White Rose Research Online

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York

Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/161333/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:
Higgins, D, Refai, D and Keita, D (2018) Focus point: the need for alternative insight into the entrepreneurial education paradigm. Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship, 31 (3). pp. 225-242. ISSN: 0827-6331

https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2018.1466851

© 2018 Journal of the Canadian Council for Small Business and Entrepreneurship/Conseil de la PME et de l'entrepreneuriat. This is an author produced version of a journal article published in Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse
Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
University of Sheffield
UNIVERSITY of York

Focus Point: the need for alternative insight into the entrepreneurial education paradigm.

David Higgins

Organisational Management Subject Group, Chatham Building, Chatham Street, University of Liverpool, Telephone: 151 795 8328, Email: dhiggins@liv.ac.uk

Deema Refai

University of Huddersfield, Department of Management, University of Huddersfield, Queensgate, Huddersfield, UK, HD1 3DH.

Diene Keita

University of Liverpool

Abstract

There is widespread consensus that traditional instructional pedagogical methods are not sufficient to adequately prepare and educate entrepreneurship students. The growing need to consider alternative pedagogical perspectives in terms of how we engage with and study entrepreneurship from diverse perspectives is essential if the field is to develop, by challenging current boundaries established as a result of dominant functionalist paradigms. The above viewpoint is not simply a question of thinking about a new pedagogical technique, but rather involves re-conceptualising how entrepreneurial educators / students are co-constructors of the learning experience. The paper seeks to respond to calls for entrepreneurial education methods which utilises experiential learning to draw recognition on how we engage with and make sense of everyday practices. It does this by exploring the use of practice theory to develop more insight into how, through pedagogical means, one can create the opportunity for a student to engage in meaningful learning.

Introduction

The core of entrepreneurial endeavour is that of creativity and innovation, which requires people to practise or work in novel ways. To act in an entrepreneurial manner requires more than simply applying knowledge and skills; it involves doing something over and above normal practice. However, scholars and researchers in the field are currently challenging one another to question what the most effective approach to educating the entrepreneur is. Concerns are expressed about the need to engage more critically with the lived experiences of practicing entrepreneurs through pedagogical approaches and methods, seeking to account for and highlighting the social aspect of entrepreneurial practice. One particular concern relates to Hindles (2007) who refers to entrepreneurial education as a field of study that lacks legitimacy as a source of true value in the context of the community, that is higher education. Current teaching practice and initiatives in the field have focused towards drawing attention to entrepreneurship and how this can be supported, through online courses, mentoring/coaching and short courses; however, research into how we learn to practice and be entrepreneurs, from a pedagogical perspective, is still in its formative stages and requires greater legitimatisation. That is not to say no research has been conducted. The work of scholars such as Gibbs, Hannon and Kearney, to name a few has offered insight into how we start to educate and develop entrepreneurship as a subject area. Ever since entrepreneurship was taught in the 1970's as a niche subject area, scholarly publications have carried articles specifically related to the field, hosting several systematic reviews (e.g. Broad, 2007; Fayolle, 2013; Pittaway and Cope, 2007), which have led to some interesting insights suggesting towards the fragmented nature of the field and the complexity of aligning pedagogical expectations with learning outcomes in terms of what we understand entrepreneurship to be, coupled to the soft and hard skills associated with entrepreneurial practice.

This growing interest in entrepreneurial education over the past number of years has equally witnessed an increasing demand for greater and more robust methodological and theoretical foundations to educational practice (Pittaway & Cope, 2007). Entrepreneurship education has been the subject of numerous scientific publications that have been dominated over the past ten years by behavioral, cognitive and socio-cognitive approaches (Byrne et al., 2014; Toutain et al., Forthcoming). These approaches, which focus mainly on how to learn, often underpin learning by doing to help the individual develop his or her knowledge, abilities and entrepreneurial behavior. The contribution of psychology, embodied by the contributions of Bandura (1977, 1985, 1997, and 2001) and Azjen (1991), contributed greatly to the

development of this tendency, as did the founding works of the sciences of education (Dewey, 1916, Freinet, 1993, Montessori, 2016, Piaget, 2001, Piaget and Inhelder, 1969, Vygotsky, 1934) 'In' and 'with' its environment.

Still, scholarly publications in the area of entrepreneurial education tend to describe methods of engagement, in particular pedagogical approaches, at the expense of philosophical, methodological and theoretical underpinning or rationales. Thus, a descriptive tone dominates the nature of the interventions used at the expense of critical reasoning, where the focus is on telling about at the expense of understanding why (Katz 2003; Kuratko 2005; Pittaway and Cope 2007; Mwasalwiba 2010; Naia et al. 2014; Byrne, Fayolle, and Toutain 2014; Fayolle 2013). Here, methods of learning are assumed with little attention towards moments of reflection or self-reflexivity. In this regard, the study of entrepreneurial education still tends to have a rather narrow view regarding what it means to live and practice as an entrepreneur in today's business environment. Entrepreneurship education scholars in the field have tended to continuously close themselves off from seeing a purposeful yet different set of multiplicity of views on what it means to practice as an entrepreneur, and as a result to a degree hindering our ability to educate or to observe the phenomena, and develop educational practices which have the capacity to offer insight and value. As a result, a gap has emerged in the entrepreneurship education field, where issues such as learning activities and methods of learning and how these are developed require more attention (Béchard and Grégoire, 2005; Edelman, Manolova and Edelman et al, 2008; Honig, 2004; Neck and Greene,2011; and Pittaway and Cope, 2007). This goes in line with Fayolle (2013) who highlights the need for entrepreneurship education research that focuses on concepts and processes of engagement, use of cross disciplinary educational theories that underpin pedagogical approaches to entrepreneurial learning, and focus on the use of practice-based methodological approaches.

Criticisms of entrepreneurial education have given rise for the need to promote a more critically engaged pedagogical approaches towards entrepreneurial learning in action. There is a growing need to consider alternative pedagogical perspectives in terms of how we engage with and study entrepreneurship from diverse perspectives, if the field is to develop, by challenging the boundaries established through the adoption of dominant functionalist paradigms (Tedmanson et al., 2012). This is not simply a question of thinking about a new pedagogical technique, but rather re-conceptualising how entrepreneurial educators / students are co-constructors of the learning experience. Scholars recognise the challenges facing researchers and educators in tackling the difficulty in enhancing opportunity identification competence (Karimi et al.,2016). Yet, as entrepreneurs are viewed as possessing high levels of self-confidence and creativity, and have the ability to utilize innovative approaches to decision making, entrepreneurial education needs to provide a viable platform for pedagogical development. This is a difficult task that contributes to the debate of whether entrepreneurship can be taught in a flexible, innovative and entrepreneurial way at all (Smith, Collins, Hannon 2006). Scholars agree that there exists a need for HEIs to both recognise and develop a more focused pedagogy towards entrepreneurial education by shifting attention away from the traditional means of delivery towards facilitating learning through alternative methods (Johnston, Zhang and Hamilton, 2008). This calls for more critical and pragmatic based approaches towards the development of the field, and also gives rise to the need to promote a more critically engaged pedagogical approach towards entrepreneurial learning in action. The fundamental questions of what it means to be an entrepreneur, what they actually do and how they engage in practise are becoming more obscured and fragmented (Ucbasaran et al., 2001; Higgins et al., 2015; Watson 2013). The beauty, simplicity and yet complexity of what it means to practice as an entrepreneur cannot be decontextualized into constituent

parts; entrepreneurship must be appreciated as an emergent dynamic whole. The diversity and complexity of entrepreneurship is simply not accountable through the use of logical modelling or theorising. In this context, we reject the very basis of what it means to be rational. This is not to say that the knowledge we have gained about entrepreneurship is redundant, rather what is being suggested is that we use this knowledge as an opportunity to seek alternative ways of exploring entrepreneurship. We need to be critically reflexive of the strengths and weaknesses of the current theories we have formulated. This involves taking time to really understand and appreciate what we know, but equally also trying to see the "wood from the trees" by focusing on the abstract as opposed to the detail (Korsgaard and Anderson, 2011; Diochon and Anderson, 2011; Anderson, 2000; Anderson et al., 2009; Jack et al., 2010).

In this paper, we aim to synthesize current literature into a conceptual andragogical approach towards entrepreneurial education and learning that seeks to understand the process of entrepreneurial learning as an (experiential) practice. The paper seeks to contribute to the existing debate on entrepreneurial learning and education by emphasizing the role of learning by doing in developing entrepreneurial knowledge through viewing learning as a socially enacted practice. In doing so, we draw focus towards more affirmed theoretical and methodological foundations, which seek to embrace the applied aspect of what it means to practice and live as an entrepreneur. The paper is influenced through the writers' own views that learning is a socially enacted process. Drawing from critical and social constructionist perspectives in relation to learning, the paper focuses on the use of practice as a means of entrepreneurial pedagogical engagement. The authors seek to respond to calls for entrepreneurial education methods which utilise experiential learning to draw recognition on how we engage with, and make sense of, everyday practices. It does this by exploring the use of practice theory to develop more insight into how, through pedagogical means, one can create the opportunity for a student to engage in meaningful learning. In this context the paper focus is placed on methods through which learning resides in action. Recognising experience in learning allows for the development of action which re-directs thinking and conceptualizing towards understanding the social tensions, complex relations and connections in the co-construction of knowing, and discussing the nature of experiential learning as an enacted practice.

Having said this, we do recognise that such insights can be regarded as new to some, but to others obvious, in that these spaces are all part of the entrepreneurs reality, however, our comments are consistent with the need to develop a more critical approach to entrepreneurial education and related studies (Berglund, Johannisson, & Schwartz, 2012; Hjorth, Holt, & Steyaert, 2015; Hjorth, Jones, & Gartner, 2008; Hjorth & Steyaert, 2010; Rehn, Br€annback, Carsrud, & Lindahl, 2013; Sørensen, 2008; Steyaert & Hjorth, 2003, 2006; Tedmanson, Verduyn, Essers, & Gartner, 2012; Verduijn, Dey, Tedmanson, & Essers, 2014). In this paper, we speak into current educational debate for entrepreneurial practice to become a key consideration of how we educate and develop entrepreneurs in order to avoid the marginalisation of this emerging research agenda, through this paper we seek to embrace, celebrate and understand the diversity inherent in the field.

The paper begins with a review of the literature surrounding entrepreneurial education and learning/pedagogy, suggesting that heavily programmed learning is an obstacle to effective learning-by-doing. It is argued in the paper that by addressing this issue, meaning may be found as to why and how progress can be made in meeting the learning needs of developing entrepreneurs. The paper then moves on to develop a practice-based view of entrepreneurial

education and learning in order to achieve "greater consistency, clarity and coherence of purpose, process and practice". By doing so, the paper explores an area that has been continuously overlooked in entrepreneurial education and learning; namely the role of practice as an epistemological means of learning, and what practice can contribute to the entrepreneur's knowledge base. What is ultimately required here is a synthesis of theory and practice if we are to develop thoughtful entrepreneurial practitioners.

Compatibility of HEIs and Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurial education has become an ever-increasing important agenda in local, regional and national government policy both in the UK and Europe. Even though entrepreneurial education is quite a new phenomenon in HEIs, as a field of inquiry it is one of the most rapidly growing areas of research, and is viewed as the engine for social and economic movement and development here in the UK through new venture creation and growth (Matlay, 2009). A recent GEM survey (2016) indicated that 66% of the adult population view entrepreneurship as a good career choice, with almost 50% of the survey population believing they had the capabilities to engage in entrepreneurial practice. Since the 2008 economic crisis, the intensity to create and develop entrepreneurial action has dramatically increased, calling upon HEI business schools to offer more entrepreneurship and innovation based programmes, government policy has also sought to extend this into primary and secondary school education systems (Kyrö, 2015; Rizza and Amorim Varum, 2011).

Alongside the growing importance of entrepreneurial education, business schools have been criticised for their use of pedagogical approaches, which have neglected or even dispelled the notion of experiential learning, "learning by doing" as a basis for practice, and have further neglected the associated inductive ontological based views to understanding the framing of real world "live" concepts and problems (Pfeffer and Fong 2002). This existing mode of entrepreneurial education has been dominated by an ideology of rational institutionalism, which treats the process of entrepreneurship not as an art or craft that is deeply rooted in the practice of everyday life, but something that is functional. This preference to adopt a pedagogy focused on case based delivery has resulted in a failure to focus on soft skills development (Bennis and O' Toole 2005). The end results being the development of an "entrepreneur" with no supporting analytical framework for understanding and appreciating real management based issues.

For many years the functional orientated pedagogy of the traditional business school has been unquestioned in its application towards favouring functionalist ideologies. This orientation does not address the changing nature of entrepreneurial learning, leading to ongoing challenges in both the UK and Europe. There is limited empirical evidence to suggest that current entrepreneurial programmes encourage the use of reflexive perspectives in the exploration of entrepreneurial practice with regards to the learning through and from experiences (Widding, 2005; Wu et al., 2007). While certain studies are persistent in the view that entrepreneurship and its practice can be learned through traditional methods (Gorman *et al.,* 1997; Falkang and Alberti, 2000; Kuratko, 2005; Fayolle *et al.,* 2006), these methods continue to raise many debates, particularly as they tend to analyse entrepreneurship as a series of functional, measureable and teachable processes (Deakins *et al.,* 1998). The traditional philosophy of entrepreneurial pedagogy is increasingly in tension with the changing demands of the modern business environment, resulting in the requirement for a new emergent conception of the role of practice and experiential learning. A continued reoccurring theme is the divide in education ideologies between the "corporate bureaucratic

model" and the "entrepreneurial value driven world", which is manifested in the polarisation between experiential and passive learning, which persists in current education (Draycott and Rae, 2011). Henry *et al.* (2005) argue the need for different skill sets in the education of entrepreneurs such as technical skills including oral and written communication, business management skills including strategic awareness, marketing and finance, and personal skills developed through learning via experience. Refai and Thompson (2014) agree to this this and highlight the need for developing both functional and soft skills in entrepreneurial education. Similarly, Neck and Green (2011) advocate that entrepreneurship education should stimulate the development of business management knowledge alongside entrepreneurial competencies (i.e. behaviour traits and skills), thereby creating value for students and fostering more competent entrepreneurs. Yet, these skills cannot be adequately developed through traditional teaching methods (Munoz et al., 2008; Refai and Thompson, 2015), which have origins deep within passive learning strategies and techniques. There is widespread consensus that the traditional instructional pedagogical methods are not sufficient to adequately prepare and educate entrepreneurship students (Honig, 2004). Davies and Gibb (1991) suggest that methods employed within traditional education are, in the main, inappropriate for entrepreneurs. Several authors (e.g. Gorman *et al.,* 1997; Falkang and Alberti, 2000; Kuratko, 2003; Fayolle *et al.,* 2006) agree to this and highlight that traditional educational programmes are inappropriate for assessing students' readiness to become enterprising (Solomon and Fernald, 1991; Hisrich and Peters, 2002; Rae, 2004), and tend to leave participants with an abstract and unconnected set of knowledge and skills, which at times have very little relevance to the actual complex active of being an entrepreneur. In this regard, Henry *et al*. (2005) and Young (1997) agree that there are limitations to what entrepreneurs can be taught in the classroom and that learning from experience is the only way. This is further backed by Dhliwayo (2008) who argues that traditional passive learning methods can only be memorised by the student, in terms of the concepts and theories that are taught to them, while Hwang *et al.* (2008) suggest that entrepreneurs who are exposed to such learning strategies are simply 'involved' spectators, rather than active participants.

Traditional teaching methods, which focus on students' passive receipt of information, are seen as unsuccessful in developing students' active participation and critical thinking and are described as '*static*' since they limit students' learning within certain sources, environments or approaches to learning (Taylor, and Thorpe 2004). In contrast, however, experiential learning is more concerned with the relating to, understanding and actively applying concepts taught in the classroom to the student's environment. Experiential learning offers '*a means of development, intellection, emotional or physical input that requires its subjects, through responsible involvement in some real complex and stressful problems, to achieve intended change to improve their observable behaviour in the problem field*' (Revans, 1982, p.12). Jennings (2010) identifies four elements to experiential learning – the exposure to experiences, the practice of embedding experiences, conversation and interaction with others regarding the experiences in order to make further sense and reflections on what we do, see and hear. As such, experiential learning allows for a more involved pro-active approach through exposure to experiences, the practice of embedding experiences, conversation and interaction with others and reflections on what is done (Jennings, 2010). Experiential learning supports an '*active process*' of learning that is moved forward by the learner (Kolb, 1984), thus, bringing about a more '*generative*' view of learning that brings out new experiences in advance rather than adapting to changes after they happen (Hamel and Prahalad, 1994). Chairam *et al.* (2009) and Refai, Klapper and Thompson (2015) argue for the need to engage students in new experiences by moving away from traditional passive learning styles towards more 'constructionist perspectives' that focus on entrepreneur's 'centred learning', where the

latter propose experiential learning, in particular, as an appropriate tool. In other words, learning through experience and reflection should have greater priority than the methods and teaching styles that have been traditionally employed in the past.

An example illustrating this view is the '*Discovering Entrepreneurship'* tripartite experimental programme by Smith, Collins and Hannon (2006), undertaken in the UK and involving students, academics and entrepreneurs. This programme has the particularity of encouraging cooperation with entrepreneurs and academics, co-learning, consultation with academics and entrepreneurs and collective-action, where students independently carry out projects. The researchers argue that such programmes encourage the entrepreneurial intent of students, and support achieving desirable entrepreneurial outcomes, where the latter are viewed in the context of arming students with inspiration that enhances their chances of successful venture creation and implementation. One participant reported that the programme "caused her to consider launching her career as an artist far earlier than intended; she had submitted pieces to galleries and sold everything" (Smith, Collins and Hannon, 2006, p.562). It is possible that this student's entrepreneurial intent was encouraged, and she gained confidence through the programme, tying back to the concepts of inspiring students.

Indeed, "few modules or courses have specifically been validated to achieve desirable entrepreneurial outcomes" (Hannon, 2006, p. 298), where such outcomes refer to arming students with *inspiration* that enhances their chances of successful venture creation and implementation, thereby creating value for students and fostering more competent entrepreneurs. Since the 1980s, the debate about "what" should be taught and "how", regarding entrepreneurial education has been ongoing (Ronstadt, 1990). However, equally and effectively, stimulating both the knowledge base and entrepreneurial competencies has been shown to be a challenge as it involves fighting against academics' "natural inclination to resort to "old" behaviours – "chalk and talk", giving too much direction and leading from the front", or doing what is supposedly the good traditional way of doing things (Refai and Klapper, 2016). Smith, Collins, Hannon (2006) question whether entrepreneurship can be taught in a flexible, innovative and entrepreneurial ways at all, and conclude that "using participatory methods is not an approach that would work well in highly bureaucratic institutions where there is little time for reflection; where there is a role oriented culture and where the skills necessary to engage successfully with these methods are outside the traditional and practiced skill set of some academics" (Smith, Collins, Hannon, 2006, p.563). It is here that we draw attention towards theories of experiential learning (Papert and Harel, 1991), tacit learning (Polanyi, 1958), decision-making (Sadler-Smith, 2004, Burke and Sadler-Smith, 2006) and heuristics (Holcomb et al, 2009), which all support an entrepreneurial education approach that draws focus towards the situated aspects of learning by doing or experiential learning (Gibb, 2007), which are areas that are further explored next.

What is to practice? Situated learning as a process of entrepreneurial education

The perspective of situated learning represents a movement away from the pre-conceptualisations of rationality, offered through current HEI institutionalism to a method that embraces introspection of critical reflection as a means of creating learning practices that enable and facilitate the exploration of alternative spaces of possible actions. The implication of this position in terms of an educational agenda involves challenging the "self-conceptions" of what it means to be an "entrepreneur", inviting openness to alternative meanings. Entrepreneurs have increasingly emphasized the importance and value of practice as a critical source of knowledge (Johannisson, 2011; Keating, Geiger & McLoughlin, 2013). To practice

means to embrace what is unknown as a critical mechanism for challenging and generating new questions to deal with the entrepreneur's day to day activities. A core aspect of the entrepreneur's practice is their ability to question/critique, an element of emergence (learning) which connects practice to action. By situating reflexivity as a pedagogical practice one needs to take account of how both educators and entrepreneurs (students) recognise their own place in the learning process. A reflexive view of the entrepreneurs' practice emphasizes attention towards the entrepreneur as a learner and their problems and experiences. The paper evidences the need for a more rigorous pedagogy, which draws analysis of the theoretical underpinnings required so that the political and social dynamics of learning as a practice can be revealed. The use and purpose of reflexive practice in entrepreneurial education enables space to be created for both academics and learners to become more reflexive in their thinking in order to create meaningful and actionable applied knowledge.

Entrepreneurial education from a practice based perspective encompasses and reflects many research traditions in the sociological field (Bourdieu, 1972; Foucault, 1973; Giddens, 1984), activity theory (Engestrom et al., 1999), and ethnomethodology (Fox, 2006) to name some. Because of these divergent perspectives, it is difficult to determine a common perspective on what it means to practice. Yet, while there is no exact definition of what the term practice means in the sociological field, there is an assumed understanding that to practice is to recognize the social and collective dimensions of human interaction (Bourdieu, 1987). From a sociological perspective, practice offers insight into the social construction of our normative behaviour which emerges overtime; which reflects, sustains and produces/reproduces norms, values, and knowledge (Foucault, 1973). Practices, in this context, represent the normative constructs, which define the norms of what we view to be entrepreneurial practice, while simultaneously produce and reproduce new and existing norms through the mediation of dynamic tensions and ongoing normative practice. In a similar vein, Joas (1996) focuses towards two critical elements of human actors and their practise, firstly the embodiment of what it means to enact feelings, emotions and awareness, secondly the social aspects of action, the entrepreneur is a social being where actions are always situated with their interactions with other human beings (Blumer, 1969). It is thus important to understand the entrepreneurial practise as a means of sense making, how they interrupt their social reality, engage in exchanges with others as a means of circumstance.

Situated learning emphasises the importance of these social dynamics, as an enactment of learning, thus supporting the understanding of entrepreneurial learning as a social practice (not a theory). In this regard, entrepreneurial education literature has sought to position the entrepreneur as a socially constructed entity (Auerswald, 2008; Chalmers and Shaw, 2017; Johannisson, 2011; Watson, 2013; Chell, 2007; Nicholson and Anderson, 2005), drawing focus to the position of the entrepreneur and their activities as a set of socially enacted practices, which are intrinsically entwined with the fabric of the contemporary world. The importance of developing entrepreneurial self-awareness, exposing, and giving access to knowledge is a critical element for success (Widding, 2005; Wu et al., 2008). Here, it is often recognised that entrepreneurial practice is a crafted form of art, which requires an appreciative and sensitive engagement with a range of socio-cultural phenomena in the entrepreneurial setting (Blackburn and Kovalainen, 2009; Hjorth, Jones and Gartner 2008). The entrepreneur continually faces complex situations, as they engage in their everyday practice, dealing with new situations, seeking ways to overcome these issues. This goes in line with Neck and Greene (2011) who describe entrepreneurship as "complex, chaotic, [lacking] any notion of linearity", and leading to no specific destination through operating "in

uncertain and even currently unknowable environments" (p. 55). This position encourages the instructor to expose the entrepreneur to their practice, which as a result enables the introduction of critical reflection and the emergence of meaning that enables the entrepreneur, through facilitation, to add meaning to their practice. Higgins et al. (2015) argue for alternative approaches to entrepreneurial pedagogy, which illustrate the contextualised nature of social practice. Here, human activity is placed at the centre of how we understand and make sense of what it means to practice.

Entrepreneurial education from a practice based perspective can be described as a means of criticizing the dominant rationalist positions in the field. Ehiobuche and Justus (2014) add that enhanced engagement is a result of students developing emotional and cognitive feelings of participating and implementing academic work for a wider audience, therefore, giving a greater meaning to their activities and making the learning process matter. As Illustrated by the '*Discovering Entrepreneurship'* programme, students taking part in other disciplines in a HEI may have an interest in entrepreneurship and equally, entrepreneurship students may require knowledge from those fields. Collaboration among these groups can be beneficial for a purpose of mutual learning because it remains true that entrepreneurs emerge from a wide variety of knowledge bases, and that they do equally benefit from knowledge outside of their formal training to foment their creativity, inspire their minds and identify and develop opportunities. Although much of the literature about entrepreneurial education tends to not explicitly acknowledge the emotional support and factors behind the business creation process, Ehiobuche and Justus (2014) recommend that instructors consider prioritising a dialogue-based approach over traditional instructional approaches when student engagement declines because "if instructors do not have an interest in them or care about their future, students can sense this" (Ehiobuche and Justus, 2014, p. 132). This puts further emphasis on the idea of inspiring and enriching students (Bumpus and Burton, 2008; Tan and Ng,2006). Indeed, Jones and English (2004) suggest that encouraging self-esteem should be a concern of entrepreneurial education. It is therefore important to first look at entrepreneurial education from the student perspective, notably with regards to the question of entrepreneurial intention and key factors that contribute to turning these intentions into tangible actions as contributing factors of the development of effective entrepreneurial education. While considering that "the journey to graduate entrepreneurship is not a function of a single motivating factor" (Nabi, Walmsley and Holden, 2015), research suggests the need for continuous, holistic and tailored support as graduate entrepreneurship tends to be evolutionary rather than a strategic step-by-step process, and in some cases intent may be present without even a clear business idea (Nabi, Holden and Walmsley, 2010).

This view changes the perception of the educator's role and level of involvement, from that of a transmitter and disseminator of knowledge to that of a facilitator of learning which is consistent with an inquiry-based pedagogical approach (Goodlad, 1992; Brookfield and Preskill, 1999; Sarasin, 1999). It changes the traditional role of educators to become mentors and facilitators who can enhance students' learning by helping them to '*dissect, reflect, and learn*' from their experiences (Deakins and O'Neill 2000). Such pedagogy draws focus to exposing differences or gaps between the individual entrepreneurs' espoused perceptions of theories; it seeks to probe into the politically defensive routines used by the entrepreneur to be rational and controlling over others. In this way, it allows for the exploration of hidden tensions of resistance and conflicts that are embedded in social discourse. Here, the entrepreneur begins to understand how they and others select bits of knowledge from learning experiences, and then draw almost immediate conclusions from these bits of knowledge without understanding their embedded assumptions or attributions.

By drawing recognition to the lived practice of the entrepreneur, one can begin to position entrepreneurial learning as a process of socially constructed emergent practice. Such a change in perspective requires a conceptualization of what we understand entrepreneurship to be and how we theorise and develop new dialogue. Such discussion seeks to provide the community an opportunity to an alternative perspective as a method of re-shaping and understanding what it means to practice as an entrepreneur (Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009). The entrepreneur continually faces complex situations, as they engage in their everyday practise, continuously seeking ways of dealing with these new situations, seeking ways to overcome these issues. Here, the development of how we view and make sense of social action can be to assume that entrepreneurial practice is emergent in nature. Such emergent behaviour is not unbounded; it is situated in a social context which has outcomes that are determined and mediated by social, historical and cultural elements. Consequently, we position entrepreneurship in an ontological position of "becoming" (entrepreneuring), rather than simply "being", a way of transcending how we view and appreciate the relationality of the entrepreneur's patterns of interacting and enactment. This is consistent with the perspective of Steyant and Hjorth (2007), Steyaert (2007) and Johannission (2011) who view the practice of "entrepreneuring" with that of everyday life, establishing the practise as a fundamental element of complex human activity, and a way of coping or making sense with their social reality. This is also consistent with Vygotsky (1978) whose work underpins the idea of entrepreneurial learning as enacted through participative practice, linking the potential to learn with what the individual currently knows.

Entrepreneurial education design

HEIs must cultivate innovative ways of thinking, and new modes of pedagogy to fully enhance and develop entrepreneurial approaches to education and learning (Gibb, 2002), and eventually nurture a mentality which acknowledges the elusiveness of entrepreneurship competencies including behaviours and traits. This mentality should also acknowledge that though these traits may be learned through experience and training (Man et al., 2008; Mulder et al., 2007; Wagener et al., 2010), experience may be a very important aspect of their development and the results of experience may be more embedded than those acquired from training, and may not be particularly teachable or accurately assessed. Gaining a better insight with regards to the motivating factors that lead to successful identification of opportunities and firm creation would be a beneficial approach to enrich the implementation of entrepreneurial education. There is in existence an emerging body of literature in the area of entrepreneurial education, which is focused towards the use of entrepreneurial learning (Fischer and Reuber, 1993, Gibb 1997; Minniti and Bygrave, 2001). This body of literature holds the view that effective entrepreneurial education is best achieved through activity and experience, while offering the suggestion that experiential learning ideologies would be most suited for understanding and describing entrepreneurial learning. As a definition, experiential learning is often implemented through simulations, student research, study abroad or industry placements, games, internships and community based activities such as service-learning (GMCTE, 2015). This is by no means an exhaustive list.

HEIs may therefore benefit from providing a more adult-centred perspective of entrepreneurial education. This would be an andragogy based on a design thinking approach, as explained by Hassi and Laakso (2011), which uses a human-centred, experimental and explorative perspective (Willness and Bruni-Bossio, 2017). Although centred upon self-direction, experience, awareness of one's social role, problem-centred learning and internal motivation, these methods of teaching must actively seek to be removed from the common

narrative of the special, individualistic hero entrepreneur because "in reality, developing collaborative competences is more in line with the life of everyday entrepreneurs who have to form networks and learn to draw on the resources of others" (Warhuus et al., 2016, p.235). Warhuus et al. (2016) addresses the importance of social interaction in the context of entrepreneurship, notably through group work. They emphasise that group work can go from just a didactical instrument to one that can be an active pedagogical tool in the classroom to achieve learning outcomes so that students can move from the "I-paradigm of the entrepreneur [to] the We-paradigm" [which can be an] essential component and competence in the future changing world, where there is a continual need for learning in networks and flexible organizational set-ups, and is therefore an important competence to nurture" (Warhuus et al, 2016, p. 246). A team work setting in general may allow entrepreneurial students to complement their skills, gain experience or networks and a variety of other resources (Warhuus et al., 2016). A very important point to consider, however, is that it is widely recognised that business education is not limited to the traditional classroom and course environment and can transgress this onto more informal methods (Ehiobuche and Justus 2014). Thus, although there is emphasis on what can be achieved in the classroom context, one may benefit from looking outside this scope and combine both traditional and alternative informal methods link like plain networking. In order to enable this, an area of interest is the interaction between students and their environment. There is a pressing need for educators and education designers to make students be aware that the HEIs itself is a community, which may be exploited to its maximum capacity. "The higher education community can join forces to develop practices that cultivate student engagement beliefs, values, feelings, motivation, behavioural habits and skills that are at the crux of high levels of student engagement" (Ehiobuche and Justus 2004, p. 132). This should not be only within the limits of entrepreneurship courses and HEI business schools, it must also encompass the wider HEI community. More specifically, HEIs should consider facilitating the interaction between entrepreneurs and the wider HEI environment by encouraging an entrepreneurial culture within their structure so that the microcosm of society that HEIs represent can be exploited effectively to the benefit of the entrepreneurial spirit regardless of the disciplines that students study, in turn helping to facilitate developing the business intent that may be harboured by students to its full capacity as developing networks and the ability to persuade others are also central to successful entrepreneurship (Davidsson and Honig, 2003; McClelland, 1987). Building a culture of entrepreneurship, and thus providing student with an entrepreneurially integrated and favourable environment could also provide a less resource-intensive alternative as it does not as such require integration into a formal programme planned and managed by a faculty, but just natural social interactions between people, therefore making the most of the HEI's context in terms of resources and human capital.

Conclusion / Implications

Research in educational pedagogical practice from an entrepreneurial perspective needs to fully consider the theoretical development of current assumptions in what is means to "be" and "engage in entrepreneurial practice. The field of entrepreneurship has seen the development of numerous ad-hoc ideas without creditable theoretical underpinning. If research in general is to achieve contribution or have impact, one needs to reframe and develop, the questions, which we ask and how we ask those questions. For example, moving away from the explanatory questions set of what and how, to the critical question set which seeks to explore why, thus attempting to reveal the dynamics of practices across all levels of analysis. Establishing a connection between these questions sets facilitates an orientation,

which reveals both the dynamic and relational flow of action and knowledge. To move one's understanding and appreciation of the area, scholars need to be prepared to reflexively become aware of the questions they are asking.

This paper operationalises a conceptual framework by proposing the key principles that favour the implementation of a social and situational learning in a training programme centered on the entrepreneurial process by the action in context. Thus, pedagogical approaches must place more emphasis towards practice; experiential and reflective methods to enhance and develop innovative/ critical way of thinking, to fully embrace the complexities of the entrepreneurial learning through experience (Gibbs, 2002). While one can acknowledge that the value of experiential learning has been recognised in the general literature, experiential learning occurs when the entrepreneur actively becomes involved with an experience and then reflects on that practice (Frontczak and Kelley, 2000). Unlike typical education or training, learning as an experience, which is practiced, can greatly enhance the entrepreneur's understanding and appreciation of integrating theory to real world practice.

Our work mobilizes fundamental contributions to the field of education and reflexive methods to broaden the issues surrounding the design and implementation of action learning in the field of entrepreneurship education. It invites readers to think of entrepreneurial learning as an area which although not solely concerned with didactic, and assessed teaching, can also benefit from preserving traditional theoretical practice and the transfer of information between academics and students within its parameters. It invites others to consider the inclusion of a non-didactic or instruction based approach, which puts an emphasis on supporting the entrepreneurs in other ways (such as providing an environment in which they can build confidence, build a network both in an assisted and autonomous manner) illustrating that teaching entrepreneurship in an entrepreneurial manner calls not for an omission or mere substitution of traditional approaches by experiential learning processes. Models of innovation in entrepreneurial education tend to want to create something within the familiar boundaries of education which feels the need to measure, or incorporate components into the known and existing framework of HEI pedagogy. It is becoming evident that this approach gives way to confusing and problematic outcomes. The article suggests a more thorough look at the evaluation of knowledge (maintaining conventional evaluation modes of knowledge bases and allowing a more forgiving, inspiring evaluation or lack thereof for entrepreneurial capabilities) so that knowledge is evaluated in its appropriate context and where it is realistically possible. Willness and Bruni-Bossio, (2017) assert that measuring Core elements of curriculum, such as "content and evaluation, remain essential components" (p.157). For example, testing knowledge on theoretical subjects such as finance and managements studies. It may not be necessary, however, to widen the assessment spectrum to accommodate behaviour because the real-world experience of entrepreneurship does not generally allow for a discrete perspective of competencies. This is in an attempt not to discourage students and continue allowing them to foster their entrepreneurial capabilities. Innovation in entrepreneurial education should therefore not solely focus on 'teaching' entrepreneurship in an innovative way but rather investigate how HEIs can adapt to provide an environment that encourages the propensity of entrepreneurship and promote HEIs as an opening portal to the opportunities in the real world.

The pragmatic approach that we present also leads to a re-questioning of entrepreneurial education at a more philosophical level that of the educational philosophy at stake: what is the aim of entrepreneurial education? Considering learning as a social construct, for example, opens new perspectives for thinking about an education for sustainable entrepreneurship that

integrates and combines social, economic and ecological issues (Nurse, 2006). A focus is thus required on methods which enable one to gain a real insight into the natural practices of what it means to be a practicing entrepreneur, where experience and learning are gained through the natural process of social enactment. Seeking to instil the use of reflexive processes as means of critiquing practice can be a key method here. Such reflexivity draws focus to the learning experience and the socially mediated nature of experiencing, enabling a more rigorous examination of theoretical perspectives in order for those social and political tensions to be revealed

References

Anderson, A.R. 2000. "Paradox in the periphery: an entrepreneurial reconstruction?."

Entrepreneurship and Regional Development 12(2): 91-109

Anderson, A.R., Drakopoulou Dodd, S. and Jack, S.L. 2009. "Aggressors; winners; victims and outsiders: European schools' social construction of the entrepreneur." *International Small Business Journal* 27(1): 126-36

Béchard JP and Grégoire D. 2005." Entrepreneurship education research revisited: The case of higher education." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4(1): 22–43.

Bennis, W. and O'Toole, J. 2005. "How Business Schools Lost Their Way." *Harvard Business Review* 83(5): 96-104.

Berry, L.L. 1993. "Our roles as educators: present and future." *Journal of Marketing Education* 15 (Fall): 3-8.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1987. "What Makes a Social Class? On the Theoretical and Practical Existence of Groups." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* (32): 1-17.

Bourdieu, Pierre 1972. "Les strategies matrimoniales dans le system de reproduction." Annales 4–5: 1105–27.

Blumer, H. 1969. Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Blackburn, R. and Kovalainen, A. 2009. "Researching small firms and entrepreneurship: Past, present and future." *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 11 (2): 127-148.

Brookfield, S. & Preskill, S. 1999. Discussion as a way of teaching: Tools and techniques for democratic classrooms. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Broad, J. 2007. Enterprising Skills: A Literature Review, *White Rose Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) Enterprise Research Report*, coordinated by The University of Sheffield.

Burke, L. & Sadler-Smith, E. 2006. "Extending intuition in the educational setting." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 5(2): 169-181.

Byrne J, Fayolle A and Toutain O. 2014. Entrepreneurship education: What we know and what we need to know. In: Chell E and Karataş-Özkan M (eds) *Handbook of Research on Small Business and Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 261–288.

Chell, E. 2007. "Social enterprise and entrepreneurship: towards a convergent theory of the

entrepreneurial process." *International Small Business Journal* 25(1): 5-26

Chalmers, D.M. and Shaw, E. 2017. "The endogenous construction of entrepreneurial contexts : a practice-based perspective." *International Small Business Journal,* 35(1):19-39

Davies, L.G. and Gibb, A.A. 1991. "Recent research in entrepreneurship", *Proceedings of the 3rd International EIASM Workshop*, Gower, London.

Davidsson, P. & Honig, B. 2003. "The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs." *Journal of Business Venturing* 18(3): 301–331.

Deakins, D., O'Neill, E. and Mileham, P. 2000. "Executive Learning in Entrepreneurial Firms and the Role of External Directors." *Education + Training*, 42(4/5): 317-325.

Deakins, D., Graham, L., Sullivan, R. & Whittam, G. 1998. "New venture support: an analysis of mentoring support for new and early stage entrepreneurs". *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 5(2): 151-161.

Dhliwayo, S. 2008. "Experiential learning in entrepreneurship education: a prospective model for South African tertiary institutions." *Education & Training* 50(4). 329-340.

Diochon, M. and Anderson, A.R. 2011. "Ambivalence and ambiguity in social enterprise;

narratives about values in reconciling purpose and practices". *International*

Entrepreneurship and Management Journal 7(1): 93-109.

Draycott, M. and Rae, D. 2011. "Enterprise education in schools and the role of competency frameworks." *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*. 17(2):127 – 145.

Edelman LF, Manolova TS and Brush CG 2008. "Entrepreneurship education: correspondence between practices of nascent entrepreneurs and textbook prescriptions for success." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 7(1): 56–70.

ENGESTRO¨ M, Y. 1999a. Activity theory and individual and social transformation, in: Y. ENGESTRO¨ M, R. MIETTINEN & R-L. PUNAMA¨ KI (Eds) Perspectives on Activity Theory (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Ehiobuche, C. and Justus, B. 2014. "Students As Global Citizens; Can Dialogue Enhance Engagement And Learning Outcome." *Global Education Journal* 4(4): 114-138.

Falkang, J. & Alberti, F. 2000. “The assessment of entrepreneurship education.” *Industry and Higher Education* 14(2): 101-108.

Fayolle, A., Gailly, B. and Lassas-Clerc, N. 2006. “Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes: a new methodology.” *Journal of European Industrial Training* 30(9): 701-20.

Fayolle, A. 2013. "Personal views on the future of entrepreneurship education", *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 25 (7-8). 692-701.

Fayolle A. 2013. “Personal views on the future of entrepreneurship education.” *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 25(7–8): 692–701.

Fayolle A, Gailly B, Lassarc-Clerc N 2006. “Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes: a new methodology.” *Journal of European Industrial Training* 30(9):701-720

Fox, S. 2006. “Inquiries of every imaginable kind’: ethnomethodology, practical action and the new socially situated learning theory.” *The Sociological Review* 54(3): 426-45.

Goodlad, J. 1992. “The moral dimensions of schooling and teacher education.” *Journal of Moral Education* 21(2): 87–97.

Gorman, G., Hanlon, D., and King, W. 1997. “Some research perspectives on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education, and education for small business management: a ten-year literature review”. *International Small Business Journal* 15(3): 56–77.

Gibb, A.A. 2002. “Creating Conducive Environments for Learning and Entrepreneurship; living with, dealing with, creating and enjoying uncertainty and complexity.” *Industry and Higher Education* 16(3): 135–148

Gibb, A.A. 2007. “Entrepreneurship: Unique Solutions for Unique Environments. Is it possible to achieve this with the existing paradigm?” *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*. (5) Senate Hall.

Giddens, A. 1984. The Constitution of Society Outline of the Theory of Structuration. Cambridge: Blackwell/ Polity Press.

Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (2016) http://gemconsortium.org (accessed 15 February 2016).

Hassi, L., & Laakso, M. 2011. “Making sense of design thinking.” In Karjalainen, T.M. & Salimaki, M. (Eds.), *International design business management papers* (1): 50–63

Hamel, G. and Parahald, C.K. (1994). *Competing for the Future*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Henry, C., Hill, F. and Leitch, C. 2005. “Entrepreneurship education and training: can entrepreneurship be taught?” Part 2, *Education and Training* 47(3): 158-169.

Holcomb, T R, Ireland, R.D., Holmes, R.M. Jr., and Hitt, M.A. 2009. "Architecture of entrepreneurial learning: exploring the link among heuristics, knowledge, and action". *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practic*e 33(1): 167-192.

Honig B. 2004. "Entrepreneurship education: Toward a model of contingency-based business planning." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 3(3): 258–273.

Hwang, N.R., Lui, G. and Yew Jen Wu Tong, M. 2008. "Cooperative learning in a passive learning environment: a replication and extension." *Issues in Accounting Education* 23(1): 67-75.

Higgins, D., Trehan, K. and McGowan, P. 2015. "Developing perspectives and challenging the status Quo.*" International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research* 21(3): 1 -4

Hisrich, R.D. & Peters, M.P. 2002. Entrepreneurship, 5e . Sydney: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Hjorth, D., Jones, C., & Gartner, W.B. 2008. "Recontextualising/recreating entrepreneurship." *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 24(2), 81–84.

Hisrich, R.D. Peters. M.P. (2002). *Entrepreneurship.* Fifth Edition, Yew York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Hindle, K. 2007. "Teaching entrepreneurship at university: from the wrong building to the right philosophy", in Fayolle, A., ed, *Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education: A General Perspective,* 1, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham 104–126.

Jack, S.L., Moult, S., Anderson, A.R. and Drakopoulou Dodd, S. 2010. "An entrepreneurial

network evolving: patterns of change." *International Small Business Journal* 28(4): 315-37

Joas, H. 1996. Creativity of action. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johannisson, Bengt. 2011. "Towards a Practice Theory of Entrepreneuring." *Small Business Economics* 36 (2): 135–150

Johnston, L., Hamilton, E. and Zhang, J. 2008. "Learning through Engaging with Higher Education Institutions: A Small Business Perspective." *International Small Business Journal* 26(6): 651-660

Katz, J.A. 2003. "The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education." *Journal of Business Venturing* 18(2): 283–300.

Karimi, S, Aazami, M, Biemans, H, Lans, T, & Mulder, M 2016. "Fostering students' competence in identifying business opportunities in entrepreneurship education." *Innovations in Education And Teaching International* 53(2): 215-229.

Keating, Andrew, Susi Geiger, and Damien Mcloughlin. 2013. "Riding the Practice Waves: Social Resourcing Practices during New Venture Development." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 38(5): 1–29.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential Learning. Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Kuratko DF (2005). "The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 29(5): 577–598.

Korsgaard, S. and Anderson, A.R. 2011. "Enacting entrepreneurship as social value creation." *International Small Business Journal* 29(2): 135-51.

Kyrö, P. 2015. "The conceptual contribution of education to research on entrepreneurship education." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 27(9–10): 599–618.

Matlay, H. 2009. "Entrepreneurship education in the UK: a critical analysis of stakeholder involvement and expectations." *Journal of small business and enterprise development* 16(2): 355-368.

Man, T.W.Y., Lau, T. & Snape, E. 2008. "Entrepreneurial competencies and the performance of small and medium enterprises: An investigation through a framework of competitiveness." *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship* 23(3), 257-276.

McClelland, D.C., (1987). Human motivation. CUP Archive.

Mulder, M., Lans, T., Verstegen, J., Biemans, H., & Meijer, Y. 2007. "Competence development of entrepreneurs in innovative horticulture." *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 19(1): 32-44

Mwasalwiba E.S. 2010. "Entrepreneurship education: A review of its objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators." *Education + Training* 52(1): 20–47.

Naia A, Rui B, Januario C, 2014. "A systematization of the literature on entrepreneurship education in higher education: Challenges and emerging solutions in the entrepreneurial classroom." *Industry & Higher Education* 28(2): 79–96.

Neck HM and Greene P G. 2011. "Entrepreneurship education: Known worlds and new frontiers." *Journal of Small Business Management* 49(1): 55–70.

Nicholson, L. and Anderson, A. 2005. "News and nuances of the entrepreneurial myth and metaphor: linguistic games in entrepreneurial sense-making and sense-giving." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practise* 29(2): 153-73.

Pfeffer, J. and Fong, C.T. 2002. "The end of the business school? Less success than meets the eye." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 1(1): 78–95

Polanyi, M. (1958). Personal Knowledge: "Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy. University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Pittaway, L. and Cope, J. 2007. "Entrepreneurship education: A systematic review of the evidence." *International Small Business Journal* 25(5): 479–510.

Rae, D. 2004. "Entrepreneurial learning: a narrative-based conceptual mode." *Paper presented at the Institute for Small Business Affairs 27th National Conference*, Newcastle, 2-4 November.

Refai, D. and Thompson, J. 2015. "Where do graduates Develop their Enterprise Skills? The Value of the Contribution of Higher Education Institutions' Context" *Industry and Higher Education*, 29(6): 435-444.

Refai, D., Klapper, R. and Thompson, J. 2015. "A Holistic Social Constructionist perspective to Enterprise Education." *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 21(3): 316-337.

Refai, D. and Thompson, J. 2014. "Using Enterprise Education to Prepare Healthcare Professional Graduates for the Real-world." *Industry and Higher Education Special issue: Enterprise Education and Entrepreneurial Learning*, 28(6): 427-438.

Revans, R.W. (1982). *The Origins and Growth of Action Learning*. Lund; Bromley: Chartwell-Bartt: Studentlitteratur

Rizza C and Amorim Varum C. 2011. "*Directions in entrepreneurship education in Europe*." XX Meeting of the Association of Economics of Education JRC65912. Association of Economics of Education. http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC65912

Sarasin, L. C. 1999. "Learning styles perspectives: Impact in the classroom". Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing.

Sadler-Smith, E. 2004. "Cognitive style and the performance of small and medium sized enterprises." *Organization Studies* 25(2): 155-182.

Steyaert, C., Hjorth, D. 2007. "Entrepreneurship as Social Change." Cheltenham: Edward Elgar

Steyaert, Chris. 2007. "Entrepreneuring' as a Conceptual Attractor? A Review of Process Theories in 20 Years of Entrepreneurship Studies." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 19(6): 453–477

Solomon, G.T. and Fernald, L.W., Jr. 1991. "Trends in small business management and entrepreneurship education in the United States." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 15(3): 25-40.

Smith, A.J., Collins, L.A. and Hannon, P.D. 2006. "Embedding new entrepreneurship programmes in UK higher education institutions: challenges and considerations." Education + Training, 48(8/9): 555-567.

Taylor, D.W. and Thorpe, R. 2004. "Entrepreneurial learning: a process of co-participation", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 11(2): 203-11.

Tedmanson, D., Verduyn, K., Essers, C. & Gartner, W.B. 2012. "Critical perspectives in entrepreneurship research." *Organization* 19(5): 531-541.

Tiwari, A., Lai, P., So, M. and Yuen, K. 2006. *A comparison of the effects of PBL and lecturing on the development of students' critical thinking*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd., *Medical Education*, Vol. 40, pp. 547-554.

Ucbasaran, D., Westhead, P. and Wright, M. 2001. "The focus of entrepreneurial research: contextual and process issues." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 25(4): 57-80

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (Cole, M., John-Steiner, V., Scribner, S. & Souberman, E., Eds.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Watson, T.J. 2013. "Entrepreneurial action and the Euro-American social science tradition: pragmatism, realism and looking beyond "the entrepreneur"." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 25(1-2): 16-33.

Warhuus, J. and Jones, S. 2016. "How do students decide to choose an entrepreneurship elective? The role of gendered language in course descriptions." *In 3E Conference-ECSB Entrepreneurship Education Conference* Leeds 2016.

Wagener, S., Gorgievski, M., & Rijsdijk, S. 2010. "Businessman or host? Individual differences between entrepreneurs and small business owners in the hospitality industry." *The Service Industries Journal* 30(9): 1513–1527.

Weiskopf, R., Steyaert, C. 2009. "Metamorphoses in Entrepreneurship Studies: Towards an Affirmative Politics of Entrepreneuring." in Hjorth, D., Steyaert, C. (eds) The Politics and Aesthetics of Entrepreneurship. A Fourth Movements in Entrepreneurship Book: 183–201. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Willness, C, & Bruni-Bossio, V, 2017. "The Curriculum Innovation Canvas: A Design Thinking Framework for the Engaged Educational Entrepreneur." *Journal Of Higher Education Outreach And Engagement* 21(1): 134-16

Wu, S., Matthews, L. and Dagher, G.K. 2007. "Need for achievement, business goals and entrepreneurial persistence." *Management Research News* 30(12): 928–941.

Young, J. E. 1997. "Entrepreneurship education and learning for university students and practising entrepreneurs." in: Sexton, D.L. and Smilor, R.W. (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship 2000*, Chicago, Illinois: Upstart Publishing Co, pp. 215-238.