intuition and its role in managerial decision making. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1), 33–54.
- De Vries, M. F. K., & Miller, D. (1984). *The neurotic organization: Diagnosing and changing counterproductive styles of management*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Denhardt, R. B. (1981). *In the shadow of Organization*. Lawrence, KS: Regent.
- Drucker, P. (1985). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Practice and Principles*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Duchesneau, D. A., & Gartner, W. B. (1988). A profile of new venture success and failure in an emerging industry. In Kirchhoff, B.A. et al (Eds.), *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* (pp. 372–386). Wellesley, MA: Babson College.
- Dyer, W. G., & Handler, W. (1994). Entrepreneurship and family business: Exploring the connections. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 19, 71–71.
- Fayolle, A., Gailly, B., & Lassas-Clerc, N. (2006). Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes: A new methodology. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(9), 701–720.
- Fotaki M., Long S., & Schwartz H. S. (2012). What can psychoanalysis offer organization studies today? Taking stock of current developments and thinking about future directions. *Organization Studies*, 33(9), 1105–1120.
- Freud, S. (1899). *L'interpretazione dei sogni—Opere Vol. III* [The Interpretation of Dreams, Vol. III]. Boringhieri, Torino, 1966.
- Freud, S. (1905). *Tre saggi sulla teoria sessuale—Opere Vol. IV* [Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality, Vol. IV]. Boringhieri, Torino, 1970.
- Freud, S. (1913). *Totem e tabù—Opere Vol. VII* [Totem and Taboo]. Boringhieri. Torino, 1975.
- Freud, S. (1920). *Al di là del principio di piacere—Opere Vol. IX* [Beyond the Pleasure Principle]. Boringhieri, Torino, 1977.
- Freud, S. (1922). *L'io e l'Es—Opere Vol. IX* [The Ego and the Id]. Boringhieri, Torino, 1977.
- Galloway, L., & Brown, W. (2002). Entrepreneurship education at university: A driver in the creation of high growth firms? *Education and Training*, 44, 398–404.

- Gorman, G., & Hanlon, D. (1997). Some research perspectives on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education and education for small business management: A ten-year literature review. *International Small Business Journal*, 15(3), 56–78.
- Gorman, G., Hanlon, D., & King, W. (1997). Some research perspectives on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education and education for small business management: A ten-year literature review. *International Small Business Journal*, 15(3), 56–79.
- Grandi, A., & Grimaldi, R. (2005). The effects of academic research groups' organisational characteristics on the generation of successful business idea. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20, 821–845.
- Greiner, L.E. (1997). "Evolution and revolution as organizations grow. 1972." *Harvard Business Review*, 76(3), 55–60.
- Grunbaum, A. (2001). Does Freudian Theory Resolve "The Paradoxes of Irrationality"? *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 62(1), 129–143.
- Hayes, J., & Allinson, C. W. (1998). Cognitive style and the theory and practice of individual and collective learning in organizations. *Human Relations*, 51, 847–871.
- Healy, W. (1939). Psychoanalytic Contributions to the Understanding and Treatment of Behavior Problems. *American Journal of Sociology*, 45(3), 418–425.
- Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. (2010). *Organizational behavior*. Nashville, TN: South Western Educational.
- Hills, G. E. (1988). Variations in University Entrepreneurship Education: An Empirical Study of an Evolving Field. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 3, 109–122.
- Hogarth, R. M. (2001). *Educating intuition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Honig, B., & Karlsson, T. (2004). Institutional forces and the written business plan. *Journal of Management*, 30, 29–48.
- Hoyer, P. & Steyaert, C. (2015). Narrative identity construction in times of career change: Taking note of unconscious desires. *Human Relations*. Retrieved from <http://hum.sagepub.com/content/68/12/1837>
- Jung, C. G. (1959). *The archetypes and collective unconscious*. New York, NY: Bollingen Foundation Inc..
- Jung, C. G. (1928). *Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Ich und dem Unbewussten* [The relations between the ego and the unconscious], (trans. di Vita A., 1948). *L'io e l'Inconscio*, Boringhieri, Torino.
- Jung, C.G. (1969). *On the Nature of the Psyche: From Collected Works Vol. 8* (posthumous publication Jung Extracts). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kanzer, M. (1955). The Communicative Function of the Dream. *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 36, 260–266.
- Katz, J. A. (2007). Education and training in entrepreneurship. In J. R. Baum, M. Frese, & R. A. Baron (Eds.). *The psychology of entrepreneurship* (209–235). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1996). The Anatomy of the Entrepreneur: Clinical Observations. *Human Relations*, 49(7), 853–883.
- Klein, G. (2003). *Intuition at work*. New York, NY: Currency/Doubleday.
- Kolvereid, L., & Moen, Ø. (1997). Entrepreneurship among business graduates: Does a major in entrepreneurship make a difference? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 21(4), 154–160.
- Krueger, N. F. Jr. (2003). The cognitive psychology of entrepreneurship. In Z. A. Acs & D. B. Audretsch (Eds.), *Handbook of entrepreneurial research* (pp. 105–140). London, England: Kluwer Law International.
- Kuratko, D. F. (2005). The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(5), 577–598.
- Landstrom, H. (1998, November). *The Roots of Entrepreneurship Research*. Conference proceedings, Lyon, France.
- Liñán, F. (2004). Intention-based models of entrepreneurship education. *Piccola Impresa/Small Business*, 3, 11–35.
- Liñán, F. (2007). The role of entrepreneurship education in the entrepreneurial process. In A. Fayolle (Ed.), *Handbook of research in entrepreneurship education* (230–247). Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.
- Liñán, F. (2008). Skill and value perceptions: How do they affect entrepreneurial intentions? *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 4(3), 257–272.
- Lipton, B. (2005). *Biology of belief: Unleashing the power of consciousness, matter and miracles*. Carlsbad, CA: Hay House.
- Lorz, M., Volery, T., & Müller, C.A. (2011). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intention (Doctoral dissertation). The University of St. Gallen, Switzerland.
- Martin, B. C., McNally, J. J., & Kay, M. J. (2013). Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(2), 211–224.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D. C. (1973). Testing for competence rather than for intelligence. *American psychologist*, 28(1), 1.
- Messick, S. (1984). The nature of cognitive styles: Problems and promises in educational practice. *Educational Psychologist*, 19, 59–74.
- Mitchell, R. K., Busenitz, L., Lant, T., McDougall, P. P., Morse, E. A., & Smith, B. (2002). Toward a theory of entrepreneurial cognition: Rethinking the people side of entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 27, 93–104.
- Mitchell, R. K., Smith, J. B., Morse, E. A., Seawright, K. W., Peredo, A., & McKenzie, B. (2002). Are entrepreneurial cognitions universal? Assessing entrepreneurial cognitions across cultures. *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 26(4), 9–33.
- Normann, R. (1977). *Management for growth*. Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Obisi, C., Gbajumo-Sheriff, M., & Uche, C. B. N. (2003). Human resource development and preservation: Implications for economic growth. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 5(2), 414.
- Oosterbeek, H., Van Praag, M., & Ijsselstein, A. (2010). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. *European Economic Review*, 54(3), 442–454.

- Pavlovich K. (2012). Management education for developing spiritual integrity. In C. Wankel & A. Stachowicz-Stanusch (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching ethics in business and management education* (pp. 100–113). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). Entrepreneurship education: A systematic review of the evidence. *International Small Business Journal*, 25, 479–510.
- Potter, J. (2008). Entrepreneurship and higher education: Future policy directions. *Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED)*, 313–335.
- Reynolds, P. D. (1991). Sociology and entrepreneurship: Concepts and contributions. *Entrepreneurship, Theory, & Practice*, 16(2), 47–70.
- Rotter, J. (1966). Generalised expectancies for internal versus external control reinforcements. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, Whole No. 609.
- Sadler-Smith, E., & Badger, B. (1998). Cognitive style, learning and innovation. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 10(2), 247–266.
- Sadler-Smith E., & Shefy E. (2007). Developing Intuitive Awareness in Management Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(2), 186–205.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*, Redvers Opie. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schwartz, J., Stapp, H., & Beauregard, M. (2005). Quantum physics in neuroscience and psychology: A neurophysical model of mind-brain interaction. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 360(1458), 1309–1327.
- Scott, M., & Bruce, R. (1987). Five stages of growth in small business. *Long range planning*, 20(3) 45–52.
- Shane, S. A., & Eckhardt, J. T. (2003). Opportunities and Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3), 333–349.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226.
- Simpheh, K. N., (2011). Entrepreneurship Theories and Empirical Research: A Summary Review of the Literature. *European Journal of Business Management*, 3(6), 1–8.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Stevenson, H. H., & Jarillo, J. C. (1990). A Paradigm of Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 17–27.
- Tkachev, A., & Kolvereid, L. (1999). Self employment intentions among Russian students. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 11(3), 269–280.
- Unger, J. M., Rauch, A., Frese, M., & Rosenbusch, N. (2011). Human capital and entrepreneurial success: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(3), 341–358.
- Van den Broeck, H., Vanderheyden, K., & Cools, E. (2003). Individual differences in cognitive styles: Development, validation, and cross validation of the cognitive style inventory. *Vlerick Leuven Gent Working Paper Series*, 2003/27, 1–31.
- Vesper, K. H., & McMullan, W. E. (1988). Entrepreneurship: Today courses, tomorrow degrees? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 13(1), 7–13.
- Von Graevenitz, G., Harhoff, D., & Weber, R. (2010). The effects of entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 76(1), 90–112.
- Wankel C., & Stachowicz-Stanusch, A. (2012). Teaching business ethics in an epoch of catastrophes. In C. Wankel & A. Stachowicz-Stanusch (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching ethics in business and management education* (pp. 1–14). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Watson, J. B. (1924). *Behaviorism*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Weinrauch, J. D. (1984). Educating the entrepreneur: Understanding adult learning behavior. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 22(2), 32–37.
- Zellweger, T., Sieger, P., & Halter, F. (2011). Should I stay or should I go? Career choice intentions of students with family business background. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(5), 521–536.