



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



Towards a strategic stewardship and entrepreneurial transformation: A multi-stakeholder analysis on entrepreneurial leadership and governance practices of a state university in the Philippines

Client William M. Malinao ^{1,2,*} and Nerissa P. Batoon ¹

¹ Central Graduate School, Isabela State University, Echague, Isabela, Philippines.

² College of Business and Management, Ifugao State University, Alfonso Lista, Ifugao, Philippines.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 30(02), 523-532

Publication history: Received on 31 March 2026; revised on 06 May 2026; accepted on 08 May 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.30.2.1142>

Abstract

Entrepreneurial higher education institutions are increasingly recognized as catalysts of innovation, regional development, and graduate employability. Within this context, this study examined the entrepreneurial leadership and governance practices of a selected state university in the Philippines, with emphasis on determining whether significant differences exist in the perceptions of key institutional stakeholders, namely supervisors, teachers, and students. Employing a quantitative descriptive-comparative research design, the study utilized a structured survey instrument anchored on the entrepreneurial university framework, particularly focusing on leadership, governance, and institutional support dimensions. Data were analyzed using weighted mean and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Findings revealed that respondents generally perceived the university's entrepreneurial leadership and governance practices positively, indicating the presence of supportive institutional mechanisms that promote innovation-oriented academic management. Statistical analysis further revealed no significant difference in perceptions among stakeholder groups ($F = 1.386, p = 0.252$), suggesting a shared understanding and consistent experience of entrepreneurial practices across organizational levels. The absence of perceptual disparity reflects institutional coherence in policy implementation, strategic direction, and entrepreneurial culture. These findings imply that aligned stakeholder perceptions may serve as an indicator of effective entrepreneurial integration within higher education systems. The study contributes to the expanding literature on entrepreneurial universities by providing empirical evidence from a developing-country context, where institutional transformation toward entrepreneurship remains underexplored. Moreover, the findings offer practical insights for higher education leaders and policymakers in strengthening participatory governance, collaborative strategic stewardship, and innovation-driven institutional ecosystems that support long-term organizational sustainability and competitiveness.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Leadership; Entrepreneurial Governance; Philippine Higher Education; Philippines

1. Introduction

Higher education institutions (HEIs) worldwide are undergoing a profound transformation from traditional teaching-centered organizations into dynamic entrepreneurial universities that actively contribute to innovation, regional competitiveness, and socio-economic development (Rosienkiewicz et al., 2024; Romero-Sánchez et al., 2024). In the contemporary knowledge economy, universities are no longer viewed solely as centers for instruction and research; rather, they are increasingly expected to produce entrepreneurial graduates, strengthen industry linkages, commercialize knowledge, and respond proactively to evolving societal challenges. This transformation has been intensified by globalization, technological disruption, labor market volatility, and the increasing demand for graduates who possess not only disciplinary expertise but also creativity, adaptability, leadership, and opportunity-recognition

* Corresponding author: Client William M. Malinao

competencies (Guerrero et al., 2021; Aramaki et al., 2023). Consequently, entrepreneurship has emerged as a strategic imperative in higher education systems across both developed and developing countries (Nguyen et al., 2022).

The growing emphasis on entrepreneurship in higher education has given rise to the concept of the entrepreneurial university, which recognizes HEIs as active agents of economic and social transformation. Rather than functioning solely as knowledge producers, universities are now expected to serve as catalysts of innovation, enterprise creation, and community advancement (Henry & Lahikainen, 2024). Anchored in the Triple Helix framework, universities are encouraged to establish strong collaborations with government and industry to create sustainable innovation ecosystems that stimulate employment generation, regional competitiveness, and socio-economic progress (Linton, 2024). Within this evolving institutional landscape, leadership and governance have been consistently recognized as foundational dimensions of entrepreneurial transformation. Effective institutional leadership provides strategic direction, mobilizes resources, cultivates an entrepreneurial culture, and aligns academic programs with emerging societal and market needs (Rodríguez-Aceves et al., 2024; Purcell & Chahine, 2019). Governance systems, meanwhile, ensure that entrepreneurial initiatives are embedded within institutional policies, organizational structures, accountability mechanisms, and long-term strategic planning processes (Koeswayo et al., 2024).

The importance of leadership and governance in entrepreneurial transformation has been further reinforced through the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and European Commission's HEInnovate framework, which operationalizes the dimensions of entrepreneurial universities. Among the framework's dimensions, leadership and governance occupy a central role because they influence how entrepreneurial values, practices, and institutional cultures are initiated, institutionalized, and sustained over time (Patricio & Ferreira, 2023). Entrepreneurial leadership is characterized by visionary decision-making, openness to innovation, calculated risk-taking, stakeholder engagement, and the ability to inspire institutional change and continuous improvement (Hussain & Li, 2022; Beta & Gzehegna, 2025; Herlina et al., 2021; Gumbo et al., 2026). Governance, on the other hand, encompasses participatory management systems, policy coherence, decentralized decision-making, performance monitoring, and strategic partnerships that collectively support institutional adaptability and innovation. Without strong leadership and sound governance structures, entrepreneurial initiatives often remain fragmented, personality-driven, or symbolic rather than systemic, inclusive, and sustainable (Moradi & Jahanbakht, 2026; Alfahaid & Omri, 2026).

In developing countries such as the Philippines, the entrepreneurial transformation of HEIs assumes even greater significance because universities are increasingly expected to contribute to inclusive growth, local enterprise development, innovation capacity-building, and graduate employability. In response to these demands, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has continuously emphasized outcomes-based education, industry responsiveness, research productivity, innovation, and internationalization as strategic priorities for higher education institutions. State universities and colleges (SUCs), particularly those situated in geographically isolated and economically challenged provinces, are uniquely positioned to become engines of countryside development and social mobility (Cerado & Naanep, 2023). Through entrepreneurship education, community extension initiatives, technology transfer, and collaboration with local industries, SUCs can contribute significantly to reducing unemployment, stimulating rural enterprise development, and improving the quality of life in underserved communities (Valle et al., 2022).

Despite the growing recognition of entrepreneurial universities, empirical studies examining entrepreneurial leadership and governance practices in provincial and developing-country contexts remain limited. Existing literature has predominantly focused on large urban institutions or innovation-driven universities in developed economies, leaving a significant gap in understanding how entrepreneurial practices are manifested and perceived in rural state universities operating under resource-constrained conditions. Addressing this gap is important because stakeholder perceptions provide critical insights into the effectiveness, inclusiveness, and sustainability of entrepreneurial initiatives within institutional systems.

Anchored on the leadership and governance dimension of the HEInnovate framework, this study investigates the entrepreneurial practices of a selected state university in the Philippines as perceived by supervisors, teachers, and students. Moreover, the study examines whether significant differences exist among stakeholder groups regarding their perceptions of these entrepreneurial practices. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the expanding body of literature on entrepreneurial universities, particularly within developing and rural higher education contexts. Practically, the results may provide evidence-based insights for university leaders, policymakers, and educational planners in strengthening governance systems, cultivating entrepreneurial culture, and designing strategic interventions that are responsive to stakeholder needs and institutional realities. Ultimately, by enhancing entrepreneurial leadership and governance, provincial universities may become stronger drivers of innovation, graduate success, institutional resilience, and sustainable regional development.

2. Research methodology

2.1. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-comparative research design to assess the entrepreneurial practices of a selected state university in the Philippines in terms of Leadership and Governance, as perceived by supervisors, teachers, and students. The descriptive approach was considered appropriate because it enabled the systematic collection of numerical data to determine the extent to which entrepreneurial practices are manifested within the institution. Moreover, the comparative research design allowed the comparison of perceptions across different stakeholder groups, thereby generating a comprehensive institutional assessment.

2.2. Research Environment

The study was conducted in a selected state university located in the Philippines. The institution serves diverse academic programs and plays a significant role in regional development through instruction, research, extension, and innovation. As a public higher education institution situated in a rural and culturally significant province, it provides an appropriate context for examining entrepreneurial university practices within a developing and geographically peripheral setting.

2.3. Respondents of the Study

The respondents consisted of three key internal stakeholder groups: Supervisors, Faculty, and Students. These groups were selected because they represent the principal actors who experience entrepreneurial institutional leadership and governance processes. A stratified sampling technique was employed to ensure proportional representation from each stakeholder category. This method enhanced the reliability of comparisons among groups and minimized sampling bias. The sample size was determined using a Cochran's Formula based on the total population of each stratum.

2.4. Research Instrument

Data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire patterned from the HEInnovate Self-Assessment Tool, particularly the indicators under Leadership and Governance. The instrument was contextualized to suit the local university environment while preserving the original constructs. To ensure content validity, the questionnaire was reviewed by experts in higher education management, entrepreneurship education, and research methodology. Their comments and recommendations were incorporated before final administration. A pilot test was conducted among respondents with similar characteristics but outside the actual sample. Reliability was measured using Cronbach's Alpha (.91), indicating excellent internal consistency of the instrument.

2.5. Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, formal permission was secured from the university administration and relevant offices. Ethical protocols were strictly observed, including voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and anonymity of responses. After approval, questionnaires were distributed personally to the selected respondents. Clear instructions were provided, and sufficient time was given for completion. Retrieved questionnaires were checked for completeness, coded, tabulated, and prepared for statistical analysis. The study adhered to ethical research standards. Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents were informed of the purpose of the study, their right to withdraw at any time, and the confidentiality of their responses. No identifying information was disclosed, and all collected data were used strictly for academic and research purposes.

2.6. Statistical Treatment of Data

The collected data were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics through statistical software. Weighted Mean was used to determine the extent of entrepreneurial practices in terms of Leadership and Governance; One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine significant differences in perceptions among supervisors, teachers, and students. The level of significance was set at a 0.05 alpha level.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Entrepreneurial Practices of Selected State University in the Philippines as Perceived by Supervisors, Teachers, and Students

Table 1 presents the comparative mean on the entrepreneurial practices of a State University in the Philippines as perceived by supervisors, teachers, and students in terms of leadership and governance. Generally, the data reveal a clear pattern showing strong variations in perception among the different respondent groups regarding leadership and governance. The findings of the study reveal notable differences in how entrepreneurial leadership and governance practices are perceived across institutional stakeholder groups within the selected state university in the Philippines. Generally, the results suggest that while entrepreneurial principles and innovation-oriented practices are present within the institution, their implementation and visibility vary across administrative, instructional, and student levels.

The data demonstrate that Deans consistently rated the indicators under leadership and governance as Highly Practiced (HP), indicating a strong administrative perception that entrepreneurial values, innovation-driven strategies, and institutional mechanisms are already well-established within the university. In contrast, Program Coordinators, Faculty members, and Students generally rated these indicators within the Practiced (P) range, suggesting that although entrepreneurial initiatives are evident, they may not yet be fully institutionalized or consistently experienced across operational and instructional environments. This discrepancy in perception may indicate a gap between strategic leadership intentions and the actual operational experiences of internal stakeholders.

The higher ratings among Deans may be attributed to their direct involvement in institutional planning, policy formulation, strategic implementation, and external partnerships. As key decision-makers, administrators are more likely to have broader exposure to institutional entrepreneurial initiatives, including strategic plans, innovation agendas, and governance reforms. Their perspective may therefore reflect institutional aspirations and macro-level accomplishments. However, the comparatively lower perceptions among Program Coordinators, Faculty members, and Students suggest that entrepreneurial governance practices may not yet be sufficiently translated into day-to-day academic, instructional, and student experiences. This finding reinforces the argument that entrepreneurial transformation in universities is not solely dependent on visionary leadership, but also on how effectively entrepreneurial values are communicated, operationalized, and embedded across institutional systems.

Table 1 Comparative Mean on the Entrepreneurial Practices of Selected State University in the Philippines as Perceived by Supervisors, Teachers, and Students in terms of Leadership and Governance

Our school values entrepreneurship and innovation.	Mean (Dean)	D.I	Mean (PC)	D.I	Mean (Faculty)	D.I	Mean (Students)	D.I
Our school regularly updates its plans to match its goals.	4.00	HP	3.00	P	2.90	P	2.85	P
Our plans are easy to understand and shared with everyone.	4.00	HP	3.10	P	3.00	P	2.90	P
Our school has clear steps and goals to make its plans happen.	4.00	HP	3.20	P	3.00	P	3.00	P
Our school's goals show that entrepreneurship is essential in many areas.	4.00	HP	3.00	P	2.80	P	3.10	P
Our school's mission talks about being creative and entrepreneurial	4.00	HP	3.10	P	2.90	P	3.05	P
Section Mean	4.00	HP	3.08	P	2.92	P	2.98	P
School leaders show entrepreneurial skills and guide positive change.	Mean (Dean)	D.I	Mean (PC)	D.I	Mean (Faculty)	D.I	Mean (Students)	D.I
Our leaders oversee the promotion of entrepreneurship and innovation in the university.	4.00	HP	2.70	P	2.80	P	2.70	P

Our leaders include entrepreneurs from inside the school in activities and planning.	4.00	HP	2.60	P	2.70	P	2.60	P
Our leaders are responsible for making entrepreneurship part of school life.	3.5	HP	2.80	P	2.90	P	2.80	P
Our Leaders know how to find and create opportunities for innovation and community help.	4.00	HP	2.90	P	2.80	P	2.75	P
Section Mean	3.88	HP	2.75	P	2.80	P	2.71	P
Our school has a system to organize and support entrepreneurship activities.	Mean (Dean)	D.I	Mean (PC)	D.I	Mean (Faculty)	D.I	Mean (Students)	D.I
Our school sets goals to measure how well we are doing in entrepreneurship.	4.00	HP	2.60	P	2.70	P	2.65	P
Our school has good teamwork and communication across the school for these activities.	3.5	HP	2.70	P	2.80	P	2.70	P
Our school includes current programs and relationships when making decisions.	3.5	HP	2.80	P	2.90	P	2.75	P
Our school has clear roles for people who make decisions about entrepreneurship.	3.5	HP	2.90	P	2.80	P	2.80	P
Section Mean	3.67	HP	2.75	P	2.80	P	2.73	P
The school supports everyone to be entrepreneurial.	Mean (Dean)	D.I	Mean (PC)	D.I	Mean (Faculty)	D.I	Mean (Students)	D.I
Teachers and staff can get rewards or recognition for doing entrepreneurial activities.	3.00	P	2.30	RP	2.20	RP	2.10	RP
People are given the chance to lead new and creative projects.	3.00	P	2.20	RP	2.10	RP	2.00	RP
Groups in the school can freely create and run new ideas and programs.	3.00	P	2.40	RP	2.30	RP	2.20	RP
Section Mean	3.00	P	2.30	RP	2.20	RP	2.10	RP
The school helps the community and supports local innovation	Mean (Dean)	D.I	Mean (PC)	D.I	Mean (Faculty)	D.I	Mean (Students)	D.I
Our school takes part in community and cultural events.	4.00	HP	2.80	P	2.90	P	3.40	HP
Our help new or small businesses in our area to grow.	3.50	HP	2.90	P	3.00	P	3.50	HP
Community members can use some of the school's facilities.	4.00	HP	2.80	P	2.90	P	3.30	HP
Our school works with others to solve community and social problems.	4.00	HP	3.00	P	3.10	P	3.60	HP
Our school is involved in helping with local and national plans.	3.50	HP	3.00	P	3.20	P	3.50	HP
Section Mean	3.80	HP	2.90	P	3.02	P	3.46	HP

Notably, respondents from the operational and instructional sectors gave relatively higher ratings to indicators associated with clear institutional goals and strategic direction. This suggests that stakeholders recognize the university's efforts to establish entrepreneurial objectives and organizational priorities. However, lower ratings were

observed in indicators related to communication, integration of entrepreneurship across institutional functions, participatory governance, and regular updating of plans. These findings imply that while entrepreneurial intentions may exist at the strategic level, challenges remain in ensuring organizational coherence, inclusiveness, and stakeholder engagement.

The findings further indicate that communication and dissemination mechanisms may require strengthening. Students and faculty members perceived institutional plans and entrepreneurial directions as less visible and less accessible, suggesting possible limitations in policy transparency and participatory governance processes. In entrepreneurial universities, effective governance extends beyond policy creation; it also involves ensuring that institutional stakeholders understand, internalize, and actively participate in entrepreneurial initiatives. Thus, the observed perception gap may reflect the need for stronger consultative mechanisms, collaborative decision-making, and stakeholder-centered communication strategies.

The results also highlight important concerns regarding institutional support systems for entrepreneurship. Indicators related to rewards, recognition, and opportunities for leading innovative projects received relatively lower ratings, particularly from Program Coordinators, Faculty members, and Students. This finding suggests that while entrepreneurial discourse may be institutionally promoted, support mechanisms that encourage active entrepreneurial engagement may still be limited or inconsistently experienced. In higher education settings, entrepreneurial culture is strengthened not merely through policy statements but through enabling structures that incentivize innovation, creativity, experimentation, and collaborative initiatives. The absence or perceived insufficiency of such support systems may weaken stakeholder motivation and limit the sustainability of entrepreneurial initiatives.

Moreover, the relatively lower ratings in participatory governance and decentralized innovation support suggest that entrepreneurial transformation within the institution may still be predominantly leadership-driven rather than institutionally shared. Entrepreneurial universities require distributed leadership structures where faculty members, students, and academic units are empowered to initiate, participate in, and sustain innovation-related activities. When entrepreneurial initiatives remain concentrated at the administrative level, institutional transformation risks becoming symbolic rather than systemic. Consequently, the findings underscore the importance of democratizing entrepreneurial governance by fostering shared ownership, inclusivity, and collaborative leadership across institutional sectors.

Interestingly, students provided relatively higher ratings regarding community engagement and local innovation support. This indicates that the university's external engagement initiatives, extension activities, and community-oriented programs are more visible and directly experienced by students. Such findings reinforce the developmental role of state universities and colleges (SUCs) in the Philippines, particularly in geographically isolated and economically challenged regions where higher education institutions serve as key agents of local development. Through community extension, local enterprise support, and social innovation initiatives, universities contribute not only to academic development but also to broader socio-economic transformation.

The findings support the principles of the HEInnovate framework, which emphasizes leadership and governance as foundational dimensions of entrepreneurial universities. The study demonstrates that entrepreneurial transformation requires more than strategic declarations and administrative commitment. Rather, it necessitates institutional coherence, stakeholder participation, organizational transparency, and sustained support mechanisms that permeate all levels of the university system. Leadership becomes most effective when entrepreneurial values are collectively understood, operationalized, and experienced by the broader academic community.

From a theoretical perspective, the study contributes to the growing discourse on entrepreneurial universities by providing empirical evidence from a developing-country and provincial university context, an area that remains underrepresented in existing literature. The findings suggest that entrepreneurial transformation in rural and public higher education institutions follows a distinct trajectory shaped by institutional capacities, governance structures, stakeholder dynamics, and contextual realities. This reinforces the need for context-sensitive models of entrepreneurial university development rather than relying solely on frameworks derived from highly industrialized and innovation-intensive settings.

Practically, the findings provide important implications for university leaders, policymakers, and educational planners. Institutional leaders may need to strengthen mechanisms for participatory governance, stakeholder consultation, policy dissemination, and inclusive decision-making to ensure that entrepreneurial initiatives are more widely experienced and operationalized across institutional sectors. Additionally, universities may consider developing stronger incentive

systems, faculty innovation programs, student-led entrepreneurial platforms, and interdisciplinary collaboration mechanisms to cultivate a more sustainable entrepreneurial culture.

At the policy level, the findings reinforce the strategic role of state universities and colleges in advancing innovation, graduate employability, and regional development. Higher education policies that support entrepreneurial governance, institutional autonomy, innovation funding, and community-industry partnerships may further strengthen the entrepreneurial capacity of provincial universities. Given the growing demand for innovation-responsive higher education systems, entrepreneurial leadership and governance should be viewed not merely as institutional aspirations but as strategic necessities for long-term institutional resilience and competitiveness.

Ultimately, the study demonstrates that entrepreneurial transformation in higher education is a collective and systemic process that requires alignment between institutional leadership, governance structures, and stakeholder experiences. While the university exhibits promising entrepreneurial practices at the strategic level, the varying perceptions among stakeholders indicate the need for deeper institutional integration and broader participatory engagement. Strengthening entrepreneurial leadership and governance therefore remains essential in positioning state universities as catalysts of innovation, inclusive development, and sustainable socio-economic progress in developing contexts.

3.2. Significant Difference on Entrepreneurial Practices of Selected State University in the Philippines when grouped by Respondents.

Table 2 ANOVA on the Differences in Entrepreneurial Practices of Selected State University in the Philippines when grouped by Respondents.

Source of Variation	f-value	p-value	Decision
Between Groups	1.386	0.252	Accept Ho

*Significant at 0.05 level of significance

The table presents the result of a one-way ANOVA used to determine significant differences in the perceived entrepreneurial practices of the selected state university when respondents are grouped according to the type of respondents. The computed F-value of 1.386 represents the ratio of variance between groups to variance within groups, while the p-value of 0.252 indicates the probability that the observed differences occurred by chance.

Since the p-value (0.252) is greater than the standard level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$), the result is not statistically significant. This means that there is no sufficient evidence to conclude that differences exist among the groups. The decision "Accept Ho" indicates that the perceptions of the different respondent groups (supervisors, teachers, and students) regarding the university's entrepreneurial practices do not significantly differ from one another. Although slight variations in their responses may exist, these differences are not large enough to be considered meaningful in a statistical sense.

This suggests that all groups share a generally consistent view of the university's entrepreneurial practices. Such consistency may reflect effective communication of institutional goals, uniform implementation of entrepreneurial initiatives, or a shared institutional culture that shapes similar perceptions across stakeholders. There is no significant difference in the perceived entrepreneurial practices in terms of leadership and governance of the university when respondents are grouped. The acceptance of the null hypothesis confirms that the observed variations are due to chance rather than real differences among the groups.

3.3. Participatory Entrepreneurial Leadership and Governance Framework (PEL-Gov Framework)

Building on the quantitative findings and the documented campus/university initiatives, the following priority areas emerge for strengthening the University's transition into a more entrepreneurial university on leadership and governance, as shown in Figure 1. These areas are designed to close the observed perception gaps (leadership vs. implementers/learners) and to institutionalize entrepreneurship as a consistent, university-wide lived experience.



Figure 1 Participatory Entrepreneurial Leadership and Governance Framework (PEL-Gov Framework)

Leadership and Governance play a foundational role by embedding entrepreneurship into institutional vision, policies, and strategic priorities; concretely, findings emphasize the need for a strategic, participatory, and systems-oriented leadership approach that actively drives entrepreneurship across the institution. Leadership must first ensure the clear articulation and communication of entrepreneurial vision, goals, and performance indicators to all stakeholders through structured platforms such as meetings, dashboards, and institutional reports. This transparency builds shared understanding and institutional alignment. Moreover, governance should promote collaborative and distributed leadership, where deans, faculty, program coordinators, and even student entrepreneurs are actively involved in planning and decision-making processes. Establishing advisory councils, interdepartmental teams, and innovation committees ensures that entrepreneurship initiatives are grounded in practical insights and collective ownership. Equally important is the clarification of roles and responsibilities, where a well-defined organizational structure identifies who leads, supports, and evaluates entrepreneurial programs. This reduces ambiguity and strengthens accountability. Leadership must also institutionalize data-driven decision-making by developing clear metrics, monitoring systems, and regular evaluation mechanisms to assess entrepreneurial performance and continuously refine strategies. In addition, governance should foster a culture of open communication, teamwork, and innovation, supported by collaborative tools, capacity-building programs, and cross-functional engagement across colleges and units. Strategically, leadership must align entrepreneurship initiatives with existing institutional strengths, external partnerships, and development priorities, ensuring synergy rather than duplication of efforts. This includes strengthening linkages with industry, alumni, government agencies, and community organizations. Furthermore, an entrepreneurial university requires a governance system that promotes inclusivity, empowerment, and experimentation, where faculty and students are encouraged to lead projects, test ideas, and innovate without excessive bureaucratic constraints. This is reinforced through recognition and incentive systems, leadership opportunities in creative initiatives, and accessible support mechanisms for innovation. Leadership and governance must extend beyond the institution by integrating community engagement and local innovation, ensuring that entrepreneurial activities contribute to societal needs. This involves forming strong partnerships with local stakeholders, embedding community-based projects into academic programs, and institutionalizing policies that sustain these initiatives. Overall, becoming an entrepreneurial university in terms of leadership and governance requires a shift from traditional hierarchical management to a participatory, adaptive, and innovation-driven governance system that continuously supports, evaluates, and scales entrepreneurial efforts.

4. Conclusion

The findings reveal a perceptual gap in leadership and governance, where Deans consistently rate entrepreneurial practices as highly practiced, while Program Coordinators, faculty, and students perceive them as merely practiced to rarely practiced, and in some enabling respects, like incentives and empowerment. This disparity suggests that although entrepreneurial vision, policies, and community engagement are strongly articulated at the leadership level, their translation into inclusive, participatory, and incentive-driven practices remains limited at the operational level. Notably, relatively higher ratings in community engagement, particularly among students, indicate that external linkages are more visible and effective than internal capacity-building mechanisms. The university should strengthen the alignment between strategic leadership and operational implementation by institutionalizing participatory governance, transparent communication channels, and inclusive decision-making mechanisms across all stakeholder levels. This will address the perceptual gaps observed between leadership and ground-level actors and ensure that entrepreneurial policies are translated into lived practices.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

References

- [1] Alfehaid, F., and Omri, A. (2026). Strategic implications of entrepreneurship for economic sustainability: The roles of entrepreneurial governance and digital infrastructure. *Sustainable Development, Advance online publication*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.70765>
- [2] Aramaki, A. A., Sedghooyan, S., Lashgari, N., and Nejad Rasoul, N. (2023). The role of knowledge-based economy in third generation universities. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 11(2), 4547–4563. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijstrm/v11i02.em04>
- [3] Beta, K. W., and Gezahegn, M. (2025). Entrepreneurial leadership and MSME performance in resource-constrained uncertain contexts: Insights from Ethiopia. *Cogent Business and Management*, 12(1), Article 2573189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2573189>
- [4] Cerado, E. C., and Naanep, N. D. (2023). Measuring the performance of higher education among state universities and colleges in SOX Region, Philippines. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 12(2), 867–876. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i2.23946>
- [5] Guerrero, M., Heaton, S., and Urbano, D. (2021). Building universities' intrapreneurial capabilities in the digital era: The role and impacts of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). *Technovation*, 99, Article 102139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2020.102139>
- [6] Gumbo, E., and van der Westhuizen, T. (2026). Leading entrepreneurship ecosystems in higher education: A case of Universities South Africa's EDHE as an ecosystem coordinator and enabler. In T. van der Westhuizen (Ed.), *Innovative pedagogies for entrepreneurship education* (pp. 497–525). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-07204-7_21
- [7] Henry, C., and Lahikainen, K. (2024). Exploring intrapreneurial activities in the context of the entrepreneurial university: An analysis of five EU HEIs. *Technovation*, 129, Article 102893. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2023.102893>
- [8] Herlina, E., Tukiran, M., and Anwar, S. (2021). The effect of entrepreneurial leadership on organizational performance: Literature review. *Marginal: Journal of Management, Accounting, General Finance, and International Economic Issues*, 1(1), 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.55047/marginal.v1i1.9>
- [9] Hussain, N., and Li, B. (2022). Entrepreneurial leadership and entrepreneurial success: The role of knowledge management processes and knowledge entrepreneurship. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 829959. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.829959>
- [10] Koeswayo, P. S., Haryanto, H., and Handoyo, S. (2024). The impact of corporate governance, internal control, and corporate reputation on employee engagement: A moderating role of leadership style. *Cogent Business and Management*, 11(1), Article 2296698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2296698>

- [11] Linton, G. (2024). Triple helix dynamics and hybrid organizations: An analysis of value creation processes. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 15(4), 20797–20822. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-024-01911-2>
- [12] Moradi, M. A., and Jahanbakht, M. (2026). Institutional governance and entrepreneurship: A multi-branch perspective on policy mixes in emerging economies. *Administrative Sciences*, 16(2), 97. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci16020097>
- [13] Nguyen, Q. A., Maritz, A., and Millemann, J. A. (2021). Entrepreneurship imperatives in higher education institutions: The case of Australian universities. *Industry and Higher Education*, 36(5), 493–511. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09504222211059744>
- [14] Patrício, L. D., and Ferreira, J. J. (2023). Aligning entrepreneurial universities' HEInnovate dimensions with entrepreneurs' needs: A graduate entrepreneur-centered perspective. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(3), Article 100882. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100882>
- [15] Purcell, W. M., and Chahine, T. (2019). Leadership and governance frameworks driving transformational change in an entrepreneurial UK university. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 40(5), 612–623. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2018-0280>
- [16] Rodríguez-Aceves, L., Couto-Ortega, M., Minola, T., Markuerkiaga, L., and Hahn, D. (2024). Entrepreneurial university governance: The case of a cooperative university. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 49(6), 2200–2233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-024-10126-1>
- [17] Romero-Sánchez, A., Perdomo-Charry, G., and Burbano-Vallejo, E. L. (2024). Exploring the entrepreneurial landscape of university–industry collaboration on public university spin-off creation: A systematic literature review. *Heliyon*, 10(19), Article e27258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e27258>
- [18] Rosienkiewicz, M., Helman, J., Cholewa, M., Molasy, M., Górecka, A., Kohen-Vacs, D., Winokur, M., Amador Nelke, S., Levi, A., Gómez-González, J. F., Bourgain, M., Sagar, A., Berselli, G., and Benis, A. (2024). Enhancing Technology-Focused Entrepreneurship in Higher Education Institutions Ecosystem: Implementing Innovation Models in International Projects. *Education Sciences*, 14(7), 797. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14070797>
- [19] Valle, L., Costan, E., Costan, F., General, E., Alcántara, G., Kilat, R. V., Batican, I., Olivar, G. M., and Avila, D. (2022). Community extension MSMEs' entrepreneurial activities in relation to poverty reduction. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 7, Article 1038006. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2022.1038006>