

FUTURE TRENDS IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION: RE-VISITING BUSINESS CURRICULA

Saurav Pathak, Kansas State University

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurship education and pedagogy (EEP) has come a long way over the past two decades. The mindset of entrepreneurship students has changed along with, and is bound to continue to change further. Hence, there is need to revisit our current business curricula and adapt EEP to meet the current and future expectations of our entrepreneurship students. We can do so by identifying recent trends and what the future is likely to look like for entrepreneurship education. This study will point to some of those recent trends and offer best-practice suggestions when designing courses, programs or curricula in entrepreneurship. In particular, implications of: (1) the plausibility of incumbent business organizations and entrepreneurial start-ups likely to look similar in the future, (2) the thought process of our current generation of students, (3) the benefits of citizenship behavior toward sustaining entrepreneurial universities, (4) the value in exposing our students to non-traditional jobs and (5) the evaluation of emotional intelligence of students-on EEP will be discussed in this article.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship Education, Pedagogy, Entrepreneurial Mindset, Experiential Learning, Curriculum Development, Evaluating Emotional Intelligence.

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship education and pedagogy (EEP) started with one course taught at Harvard University way back in 1947 (Katz, 2003). Over the last 71 years EEP has come a long way and is now taught at over 3,000 institutions across the globe (Morris & Ligouri, 2016). This can be attributed to the surge in self-employment and the benefits it had on economic development, that more and more institutions saw a value in imparting entrepreneurship education (EE) and training a workforce that could continue to reap benefits from new venture creation. Highlighting the importance of entrepreneurship to economic prosperity through EEP has come at price—it grew at such rapid pace that it outpaced our own understanding of what need to be taught, or even, how to teach it (Morris & Ligouri, 2016). To preserve the effectiveness and value of EEP, it must align with the expectations of current generation of entrepreneurship students, appeal to their mindset, make adaptations to curricula and teaching techniques, and respond to current and future trends. This article will reconcile these suggestions to offer practice-oriented recommendations for EEP based upon:

1. The plausibility of incumbent business organizations and entrepreneurial start-ups likely to look similar in the future.
2. The thought process of our current generation of students.
3. The benefits of citizenship behavior toward sustaining entrepreneurial universities.
4. The value in exposing our students to non-traditional jobs.
5. The need to evaluate of emotional intelligence of students.

The article does not promise to make theoretical contributions in EEP literature, rather highlights some future trends and offers adaptations that could be implemented in courses,

programs or curricula by instructors and academic institutions across the globe and is based upon personal experiences as an instructor in a business school in USA. As such, the recommendations offered are generic and are not limited to specific contexts like country, types of institutions, etc.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In the next sections, each of the points mentioned above will be discussed exclusively and corresponding recommendations for EEP will be offered. The conclusion section will be presented thereafter.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Diminishing Differences between Business Organizations and Start-Ups

More and more business organizations are starting to become entrepreneurial. Conservative firms, even, are making it their mission to augment their entrepreneurial intensities and promote a culture of creativity and innovation. Google's model of a 70-20-10 rule to promote continuous innovation (Steiber & Alange, 2013), or models of continuous innovation implemented by Facebook, Tesla, etc., are becoming increasingly popular with other organizations of all sizes. There is a steady shift in organizational culture wherein the spirit of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship is looked upon as good qualities. It is therefore not a stretch to imagine that in a decade's time, the so called "*start-ups*" and "*incumbent business organizations*" will start to look very similar in terms of the entrepreneurial orientation. This will have implications for EEP.

Current generation of entrepreneurship students continually report that subsequent to their graduation, they would wish to work for firms that provide them with freedom of creative thinking and encourage innovation, before they start their own ventures later in their careers. Only a very small percentage of students start their own businesses immediately after graduating from college. Majority would work and gain industry experience prior to launching an entrepreneurial venture. It is widely observed of undergraduate students in entrepreneurship curricula that they take up traditional jobs upon graduation, yet there is a preference for the type of firms they would want to work for. As such, curricula in entrepreneurship should not just impart fundamental teaching of entrepreneurship related concepts but find ways to integrate theories of organizational behavior, strategic management, human resource management, leadership effectiveness, etc. This would help entrepreneurship students not only if and when they decide to start their own firms, but also be successful as long as they work for other business organizations. The converse scenario is also valuable. Academic institutions offering degree programs in general management, should find ways to incorporate courses or modules on EE. This would help students in general business curricula in their careers at not only relatively more traditional firms but also at other firms whose entrepreneurial intensities are higher.

Thought Processes and Mindset of Current Generation of Entrepreneurship Students

Any educational program or curricula is effective if it is tailored to meet the expectations of students who partake in it. It must be relatable and appealing to students involved. The definition of an appealing business curricula has evolved over time. Specific to EEP, the mindset and entrepreneurial intentions of entrepreneurship students have changed over the decades. Hence the corresponding curricula must evolve as well to be contemporaneous with the thought processes of entrepreneurship students.

In that regard, business students today have a strong sense of morality—the ability to

separate right from wrong. Current global political turmoil or observed unethical practices by corporate entities as Wells Fargo, Volks Wagon, etc., in recent years (Matthews & Matthew, 2016), speaks volumes to them, they are left to feel failed by their political and business leaders. This comes as no surprise to see the enthusiasm with which these students continually participate in “*ethics and leadership case competitions*” and come up with remarkable recommendations for fixing these issues. For them, their well-being as well as of others, are no longer limited to merely establishing and developing economic well-being, rather human and environmental well-beings as well. As such, it is fair to say that they have strong sustainability values. Regardless of whether they have ambitions to work for business organizations or start a venture of their own, this seems to be a common disposition among our business school students. This mindset of our current generation of business students, including entrepreneurship students, should be the basis behind the design and delivery of EE.

Courses could be designed such that they include teaching the development of sustainability conditions through effective leadership, entrepreneurship and ethical practices are relevant in this regard. In this regard, a SEELS model for pedagogy in sustainability is proposed (SE: Social Entrepreneurship; E: Ethics; L: Leadership; S: Sustainability). The proposed model could be taught using a module-based approach. Module 1 could introduce students to the basic concepts, definitions, terminologies, operationalizations, etc., of sustainability and acknowledge the fact that sustainability values (held at either the individual-level or at the societal-level) does not automatically translate to the establishment and thereafter the development of sustainability conditions. Identifying keys drivers that enables crossing this chasm is therefore imperative. The next three modules could discuss extensively about three key drivers of sustainability values for creating and developing sustainability conditions.

Module 2 could help identify the definitions of social entrepreneurship (SE) and highlight the role of SE in establishing sustainability conditions. SE, as a business philosophy, moves beyond social, economic, and environmental efficiency and shifts toward effectiveness, thereby contributing to business sustainability. Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector by adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value) and recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission. Hence, at a very fundamental level and in an attempt to appeal to the intentions, mindsets and values of current generation of entrepreneurship students, our curricula and courses should inculcate the motivations of becoming entrepreneurs as not just for personal utility maximization or merely making economic impact, but also of obtaining long term societal impact. Discussions can be extended on an emerging form of entrepreneurship, that of transformational entrepreneurship (TE)-a conceptualization of entrepreneurship that bears relevance given what and how our current generation of entrepreneurship students think. TE is that form of entrepreneurship that seeks to maximize both economic impact alongside long-term societal impact. Hence, its role in maximizing economic as well as sustaining societal impact sets it apart from previously conceptualized forms of entrepreneurship, something which we are only beginning to understand. TE entails approaching problems systematically, addressing and treating root cause, unlocking human potential and seeking to empower people, improving people’s relationships, ensuring that people learn from each other, and in doing all these creating more value than it can capture.

Module 3 could highlight the role that ethics plays in achieving sustainability conditions. A commitment to ethical behavior is often shown in the corporate social responsibility (CSR) policy of a business. Businesses are no longer judged solely on their ability to deliver goods and

services but also on the manner of delivery and how they impact on society and the environment. While this is true, the module could also allude to the fact that it is not just business entities that are responsible or contribute toward sustainability, rather the onus is on each and every individual too. Hence, this module could also discuss about several types of ethics—behavioral, normative, cognitive (moral ethics such as unselfishness, etc.), and regulatory (public sector ethics, etc.)—and how might each type of ethic enable the development of sustainability conditions in a society.

Module 4 could highlight the importance of leadership for sustainability. This module would offer new and expanded understanding of leadership that signifies taking action based on sustainability values, leading from a living processes paradigm, and creating an inclusive, collaborative and reflective leadership process. Specifically, this module would recognize the gradual rise in the effectiveness of collective leadership style for sustainability conditions—that is based on:

- a) Pursuing shared goals based on firmly held core values.
- b) Shared decision-making.
- c) Setting standards of performance.
- d) Exchanging roles.
- e) Empathy.

Combined, the effectiveness of these attributes of leadership for sustainability would be discussed. This module could conclude with a discussion of the role that diversity inclusion plays in development of sustainability conditions. The list of contents for the proposed course are shown in Appendix 1 for reference. Instructors could adopt all or portions of the proposed contents in their syllabi at their respective institutions.

Inculcating Citizenship Behavior in Entrepreneurial Universities

The shifting focus on the knowledge and service economies exercise pressures on universities impacting how they are perceived in communities. Universities are responding by embracing a more entrepreneurial outlook and employing mechanisms that enables seamless integration with societies that feeds into the notion of entrepreneurial universities (Ferreira et al., 2018). Entrepreneurial universities emerge by going through three distinct stages (Etzkowitz, 2013). The first stage includes embracing an entrepreneurial mindset and setting objectives that declare them as autonomous entities and diminish reliance on external agents including those from governments. As Ratten (2017) points out that this represents a strategic shift from universities' typical and overt reliance on traditional sources of support, such as government support, etc., to identifying newer, non-traditional stakeholders and external sources of support including those of resources and funding. Stage two involves universities utilizing their intellectual property for commercial reasons. Entrepreneurial universities, in this regard, separate themselves from the traditional ones in that they act more like businesses wherein intellectual properties generated by them are looked upon as potential for commercialization so that they capture value for the university while also delivering value to the society. This means that universities will establish mechanisms such as technology transfer offices (TTO) and centers of entrepreneurship (CoE), etc. Finally, stage three involves universities linking into their community more to bridge the gap between academia and practice. This helps to build a sense of rapport between the university and the broader community. Universities that act entrepreneurially are able to transform the businesses and lives of people in the community (Ratten, 2017). Combined therefore, it can be safely assumed that entrepreneurial universities

have synergistic relationships among their various constituents and that they operate as an entrepreneurial ecosystem. The question then becomes, what factors assure that the establishment of a university entrepreneurial system is sustainable. The author suggests that we find answers in the concept of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Katz, 1964; Organ, 1988). Organ (1988) defines OCB as "*individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization*". Central to this construct are three critical aspects. First, OCBs are thought of as discretionary behaviors, which are not part of the job description, and are performed by the employee as a result of personal choice. Second, OCBs go above and beyond that which is an enforceable requirement of the job description. Finally, OCBs contribute positively to overall organizational effectiveness. This concept can be extended to the context of entrepreneurial universities and their sustainability, wherein all constituents, regardless of their levels of direct or indirect involvements in the eco-system should embrace citizenship behaviors. Such behaviors will have implications for EEP in general and across the three stages entailed in the creation of entrepreneurial universities in particular, which is what the author will discuss next.

Stage one concerns universities embracing and promoting entrepreneurial mindsets. While the mission, vision and strategic goals of universities are typically chalked out by those in leadership roles, the widespread effects of such decisions take time before it impacts the rest of the constituents. It is easy then for entities not directly involved in entrepreneurship on campuses, in one form or the other, to start getting detached from the initial impetus. Educators in entrepreneurship need to display citizenship behavior by reaching out to these other constituents to continually refresh them of the universities' entrepreneurial mindset. On the other hand, educators from those departments that are typically under-represented in entrepreneurship related courses, yet who recognize the benefits of entrepreneurship education, should embrace citizenship behavior and encourage their students to go take courses in entrepreneurship. Often there are turf wars over the amount of funding that each department receives based on enrollments, retention of students within the department, etc., In spite of that, departments and educators alike, must spread the word to their respective students about opportunities in entrepreneurship education on campus. When that starts to happen, EEP would benefit significantly through diversity in classrooms, exchange of ideas and the proliferation of entrepreneurial mindset throughout a given university campus.

Stage two concerns protecting intellectual properties generated within universities followed by their commercialization. There are mechanisms in the form of TTO and CoE to achieve this. These entities should display citizenship behaviors in that they could volunteer their time and allocate portions of their resource strictly for student developmental and training programs. For example, at author's institution, the TTO offers an internship program for entrepreneurship students wherein students are exposed to the entire sequence of steps involved in the commercialization process. Programs such as these would be great value addition in EEP wherein students learn first-hand about the commercialization such that when they would too, at some point in their lives, either made their own inventions or assisting someone else's, would be in a great position to be able make the head start in traversing through the steps of commercialization. Further, such programs complement classroom teaching on commercialization.

We teach general concepts in courses on entrepreneurship. In the personal experience of the author, and as others may agree as well, there are students taking such courses from all across

campus, for example it is not surprising to see students from engineering, human ecology, arts, agriculture, veterinary medicine, sociology, architecture, apparel and textiles, etc., departments to be in the same class. While the general concepts of entrepreneurship could be imparted in such settings, designing effective experiential modules that relate to these myriads of fields is quite challenging. To be able to ensure effective discipline-based experiential learning in EEP, universities need to identify community members, within their eco-systems, who are entrepreneurs in their own rights in each of these fields. Members need to display citizenship behaviors, going above and beyond their roles to be able to interact frequently with students with backgrounds and interests that match their own. A mentor-mentee relationship, where community entrepreneurs are invested in students and are willing to share their experiences and offer advice on each of the steps of the entrepreneurial journey, specific to a given field, will be invaluable experiential learning for our students. Further, through such interactions, students may view these entrepreneurs as their role models thereby motivating emulating them. This concerns stage three in the creation of entrepreneurial universities, further bridging the gap between business and practice. Universities need to devise better ways to assure such pairings.

Exposure to Non-Traditional Jobs

Another favorable consequence of establishing entrepreneurial eco-system within a university is the exposure that students get about non-standard forms of employment. These are non-traditional jobs or careers that students may have previously been unaware of. As Ratten (2017) points out that stage two of building entrepreneurial universities involves universities utilizing their intellectual property for commercial reasons. As such, universities have entities that ensure to employ suitable mechanisms for the commercialization of intellectual properties. These entities could be the Technology Transfer Office (TTO), Institute of Commercialization, Patenting Office, Office of Sponsored Research, University-Industry liaison office, Licensing office, etc. Different universities associate different names to these entities, yet their central objective is fundamentally the same—that of protecting intellectual properties developed in a university by obtaining patents and subsequently finding “road-to-market” for their commercialization through identification of partners to whom to license the patented intellectual property.

The presence of these entities on campus provides great opportunities for experiential learning by involving them in entrepreneurship courses. For example, by engaging officers/staffs from university’s licensing office (the Technology Transfer Office) as guest speakers in entrepreneurship courses, or by organizing workshops and seminars specifically on the topic of technology entrepreneurship or technology and innovation management, etc., or by scheduling student trips to these offices, we could provide opportunities for students to familiarize themselves with the patent search process such as searching for patents, maneuvering through them, understanding key components of any patent, identifying key factors that enable the selection of licensees and framing licensing contracts, etc. They would learn about how industry-university partners at universities collaborate with the TTO and how these officers seek to identify licensing partners, create a route-to-market for breakthrough technologies invented on campus. By partnering with the office of sponsored research or equivalent entities, entrepreneurship courses could also ensure that students learn about processes entailing the application of grants from government or private organizations, etc. Such relationships between entrepreneurship courses has the potential to create awareness and stir student interests in non-traditional form of employment such as considering a career as a patent officer with United

States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) or any equivalent entity in a given country, commercialization officer in Technology Transfer Offices at Universities, or in Research and Development department of high-tech firms, etc., Students would have not considered these career paths traditionally. Introducing them to people involved in the commercialization process on the university campus could see student interests in pursuing these lesser known jobs that are truly entrepreneurial in their spirit. As instructors, it is upon us to make our students aware of relatively lesser known professional career options.

Technology is one of the most financially under-utilized assets in the private or public sectors. Effective technology management and advancement can produce technological products in the form of licenses, or rights to use, that can be sold repeatedly resulting in a continual stream of income. It could also produce one of the few articles of commerce for which governments provide and sanction monopoly rights for an extended period. As an instructor of innovation and entrepreneurship, one observes this current trend where our students are attracted to new technologies or are motivated to create new technologies of their own. These non-traditional careers would be a mean by which our entrepreneurship students would continue to be on the path of interaction and problem-solving experiences in evaluating new technology ideas for their commercialization potentials—aspects of entrepreneurship that students are attracted to begin with.

Evaluating Emotional Intelligence of Students

Finally, understanding and evaluating the psychology of entrepreneurship students, while they are at school is also important. We seldom disburse time and effort to measure the emotional abilities of our students and hence overlook the significance of the role that emotional well-being plays in shaping student careers. We want our students to be psychologically fit before they set foot into their professional careers. In this regard, Shepherd (2004) proposed that *“As theory develops and increases our understanding of the role of emotion in learning from failure, entrepreneurship educators have the opportunity to reflect these advancements in their pedagogies. This requires a focus on how students “feel” rather than on how, or what they “think”*”. He goes on to suggest changes to pedagogy to help students manage the emotions of learning from failure by improving their emotional intelligence (EI). Evaluation of EI would allow us to gauge students’ emotional competencies to cope from the stress and negative emotions, should their start-ups fail if and when they would have started one in their lives. The benefits of evaluating EI of students stretches beyond just their emotional competencies to cope from failure.

EI covers individual differences in emotional capabilities, both intrapersonal (e.g. stress management) and interpersonal (e.g. perceiving emotions) and how they perceive, express, understand, and manage emotional phenomena. Extant literature defines it through three main models:

1. Ability model (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).
2. Trait model (Petrides & Furnham, 2000).
3. Mixed model (Goleman, 1998).

For this study, we propose to focus on ability and trait EI models and describe how they link with EB. Under the purview of ability EI model we examine four key aspects as proposed by Co[^]te (2014)

1. Perceiving and expressing emotions—ability to identify and process emotional information either in self or

others.

2. Using emotions-ability to harness emotions to guide cognitive activities and solve problems.
3. Understanding emotions-ability to analyze the cause and effect relations between events and emotions.
4. Regulating emotions-ability to select emotion regulation strategies (also called emotion regulation knowledge).

For trait EI, we examine four key aspects of individual's self-perceptions of emotional abilities that encompass behavioral dispositions as proposed by Petrides & Furnham (2000):

1. Well-being—generalized sense of positivity, happiness and fulfilment extending from past achievements to future expectations.
2. Sociability—degree to which individuals establish social interactions, social relationships and exercise social influence.
3. self-control—degree to which individuals have control over urges and desires.
4. Emotionality—degree to which individuals believe that they have a wide range of emotion-related skills.

EI has also been linked to several other facets of career-related actions—for example, career choice (Emmerling & Cherniss, 2003), career commitment and the entailing decision-making processes (Brown et al., 2003), career adaptability (Coetzee & Harry, 2014), career success (Goleman, 1995), Individual's EI serves as a crucial psychosocial meta-capacity for successful adaptation in various spheres of life (Jain, 2012), including the realm of careers (Puffer, 2011) and related choices and decision-making. The theory of human and psychological capital and renders EI as a resource that aides the guidance of career-selection/decision-making process. The role of emotion in the construction of a career and career development is further highlighted in the action theory (Young & Valach, 2008) which posits that career is constructed through everyday actions (e.g., language in conversations with others) and which proposes three reasons for the importance of emotions in explaining and understanding the construction of a career. First, emotion motivates and energizes action. Given that certain career actions are regarded as frustrating, challenging, or boring, then one must be energized by emotion to initiate and sustain those actions. Second, emotion controls and regulates action. In other words, individuals rely on their internal processes to make decisions about their actions. Third, emotions are able to access, orient, and develop narratives about careers. More precisely, because career is constructed from issues of concern in one's life, emotion is used when constructing and developing narratives about career. Those who evidence higher EI are better equipped to incorporate emotional experience into thoughts and actions. This ability to guide one's thinking and actions, through the use of emotions, would be related to how efficacious one is likely to feel when considering career-related actions and tasks, such that emotional experience assists in career exploration and decision-making process. Since career adaptability and work performance are critical to any profession, be it working for business organizations or starting a new venture, evaluating the EI of our business school students is critical for their successful careers.

Further, individuals' EI have been observed to influence business negotiation outcomes, conflict resolution, coping and stress management, effective communication skills, leadership effectiveness, etc. Regardless of the role that our students end up assuming after graduating from universities, be it managerial roles or entrepreneurial, these mentioned facets of business are equally critically to both roles. For example, managers and entrepreneurs alike, negotiate for favorable business outcomes, they need to be able to cope with work related stress, be able to communicate well with team members, co-founders, subordinates, newly hired employees, and while doing all these, reflect likeable and effective leadership styles. More specific to entrepreneurship, EI has been observed to shape entrepreneurial behaviors such as risk-taking, tenacity, resilience, etc., among others. Combined therefore, training our students on improving

their EI will be key for their future success.

We can evaluate our students' EI using one of many tools that have been developed and widely used. One could use Wong and Law's (2002) instrument, based on cognitive emotional ability EI model, to assess the four dimensions of:

1. Self-emotional appraisal (SEA) using items such as *"I have a good understanding of my own emotions."* and *"I really understand what I feel."*
2. Others' emotional appraisal (OEA) using items such as *"I am a good observer of others' emotions."* and *"I have a good understanding of the emotions of people around me."*
3. Use of emotion (UOE) using items such as *"I am a self-motivated person."* and *"I would always encourage myself to try my best."*
4. Regulation of emotion (ROE) using items such as *"I am quite capable of controlling my emotions."* and *"I have good control of my own emotions."*

One could also use self-reported measures of emotional self-efficacy based on Petrides and Furnham's (2000) trait EI model wherein four self-perceptions measures encompassing an individual's behavioral dispositions of:

1. Well-being-generalized sense of positivity, happiness, and fulfilment extending from past achievements to future expectations.
2. Sociability-the degree to which individuals establish social interactions, social relationships, and social influence.
3. Self-control-the degree to which individuals have control over urges and desires.
4. Emotionality- the degree to which individuals believe that they have a wide range of emotion-related skills, could be evaluated.

Regardless of the tool being used for EI evaluation, the objective behind the evaluation should be motivated to assess the psychometric and psychological and emotional competencies of our students. While the importance of EI in one's career has been highlighted above, EI will have implications for students while they are in school. For example, being able to:

1. Negotiate with corporate firms about starting salaries and perks.
2. Work comfortably in group projects that are often part of course syllabi.
3. Cope up with the stress of meeting academic requirements towards degree completion.
4. Communicate well with peers and instructors, etc., could all be improved by indulging our students in EI training programs.

Hence, our curricula should include evaluations of EI, prior to students graduating from universities, to ascertain if a student is emotionally ready to begin and excel at his/her professional career and is in a good state of emotional well-being while in school.

DISCUSSION

The author has summarized the recommendations made in this article in a Table 1 below. While some specific current and future trends have been recognized and practice-oriented suggestions have been offered in this article, a recent paper (Kuratko & Morris, 2018) among a selection of papers in the 2018 special issue at the Journal of Small Business Management offers insights for EEP in generic terms. They point out that exactly how entrepreneurship gets defined and by whom is the greatest challenge confronting the discipline as these two criteria will forge the future of EEP and examine major trajectories in this regard.

Theme	Future trends	Recommendations for business curricula
Contemporary organizational context	Start-up firms and traditional organizations adopting common business practices and standards	Merge fundamental concepts in organizational theory and entrepreneurship to create a holistic course or curriculum
Student mindset	Driven by strong sense of ethics, collective leadership and sustainability values	Adopt a <i>SEELS</i> model in courses as proposed in Appendix 1 below
Sustaining entrepreneurial universities through citizenship behavior	More and more universities would seek to establish entrepreneurial ecosystems	Different constituents of universities would need to display organizational citizenship behaviors to sustain entrepreneurial ecosystems and mindsets such that interdisciplinary courses and programs need to be created on university campus that also involves communities around universities
Non-traditional jobs	Students would become more and more interested in non-traditional jobs such as in patent scrutiny & filing office, office of commercialization, innovation-evaluations, etc.	Develop courses and curriculum that involves participation of practitioners and officers from a university's office of patenting, commercialization, etc., or from Research and Development departments of innovative firms.
Emotional intelligence	Need for our students to be psychologically stronger to meet the work demands in day and age of globalization and to emerge as business leaders	Incorporate the evaluation of students' emotional intelligence in curriculum—measuring the ability of students to use, understand, perceive, express, modify their emotions.

To begin with, institutions teaching entrepreneurship must have a clear purpose as to why they teach it. Next comes what is taught in entrepreneurship. There should be a common theme followed by all faculty—that they prioritize what they believe should be the definition of entrepreneurship and reflect unanimity in the contents or course materials. With these two falling into place, institutions need to address the how aspect of entrepreneurship teaching. The authors remark *“Entrepreneurship content is delivered through conventional lectures, flipped classrooms, online platforms, and through various other vehicles. But the key to how the content is taught in the coming years lies in how educators make the learning process experiential”*. Hence, the effectiveness of EEP, in days to come, lies in how effectively educators devise the content-delivery mechanism. Subsequent to this, universities need to rethink the institutional structure—where should the entrepreneurship program be housed? It is suggested that it should be housed within a unit that has academic standing as opposed to one that is administrative in nature (Kuratko & Morris, 2018). Next, universities should design metrics for evaluating the outcomes of entrepreneurship teaching. We often notice that evidence of successful entrepreneurship teaching is unclear. With a standard rubrics of measuring success, universities will continually monitor if what they teach meets the vision, mission and strategic goals for EEP. The full potential of entrepreneurship programs will be realized if those who deliver them identify themselves as academic entrepreneurs—someone who thinks like an entrepreneur and creates a harmony between theory and practice of entrepreneurship.

CONCLUSION

This article alluded to several current and potential future trends that will have bearing on the manner in which we impart general business education and EEP at our academic institutions. Given the context under which an academic institution operates, it is understandable that not all or any of the suggestions made here could be practical, yet as academics, we owe it to our students that we start recognizing these trends and proactively begin contemplating adaptations in EEP so as to be able to provide the best education and experience to entrepreneurship students in business curricula while also caring for their emotional well-being. The debate around whether entrepreneurship can be taught in schools or not is not going to go away anytime soon, but as long as we do teach it, we must make sure that we design our curricula that is contemporary, timely and anchored in the mindset of business leaders of tomorrow—our students of today.

REFERENCES

- Brown, C., George-Curran, R., & Smith, M.L. (2003). The role of emotional intelligence in the career commitment and decision-making process. *Journal of Career Assessment, 11*(4), 379-392.
- Coˆte, S. (2014). Emotional intelligence in organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1*(1), 459-488.
- Coetzee, M., & Harry, N. (2014). Emotional intelligence as a predictor of employees' career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84*(1), 90-97.
- Emmerling, R.J., & Cherniss, C. (2003). Emotional intelligence and the career choice process. *Journal of Career Assessment, 11*(2), 153-167.
- Etzkowitz, H. (2013). Anatomy of the entrepreneurial university. *Social Science Information, 52*(3), 486-511.
- Ferreira, J.J., Fayolle, A., Ratten, V., & Raposo, M. (2018). *Entrepreneurial Universities*, Monograph Book.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Jain, A.K. (2012). Moderating effect of impression management on the relationship of emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Behavioural and Applied Management, 13*(2), 86-107.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science, 9*(2), 131-133
- Katz, J.A. (2003). The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Business Venturing, 18*(2), 283-300.
- Kuratko, D.F., & Morris, M. (2018). Examining the future trajectory of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management, 56*(1), 11-23.
- Matthew, C., & Matthew, H. (2016). *The 5 biggest corporate scandals of 2016*. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com/2016/12/28/biggest-corporate-scandals-2016/>
- Morris, M.H., & Liguori, E.W. (2016). Preface: Teaching reason and the unreasonable. In Morris, M.H., & Liguori, E.W. (Eds.). *Annals of entrepreneurship education and pedagogy. Volume 2*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Petrides, K.V., & Furnham, A. (2000). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*(2), 313-320.
- Puffer, K.A. (2011). Emotional intelligence as a salient predictor for collegians' career decision making. *Journal of Career Assessment, 19*(2), 130-150.
- Ratten, R. (2017). Entrepreneurial universities: the role of communities, people and places. *Journal of Enterprising Communities, 11*(3), 310-315.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9*(3), 185-211.
- Shepherd, D.A. (2004). Educating entrepreneurship students about emotion and learning from failure. *Academy of Management Learning, 3*(3), 274-287.
- Steiber, A., & Alange, S. (2013). A corporate system for continuous innovation: the case of Google Inc. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 16*(2), 243-264.
- United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). Retrieved from <https://www.uspto.gov/>

- Wong, C.S., & Law, K.S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(3), 243-274.
- Young, R.A., & Valach, L. (2008). Action theory: An integrative paradigm for research and evaluation in career. In Athanassou, J.A., & Van Esbroeck, R. (Eds.). *International handbook of career guidance* (pp. 643-657). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Science and Business Media B.V.

APPENDIX 1

1. Sustainability Values to Sustainability Conditions–(Module 1)

- a. What is sustainability?
- b. The notion of “*Triple Bottom Line*”.
- c. Sustainability values Vs. Sustainability conditions: Acknowledging that societally held sustainability values may not in itself be sufficient towards creating sustainability conditions.
- d. So, what are the drivers of sustainability values towards creating sustainability conditions? Crossing the chasm with–Social Entrepreneurship (SE), Ethics (E) and Leadership (L), “*The SEELS Model*” for Sustainability.
- e. Human Development Indices–Identifying measures of human well-being, environmental well-being and economic well-being.
- f. Understanding Operationalization of Sustainability.
- g. Learning about secondary data sources that are out there that report sustainability measures.
- h. Survey methodology to come up with one’s own measure of “*sustainability*”.
- i. Assignments on generating Correlation coefficients between antecedents of sustainability and sustainability conditions using secondary data sets such as the World Bank, UNESCO, UNDP, SSI, etc.

2. Social Entrepreneurship, the Hybrid Entrepreneur and Sustainability-(Module 2)

- a. Understanding what a social entrepreneur does – the role of context in what SE does; sustainability values vary by countries, hence important to understand that the role of a social entrepreneur towards creating sustainability conditions will vary by context.
- b. Role of Social entrepreneurship for sustainability.
- c. Allocating importance to human, environmental and economic well-being as a performance measure for social entrepreneurs.

3. Ethics, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Sustainability–(Module 3)

- a. Understand the different type of ethics.
 - i. Behavioral ethics, normative ethics, moral ethics and regulatory ethics for sustainability: Sustainability through the lens of ethics that helps in crossing the chasm.
- b. Role of CSR for sustainability.
 - i. Organizational culture, structure and governance.

4. Collective leadership and Diversity (Inclusion) and Sustainability–(Module 4)

- a. Identify leadership styles and perspectives that are most effective for sustainability:
 - i. Briefly discuss the 123 leadership dimensions listed by the *Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE)* measures
 - ii. Then isolate or identify that matter most for sustainability

- b. Subsequently define and coin the term “*Collective Leadership*” for sustainability:
 - i. highlight the effectiveness of leadership styles in crossing the chasm
- c. Sustainability, Transformational Leadership and Social Entrepreneurship.
- d. Construction and operationalization of collective leadership
- e. Introducing benefits of diversity for sustainability

5. Course conclusion