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Abstract
This paper traces theoretical developments of entrepreneurship as seen through the lens of culture and the role that culture has played in entrepreneurship education. Several tributaries of thought propose that entrepreneurship, as the promoter of economic development, is rooted in particular cultural beliefs, and behaviors. In the non-communist developed world directed economic development based on incentive structures and instrumental means proved successful. When the instrumental stimuli and incentives of the successful post-war Marshall Plan failed in the developing world another solution was needed. David McClelland, a psychologist, implemented and tested an entrepreneurship training system based on increasing individual achievement motivation. This training was intended to provide businessmen with improved entrepreneurial outlook who would then act on opportunity and grasp relevant instrumental solutions as required. While McClelland’s results were positive, donors and recipients dropped cultural training as a development tool. In the United States, McClelland’s home, entrepreneurship education avoided linking cultural change with entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship education and promotion provided instrumental solutions. However, differential achievement of particular groups remain as does the question, can entrepreneurship be taught? Today culture as a precondition for entrepreneurial behavior is back on the agenda and still unresolved.
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Theoretical Development: Entrepreneurship and Culture
Discussion of the linkage between entrepreneurship and culture generally begins with the work of Max Weber and his writings on religion and its impact on business association and entrepreneurship. Concerning business association, in his essay The Protestant Sects and the Spirit of Capitalism, Weber (1958) observed that trust between business men was enhanced once the parties learned of each other’s particular religion. For a native of Germany visiting the U.S in 1904 this American habit was peculiar--especially in a country such as the U.S. with constitutional separation of church and state (U.S. Constitution First Amendment, 1791). From the European context most countries or regions of countries had a state religion and religious minorities tended to be recognizable. According to Weber’s observations, the purpose of this strange American habit was that of an informal credit check. Unlike Europe with state sponsored churches claiming all, American Protestant groups were voluntary organizations that accepted and maintained members based on standards of behaviors. In addition, Protestant groups hired and fired their own pastors. Thus, pastors seen to be unfit could be dismissed easily unlike in centralized and state supported churches. Moreover, the preacher’s text suited the concerns of the flock (who paid the pastor’s salary) and included large doses of moral, ethical, and behavior teachings instead of elaborated points of church dogma as prescribed by a centralized church authority.
Casually ascertaining a businessman’s religious affiliation was not intended to find a co-religionist but to determine if the person was trustworthy. That is, did he share particular and similar values?

On the subject of religion and entrepreneurship Weber is most well known for *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. First published in 1905 in German, the book was later translated into English (Weber, 1958). Herein Weber theorized that capitalism and its agent, the entrepreneur, was the result of the Protestant Reformation and the belief system of particular Protestant sects, especially the Calvinists. While religious devotion traditionally was associated with asceticism and eschewing the ungodly pursuit of wealth, Calvinism’s curious dogma had, according to Weber, unintended and beneficial economic consequences. While Catholicism promised salvation to those who accepted the holy sacraments and submitted to the authority of the Catholic hierarchy (Lane, 1979), salvation for Protestants was less assured (Milner, 1970). The Calvinist doctrine of double predestination taught that God predestined some people for heaven and some to hell. Thus, the dilemma arising from the inability to influence or change one’s destiny presented problems for believers. Therefore, signs of favor and salvation were important (Milner, 1970). Since insufficient faith signaled damnation, self-confidence and worldly success was a signal of God’s favor and salvation. Protestantism taught that its adherents should work productively and with zeal. However these same groups discouraged wasting money, and buying luxuries. Since Protestant churches tended to be intentionally spare, and discouraged the worship of (and purchase of) icons and statuary, the faithful had few outlets for their surpluses except for investment in productive tools and enterprises. Weber’s work is the clearest early link between culture (manifested as religion), economic development, and entrepreneurship.

Nonetheless, other early commentators observed relationships between culture and entrepreneurship. Anthony Trollop (1862) in his American travels to the Midwest noted that people voluntarily left cities to take up land on the frontier. These pioneers lived in primitive huts and caves, worked from dawn to dusk without immediate prospect of improvement, and were cheerful about their futures and did not want to return east.

Excluding the slave holding southern United States, Alexis de Tocqueville (1904) in his 1831 visit to the U.S. observed that America was a place where all worked, work was highly valued, and industriousness was an ethic. Moreover, de Tocqueville observed that Americans pursued making money with zeal. In short, America had a large population which would work hard to amass fortunes. According to de Tocqueville, Europe was different. In Europe the poor had no hope of prosperity and fortunes no matter how hard they worked and the rich upper classes affected the attitude that obtaining wealth was crass.

If entrepreneurship is to arise, work must be valued. Cultural values that eschew or devalue work retard the development of entrepreneurship and economic development. Baumol (2004, p. 317) states that average economic growth rates for the 1,500 years before the Industrial Revolution were essentially zero. “But in the 18th century, with the advent of capitalism in England, GDP per capital is estimated to have grown some 20-30%. In the 19th century this figure rose, perhaps tenfold, to some 200%. In the 20th century, growth in the United States has conservatively been estimated at about 700%.”

According to Baumol (2004, p. 318), the missing element “in all economies other than those like our own is the productive entrepreneur, working under incentives to innovate that derive from the powerful mechanism of the competitive market.” While it is
true that markets have “existed throughout recorded history” the change came when work was valued “and the occupation of the entrepreneur has not only become respectable, but has also assumed the attributes of a hero….”

Many early societies devalued work and those who worked. The ancient Greeks sneered crafts and craftsmen. This disdain is communicated to us today in the Greek-rooted work “banausic” a pejorative term related to or concerning earning a living (Landes, 2000). In the case of ancient Greece the metics, alien residents, produced and sold the goods needed by Greek society and made money doing so (Landes, 2000).

According to Baumol (2004, p. 319), methods of wealth accumulation in ancient Rome and Medieval China “considered laudable in one or both…included military aggression, ransom, bribery, and usury.” In addition, Chinese mandarins were expected without hint of scandal to elicit bribes. However, in both Rome and China two activities were disgraceful—engaging in productive activity and commercial activity.

While humans generally value wealth, if societies do not value productive work, do not value those who work, and do not value entrepreneurs, economic development is questionable. In many societies valuing work came with revolutions whose influences eventually spread throughout society. For instance, the French Revolution saw a reordering of society. Charles Dickens’s A Tale of Two Cities (1894), first published in 1859, is a fictionalized account of the ills of pre- and post-revolutionary France. In the tale Dr. Manette and other high-born prisoners of the revolution spend their days in productive work. In Manette’s case the making of shoes. Other revolutions such as the Communist Revolutions of Russia and China swept away entrenched attitudes and the affectation against productive work. Without opinion leaders who scorned work, a pro-work culture arose. However, it took significant political, social, and cultural change in the People’s Republic of China and the former Soviet Union for sanctions against entrepreneurs to end. In the case of China, just 30 years ago “working for yourself was very shameful.” “The country didn’t allow (individuals) to do business.” And “there was a government office whose job it was to crack down on illegal companies” (Hogg, 2010).

The theoretical work of Joseph Schumpeter sets culture as a determinant of entrepreneurship. His major work linking economic development to the innovating entrepreneur dates to before the Second World War—Theory of Economic Development, first published in German in 1911. In Schumpeter’s writings the supply of entrepreneurs who link opportunity to action is the determining factor in economic growth (Higgins, 1959) and the role of the entrepreneur is to bring forth innovation. Schumpeter’s Theory of Economic Development (1961, p. 66) lists five forms of innovation: “(1) The introduction of a new good….” “(2) The introduction of a new form of production….” “(3) The opening of a new market….” “(4) The conquest of a new …supply of raw materials, or half manufactured goods….” “(5) The carrying out of the new organization of any industry….” Moreover, “the supply of entrepreneurs depends on the rate of profits and the social climate,” “a complex phenomenon reflecting the whole social, political, and socio-psychological atmosphere within which entrepreneurs must operate” (Higgins, 1959, p. 129). This would include a country’s particular values, social structure, and educational system. According to Schumpeter (1961, p. 155) the entrepreneur among other things is a “social deviant” and opposition to the entrepreneur is “stronger in primitive stages of culture than others” but is still present.
Economic Development and Marshall Plan Lessons

The close of World War Two saw a hollow victory for the Western Allies in regard to Europe. Nazi Germany was vanquished but the continent lie in ruins and in an economic malaise. This deprivation threatened to drive the countries of Europe toward the philosophies and political system of the Soviet Union. Faced with chaos in Europe, the United States formulated a recovery plan, officially known as the European Recovery Program but commonly known as the Marshall Plan, to aid in the recovery and rebuilding of the European economy. The plan was short lived (1947 to 1951) but widely acclaimed as successful. By 1952 all plan participants’ economies had exceeded pre-war levels (Eichengreen, 2006).

The Marshall Plan was organized such that the U.S. offered aid but the European countries would organize the program themselves after an independent assessment of that country’s economic situation. The offer was open to all European countries except neutral Spain and small micro-states (Andorra, Monaco, San Marino, and Liechtenstein). The Soviet Union, its eastern satellites, and Finland declined to participate. The U.S. Congress eventually donated $12.4 billion in aid over the four years of the plan (Grogin, 2001). Marshall Plan aid was mostly used to purchase goods ($3.4 billion to imports of raw materials and semi-manufactured goods, $3.2 billion on food, feed, and fertilizer; $1.9 billion on machines, vehicles, and equipment; and $1.6 billion on fuel) from the U.S. (Hogan, 1987, p. 415). The funds were magnified as the U.S. supplier was paid in U.S. dollars from European Recovery Program (Marshall Plan) funds and the aid recipient had to pay for the goods in local currency (on credit). These funds were then deposited in a counterpart fund that was used as a revolving loan fund (Crafts & Toniolo, 1996).

Again, the Marshall Plan was an outstanding success. Unfortunately the wrong lessons were learned. The success of the Marshall Plan led to the belief that the addition of instruments and incentives could spur development elsewhere. As would be found later, the case of Europe after World War Two was a hardware problem and not a software problem.

In the post-World War Two contexts, the spread of Communism, especially the emergence of Communism in the Western Hemisphere with the Cuban Revolution, and the dangers of a hot nuclear war stemming from the Cuban Missile Crisis, brought economic development to the forefront.

“The Alliance for Progress, John F. Kennedy’s answer to the Cuban Revolution, captured the prevailing optimism. It would duplicate the Marshall Plan’s success. Latin America would be well on its way to irreversible prosperity and democracy within ten years” (Harrison, 2000, pg. xvii). Unfortunately, development in underdeveloped countries proved problematic.

Eugene Black’s The Diplomacy of Economic Development (1961, p. 21) addresses development problems among the poor countries of Asia and Africa and states that there is no short-term solution available. “I am afraid that much of the reason of this misdirected search stems from the blinding success of the Marshall Plan. Without detracting from that unique achievement, I am compelled to say that it bears almost no comparison to the present problem; in fact, it is useful only as a contrast. “ “The governments participating in the Marshall Plan shared a common heritage and a common clearly defined predicament.”
Does Culture Matter for Development?

Two basic positions developed in relation to culture and entrepreneurship. One posed culture as a precursor to entrepreneurship, the other discounted culture’s affect altogether.

“The lack of adequate entrepreneurship is one of the most frequently cited obstacles to take-off” in under-developed countries and “it appears true that the relatively small entrepreneurial group in such countries frequently consists of a deviant class: the Chinese in Southeast Asia, the Hindus in East Bengal, the Jews in Libya...” (Higgins, 1959, p. 143). Following Schumpeter it is doubtful that successful development can occur “in countries which start with a climate inimical to entrepreneurship, as is the case in many of the underdeveloped countries” (Higgins, 1959, p. 143).

This position set opportunity as the spark for entrepreneurship. But, this spark would only catch after consciousness (an appropriate culture) was built.

“All we know for certain is that once people become conscious of the possibility of economic development in their society, entrepreneurs start appearing.” “What is true of entrepreneurship is broadly true of all the requisites for economic growth. As more people become conscious of the possibility of a better material life through a different use of their time, energy, and savings, there will be more productive work and more productive savings” (Black, 1961, p. 28).

However, the economists who guided most development projects disagreed. Economists deny any connection with culture and that it does not predict outcomes (Landes, 2000). For them, culture was an entirely extraneous variable; what mattered was institutional factors and incentives. David C. McClelland in the Preface to Motivating Economic Achievement (McClelland & Winter, 1969, p. x) stated that “more than one economist was tolerantly amused at the thought that purely psychological inputs might seriously affect the rate of economic growth...”

Thus, by the latter half of the 20th century the battle lines were clearly drawn between those who attributed entrepreneurial action and economic development to favorable institutional factors and to those that backed cultural explanations. Weiner (1966, p. 12) questions how the problem of accelerating economic development in poor nations should be made--“by a frontal attack on values or by a frontal attack upon institutions and structures that reduce incentives and opportunities and by supporting those institutions and structures which increase them.”

McClelland, Entrepreneurship Training, and Modernization Theory

McClelland, a psychologist, and his foray into economic development and entrepreneurship grew from his work with motivation. McClelland (1961) theorized that humans are motivated by the Need for Achievement, the Need for Power, and the Need for Affiliation but for purposes of entrepreneurship and economic activity the Need for Achievement is most critical. Those with a high need for achievement like challenges and stimulating environments and desire to accomplish tasks well. Such people seek autonomy, self-responsibility, and to pursue the goals they value and are willing to take on risks to do so.

McClelland (1961, p. 9) squarely understood the driver’s of economic growth—“capital accumulation (including technological improvements), population changes, division of labor, and entrepreneurship” but was the first to critically examine human factors promoting entrepreneurial behavior. McClelland’s perspective borrowed from Parsons’ studies of societal differences of developed versus developing societies.

Parsons et al. (1951; 1956) provided useful sketches of developed countries versus underdeveloped ones. Developed countries are those in which an individual’s status is achieved rather than ascribed, economic and labor relationships are specific rather than...
diffuse (i.e., leaking across political, kin, and religious structures), and labor and economic advancement are universal rather than particular (e.g., reserved for those of a particular caste or station). While it is unsophisticated thinking to believe that moving the developing country’s profile to fit that of a developed country, McClelland posits that measuring and increasing individual’s need for achievement will set in motion actions to satisfy this need such as achieving business success. The methodology McClelland used to determine needs levels was projective indicators and tests such as the Thematic Apperception Test. High Need for Achievement was correlated with economic productivity (1961) and is prominent in the personalities of entrepreneurs (Phatak, Bhagat, & Kashlak, 2005). The heart of this motivation theory is that one can learn a particular set of functional values (Phatak, Bhagat, & Kashlak, 2005). Thus, McClelland sought to train African villagers (McClelland, 1965) and Indian entrepreneurs, increase their level of motivation, such that they would better act on opportunities, and increase economic activity (McClelland, 1965; McClelland & Winter, 1969). The theoretical underpinning for McClelland’s economic development research was modernization theory. Early modernization theory observed that Western countries were the most developed, development occurs in stages, the rest of the world was at lower stages of development and eventually will reach the level of Western countries, and underdeveloped countries’ social progress was behind and needs to become more advanced (Rostow, 1960; Apter, 1965; McClelland, 1961, 1969; Inkeles, 1974). Rostow’s The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto (1960) illustrates the factors needed for a country to reach economic modernization in his take-off model. Apter (1965) is concerned with the connection between good governance, democracy and modernization and efficiency. McClelland (1961, 1965, 1969) essentially approaches modernization from a psychological perspective from motivation theory but states that modernization cannot occur until a country values entrepreneurship, innovation, and free enterprise. Inkeles’ Becoming Modern (1974) creates a model of the modern societal personality necessary for modernization to take. McClelland and his researchers followed the participants and reported that achievement training significantly improved economic outcomes (McClelland, 1965; McClelland & Winter, 1969). While these efforts to train entrepreneurs were reported to be successful, his funding was pulled and he effectively ended this phase of his research. If efficacious why did it end? While this is not entirely clear, a number of forces appear to have been arrayed against foreign aid in general and promoting cultural change to effect the development of entrepreneurs. First, McClelland complains in the Preface of Motivating Economic Achievement (McClelland & Winter, 1969) that U.S. foreign aid programs were in great trouble since many of the programs’ content and outcomes were questionable and that Senator (Senate Majority Leader) Mike Mansfield had been lionized in the press and Congress for his efforts to curtail these programs. Moreover, early modernization theory and its efforts ran afoul of its linear simplicity (Berman, 2009). Huntington (1968) observed that modernization theory was correct that economic development unleashed social change but that this social change was not necessarily progressive and that only with time could political institutions be built to positively channel such change. Finally early modernization theory was ethnocentric and efforts to change the values and behaviors of the members of particular cultures could be interpreted as devaluing the entire culture itself (Landes, 2000). In the early 1960s, Black observed that “Underdeveloped countries today are in a hurry; they are eager to imitate the technology that made Western nations rich and powerful.” “But they are also driven by a more fundamental urge; they are driven by a renewed pride in their own racial and cultural heritage—a pride born partly of a genuine renaissance and partly of accumulated resentment over the gross inequalities in wealth among nations today and over real or imagined subjugation of their countries in the past“(Black, 1961, pp. 13-14). Glazer (2000, p. 221) offered an interpretation of such efforts’ hidden message--“there
must be something undesirable about a culture that hampers economic advance.” Thus, in terms of criticizing and making efforts to change dimensions of particular cultures Landes (2000, p. 2) notes such efforts have “…a sulfuric odor of race and inheritance, an air of immutability.”

Modernization theory and culture as a determinant of entrepreneurship entered a long sleep. In its place arose a plurality of instrumental solutions for economic development such as curbing corruption, building infrastructure, and promoting economic openness and providing incentives. John Kenneth Galbraith (1964), an economist and U.S. Ambassador to India during the Kennedy administration wrote a series of speeches delivered to leading Indian universities outlining what would become the thrust of development initiatives. In these speeches and the book that followed, education and its liberating influence were as close as Galbraith and traditional economics would come to the subject of cultural building.

**Tertiary Entrepreneurship Education and Culture’s Consequences**

Tertiary (university-level) entrepreneurship education is a recent phenomena. The first entrepreneurship course, Management of New Enterprise, was offered at Harvard University in 1947 for second year MBA students; the first entrepreneurship journal, *Explorations in Entrepreneurial History* began publishing in 1949 (Katz, 2003). While its present scope is not known, by 1999 at least 2,200 courses at 1,600 colleges and universities in the U.S. were offered and supported by 277 endowed positions, 44 English-language journals and over 100 entrepreneurship centers (Katz, 2003).

While the 1961 publication of McClelland’s *The Achieving Society* and the 1969 publication of McClelland and Winter’s *Motivating Economic Achievement* are noted by Katz, he parenthetically comments that *Motivating Economic Achievement* was the “first major study of entrepreneurship training with detailed outcome assessment” (Katz, 2003 p. 287). Nonetheless, while reporting very positive findings, the publications had little effect on the field. Inculcating cultural values to increase entrepreneurship carried so little practical weight in the field of entrepreneurship education that for decades the argument of whether entrepreneurship could be taught or not raged (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991; Fiet 2000a; Thompson, 2004). Moreover, the first academic entrepreneurship journal and its emphasis on studying entrepreneurship history (and by extension contributing to a role model enculturation approach) fell away as well. *Explorations in Entrepreneurial History* ended publication in 1969 (Katz, 2003).

For business academicians the revival of interest in culture came with the publication of Hofstede’s (1980) work, *Culture’s Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*. Hofstede’s questionnaire-based study employed a large sample (over 100,000 subjects) and was administered to IBM employees in over 40 countries/regions. From this, four cultural factors emerged and Hofstede named the four cultural dimensions individualism/collectivism, masculinity/femininity, uncertainty avoidance, and power distance. Moreover, differential national/regional scores associated with these four dimensions were reported. Later work by Hofstede and Bond (1988) added a fifth dimension, Confucian orientation, linked with hard work, perseverance, and learning new skills and later renamed long-term orientation. Moreover, Hofstede and Bond (1988) posited that cultural values promoting success exist in regions without Protestant beliefs and that such beliefs are held more strongly by some groups rather than others.

The revival of interest in culture and its consequences for economic development came with the 1985 publication, *Underdevelopment Is a State of Mind*, by a former USAID official, Lawrence Harrison. Here Harrison used a series of case studies to show that in Latin America culture was the primary roadblock to development.

While culture has not received adequate attention in the discipline of entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurship education itself is not well established, lacks
consistent pedagogy, and credibility (Fiet, 2000a and 2000b; Bechard and Gregoire 2005). Moreover, entrepreneurship education lacks theory and an accepted paradigm (Vesper, 1982; Fiet, 2000a and 2000b; Bechard and Gregoire 2005; Kuraktko, 2005).

In the U.S. the field has settled into two consistent educational approaches: “entrepreneurship (wealth-creation focused courses) and small business (form-creation focused courses); for each approach there is considerable standardization” (Katz, 2003, p. 294-295).

Fayolle (2008 p. 327), citing Kirby (2007), divides the objectives of entrepreneurship education into categories. Teaching students about the role and function of entrepreneurs; “developing in their students the attributes of the successful entrepreneur;” “education for enterprise; “education through enterprise-with using the new venture creation process to help students acquire a range of both business understanding and transferable skills or competences;” education “in an entrepreneurial environment.”

However, in practice most attention is placed on education for enterprise. Little effort is expended on developing in students the attributes of successful entrepreneurs. Moreover, no meaningful discussion of differential achievement of groups is undertaken. Glazer (2000) posits that discussions of cultural differences in the U.S. have been avoided since such attention would promote the idea that some cultures are better than others and imply that particular cultures better promote well-being. Furthermore, Glazer (2000) hints that pursuing cultural comparisons and discussions of functional cultures may be more detrimental than the potential gains achieved by such discussions.

Unresolved Issues—Inculcation, Appropriate Variable(s) to Represent Culture, and Model(s) to Represent the Action of Culture on Entrepreneurship

Nonetheless, culture, and the role of culture on differential rates of entrepreneurship needs to be taught. According to David Landes (2000, p. 3) “Max Weber was right. If we learn anything from the history of economic development, it is that culture makes almost all the difference.” This is evident in the success of expatriate minorities—“the Chinese in East and Southeast Asia, Indians in East Africa, Lebanese in West Africa, Jews and Calvinists throughout much of Europe and on and on.” “But if culture does so much, why does it not work consistently?” Why have the Chinese “been long so unproductive at home yet so enterprising away?” It is because “culture does not stand alone.” “Monocausal explanations will not work.” “Because culture and economic performance are linked, change in one will work back on the other” Landes, 2000, p.3). Reviews of empirical work support Landes’ contention. Hayton, George, and Zahara (2002, p. 33) undertook a review of the question “how does national culture relate to levels of entrepreneurial activity?” Three streams of research were identified (Hayton, George, and Zahara (2002, p. 34). These include: 1) “the impact of national culture on the aggregate measures of entrepreneurship such as national innovative output or new business created;” 2)”the association between national culture and the characteristics of individual entrepreneurs” including “the values, beliefs, motivations, and cognitions of entrepreneurs across cultures;” 3) “the impact of national culture on corporate entrepreneurship.” The findings suggest that national culture “is captured in different forms in behavioral research and culture in various forms is depicted as a moderator of the relationship between contextual factors and entrepreneurial outcomes. The moderating role of culture highlights that national culture acts as a catalyst rather than a causative agent of entrepreneurial outcomes. Though some studies find significant relationships between national culture and entrepreneurial outcomes, the model suggests that cultural characteristics transform and complement the institutional and economic contexts to influence entrepreneurship” (Hayton, George, and Zahara (2002, p. 45).
Berman (2009), commenting on other conceptualizations of culture, cites the work of Robert Inglehart. In particular, Robert Inglehart, working with many researchers on data collected from the World Values Survey, posits that culture and cultural changes are the key intervening variables between institutional processes and economic development. According to Hayton, George, and Zahara (2002, p. 49) “an independent measure of cultural values that are relevant to entrepreneurship needs to be developed.” Using a measure constructed from dimensions of the World Values Survey, some empirical support for achievement motivation and entrepreneurial action has been reported (Granato, Inglehart & Leblang, 1996). However, empirical tests of McClelland’s work have failed to support its contentions (Finison, 1976; Frey, 1984; Gilleard, 1989). Nonetheless, Beugelsdijk and Smeets (2008, p. 10) re-examined and analyzed the proposed relationship between Need for Achievement and economic development and found no direct support. However, they acknowledge “the difficulty of measuring something complex as culture…. What is required is a more substantive empirical analysis researching the relationship between the three different core elements in McClelland’s thesis: entrepreneurial culture and (as proxied by N achievement), the overall rate of entrepreneurial activity, and economic growth.”

**Partial Solution**

While it is premature to offer an effective inculcation/education routine or a variable or variables that proxy entrepreneurial culture, we can offer a cyclical model of the role of culture’s components and its relationship to entrepreneurship. The base model is derived from a universal perspective that cultural begins with solutions that are proposed to human problems. In this model problems drive choices humans make which in turn impacts behaviors, values, and beliefs and norms. Beliefs and norms in turn affect human choices closing the loop.

Figure One: Culture’s Cycle¹

---

¹As presented by Bertsch (2009) and therein synthesized from Adler (2002, 2008); Barnouw (1963); Bodrova and Leong (1996); Brown (1976); Denison (2000); Dresser and Carns (1969); England (1978); Foster (1962); Kluckhohn and Strodbeck (1961); Kroeber and Parsons (1958); Hansen and Brooks (1994); Hofstede (1980a, 2001); Holt (2007);
House et al. (2004); Javidan and House (2001); Javidan et al. (2006); Schein (1985, 1992, 2004); Schneider (1988); Shweder (2000); Triandis (2004a); Trompenaars (1993a); Weisner (2000); and Whiting (1996)

Figure Two poses the same system as does Figure One. However, in this conceptualization opportunities drive choices and behaviors that finally impact values, and beliefs and norms. Prior choices, behaviors, values, and beliefs and norms in turn affect choices made in the face of opportunities. In conclusion Figure Two is offered as a bridge to stimulate discussion and research about the relationship between culture and entrepreneurial action.

Figure Two: Opportunities and Culture’s Cycles
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