APPLICABLE SOCIO-COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES

ПРИКЛАДНІ СОЦІАЛЬНО-КОМУНІКАЦІЙНІ ТЕХНОЛОГІЇ

UDC 007 : 304 : 004.9

PhD Hans Elbeshausen

Associate professor
University Copenhagen; Department of Information Studies
(*Copenhagen, Danmark*)

Dr Valentyna Ilganayeva

Professor
Kharkiv State Academy of Culture
(*Kharkiv, Ukraine*)

TEACHING AND LEARNING IN, WITH, AND THROUGH ENTREPRENEURSHIP. LESSONS LEARNED FROM AN EXPERIMENT IN SOCIO-CULTURAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

In a number of experimental courses with entrepreneurship as content, approach, and method it was discovered that students working with socio-cultural entrepreneurship projects provided more often discerning comments on the models used in the courses than students working with economic issues. The aim of the article is to consider whether the process models for entrepreneurship education need elaboration to be adapted for a better fit with the specific structure and processes in the socio-cultural fields of entrepreneurship. It is assumed that the models used in entrepreneurship education were developed from research, teaching and actual practice in the economic field and were subsequently generalized. Our analysis method is "Critical Discourse Analysis".

Keywords: socio-cultural entrepreneurship; teaching entrepreneurship; process models; tested models

1. Introduction

Several conflicting suggestions about entrepreneurship education exist. David Birch, best known for the influential work *The Job Generation* and for his contributions to small business research, does not believe that students can be taught to be become entrepreneurs (Aronsson 2004). Teaching students to work for entrepreneurs or in entrepreneurial companies should not be confused with teaching people to *become* entrepreneurs. Future entrepreneurs must discover in real business life what it means to be an entrepreneur and whether they are well suited for an

entrepreneurial career. Accordingly, entrepreneurship can only be learned by being an apprentice. Pittaway & Cope (2006) made the same criticisms of entrepreneurship education, albeit in a more moderate way. Courses have an impact on student intentionality, but such impact does not imply that the students turn into more effective entrepreneurs.

Sarasvathy and Venkataraman have over the past decade done much research within entrepreneurial processes and their structures and dynamics. Unlike Birch, they do not concentrate on entrepreneurial traits. Entrepreneurship is rather conceptualized as a societal force or a specific method to tackle challenges in a world of uncertainty. Creating wealth or struggling against poverty are considered proper goals for entrepreneurial activities. By defining entrepreneurship first and foremost as a societal force, Sarasvathy and Venkataraman also plead for entrepreneurship becoming an essential part of basic education "starting in middle school or earlier and excluding no one" (2011; p. 120).

At present, the advocates of academization and school-like teaching seem to be recognized mainly for political reasons as Paul Hannon (2005) stresses. However, higher educational institutions (HEI) do not appear to be fully prepared to dance to the economic policy tune. Gibb (2005) pointed to institutional gaps between analytical values prevalent in HEIs and the habitus characterizing entrepreneurs. Teaching 'for' entrepreneurship is seen as vocationalism, which is so far not fully in line with the academic mindset. Especially after the global financial crisis, 'pockets' at universities have tried to disclose and reinterpret the potential usability of entrepreneurship education. By accentuating the practical goals and moral purposes of entrepreneurship education, Rae (2010) intends to contribute "to the accountability of entrepreneurs to society" (p. 603). Similarly, entrepreneurial processes are not only directed against business targets, but are also expected to solve social and cultural challenges (Blenker et al 2011).

A brief review of the literature shows that teaching of entrepreneurship reflects some of the dichotomies found in the concept of entrepreneurship: a) the level of autonomy of HEIs relative to the market or state, b) values, institutional visions, and purposes that legitimize entrepreneurial activities, c) a broad or a narrow understanding of social, cultural, and institutional entrepreneurship. In our context, we are especially dealing with one question: Are entrepreneurial activities an expression of a societal force or a manifestation of specific traits? Depending on how this question is answered, different teaching concepts and theories of learning will come into consideration when students are taught in, with, and through entrepreneurship.

If one considers entrepreneurship as a social force, it is obvious to opt for learning concepts, focusing on an epistemology of practice. At the core of experiential, expansive, and social learning theories are the mutual interaction of processes such as involvement in practice, critical reflection on experience, and active participation in meaning. Viewing entrepreneurship as a manifestation of specific traits involves psychological learning theories in a context of personal behavior modification. This means, for example, strengthening entrepreneurial habits in order to make them independent from external rewards. There are fundamental differences between the two approaches. In experiential and expansive learning theories, internalization and externalization processes are highlighted. In contrast, psychological learning theories focus in particular on behavioral outcomes.

2. Teaching entrepreneurship – the experimental courses

The experiments in entrepreneurship education have taken place at "The Royal School of Library and Information Science" in Copenhagen, until 2014 an independent educational and research institution and now part of the University of Copenhagen. Bachelors, Masters and PhD students are trained in information science and cultural studies including dissemination of culture. The information science graduates find employment in the public and private sector. Due to traditionally strong ties between the institution and the culture sector, especially to public libraries, the theory-practice relationship is an integrated part of the institution's self-understanding.

Four years ago, the first experiment was carried out and as of 2010, five more classes at the bachelor and master level have participated. The experiments have been motivated by an overall political agenda, expectations on the part of important stakeholders, and personal curiosity among the lecturers. The intention has been to enhance students' competence to take action in synergy with their analytical capacities and methodological skills. Students have been taught in, with, and through entrepreneurship. 'In'-entrepreneurship means to provide students with propositional knowledge about the phenomenon of entrepreneurship. 'With'- entrepreneurship highlights the involvement in particular fields of practice and participation in entrepreneurial activities. 'Through"- entrepreneurship deals with applying entrepreneurial thinking and methods to structure the classroom instruction.

Approximately 75% of the students' projects and seminar papers belonged to the domain of socio-cultural entrepreneurship. The remaining 25% were related to intrapreneurship, i.e. employee-driven innovation, or market-oriented entrepreneurship. The result is not surprising since about half of the entire curriculum deals with cultural issues. The other half lies within the fields of information behavior, information architecture, and knowledge organization.

However, it is necessary to ask if process models prevalent in entrepreneurship education provide the ideal support to learning in socio-cultural activity systems. It could be argued that teaching and learning in and through practice, other things being equal, will always be embedded in particular fields with singular structures, routines, knowledge elements, and opportunities. Still, the models used in entrepreneurship education were developed from research, teaching and actual practice in the economic field and were subsequently generalized. The aim of the article is to examine whether process models for entrepreneurship education are viable and suitable in socio-cultural fields as well or whether they need to be adapted to the specific structure and processes of the field under investigation.

3. The theoretical framework

In 2000, Shane & Venkataraman put forward a new concept for entrepreneurship. The concept became known as the individual-opportunity nexus. With a new focus on the individual-opportunity nexus, previously prominent explanatory patterns (entrepreneurial traits, mental disposition, or start-ups) have taken a back seat. Furthermore they expanded the scope of entrepreneurship to encompass social, cultural, and institutional entrepreneurship.

From a systematic viewpoint, entrepreneurship education can be divided into at least three main areas.

- Entrepreneurship as part of managerial or strategic concepts; the educational focus is then on rationality and strategic reasoning.
- Entrepreneurship as a process of creation; the major focus will be the creative capacities of the individual.
- Entrepreneurship as a *generalized method*, i.e. a form of reasoning and logic (Sarasvathy & Venkataraman 2011) or as *everyday practice* (Blenker et al 2012), i.e. the process and the ability to identify anomalies in the world in which the entrepreneur operates. Either definition allows entrepreneurship to be a part of the culturally based activities by means of which societies are developed and cultures altered.

In the experiments with entrepreneurship education, we primarily used social, experiential and expansive learning theories. In accordance with Higgins et al (2013), social constructionism and critical reflection were important premises for the experiments. Our goal was to give the students a deeper insight into how they are creating opportunities via their interventions and how they thereby are changing social domains and disclosing new worlds.

Because entrepreneurial activity aims to disclose new worlds by creating hitherto unknown opportunities, we couldn't settle for a critical reflexive approach only. Critical reflection evaluates the outcome of processes and activities from a retrospective angle. Discovering alternative solutions retrospectively is an instance of divergent thinking based on information retrieved from an already obsolete or terminated practice. What is required is *prospective* thinking - coming up with multiple ways to act even before acting.

In the contingency planning model suggested by Honig and based on Piaget's "Stages of Cognitive Development" (2004), students should move to a position of disequilibrium when they are planning for dynamic and disclosing activities. But in Piaget's model, disequilibrium is regarded as temporary disturbance until the state of equilibrium is restored again - a learning cycle, which only partially reflects the challenges entrepreneurs face. Therefore, we try to clarify disequilibrium with reference to the concept of non-knowledge.

Disequilibrium is defined as a situation of not-knowing, expressed by uncertainty and unpredictability. Being in a state of not-knowing does not imply the absence of knowledge, skills, or competencies to cope with open situations and complex phenomena. One might say that applied knowledge "is constructed to freeze and simplify a constantly shifting or otherwise bewildering reality" (Engeström 2007; p. 271). But categories and proven concepts should be kept fluid if structures, processes, and objects as well as concepts, meanings, and ideas in constant transformation are to be analyzed and understood. In order to achieve knowledge of possibilities, Engeström therefore suggests de-stabilizing knowledge, since that is when knowledge of possibility emerges. Then, the transition of objects and categories in a given field can be depicted, and a new understanding of future opportunities can be established.

"Possibility knowledge" about future opportunities was achieved by putting together three different learning and teaching steps in the courses. Experiential learning concepts were used as a basis for further extension (Kolb 1984; Engeström 2001; Honig 2004). The basic concept consists of two separate but interrelated steps: concrete experiences via active experimentation on the one hand and analytical conceptualization via reflective observation on the other hand. By emphasizing that learning in practice is culturally and socially embedded and by highlighting the necessity that divergent learning is expansive learning, a further dimension was added: boundary crossing via wondering. By boundary crossing we mean the ability to move - emotionally, physically, and mentally - beyond the limitations associated with individual and social experience. By wondering we mean the force to discover and respect unknown aspects in activities of everyday life.

Our tripartite model can be described as follows: a) turning a wondering gaze on barriers (inhibiting and irritating phenomena) in everyday life helps to discover the limitation of one's own viewpoint; b) active experimentation as the basis for divergent thinking leads to the experience that objects and processes are difficult to classify due to their relative autonomy; c) starting convergent thinking with reflective observations results in a concept with an analytical and theoretical base. The tripartite model was developed by Schreiber, Kristiansson, and Elbeshausen, Associated Professors at the Department of Information Studies (University Copenhagen).

4. Three process models used in the experiments

The article's focus is the epistemological functions of process models with regard to economic and socio-cultural entrepreneurship. The primary question is whether models describing economic processes can also be used to describe value creation in socio-cultural entrepreneurship.

It is important to note that the methodology of these experiments is more related to the socio-cultural aspects of entrepreneurship than the economic ones. Klamer, Dutch professor in cultural economics, defines cultural entrepreneurs as people "who are geared toward the realization of cultural values. Cultural entrepreneur are cultural because they are about the cultural. ....The economics has to be an instrument for them in order to realize cultural values" (Klamer 2011; p. 154). From a phenomenological (and a western) point of view, entrepreneurship is understood

as a cultural undertaking, i.e. as heightened sensitivity, as holding on to an everyday anomaly and as entrepreneurial disclosure of new worlds (Spinosa, Flores & Dreyfus 1997; p. 66).

In the scientific literature one finds many different concepts of modeling (Hodge et al 1996; Deming, 1986). Of specific interest is the work of Andersen (1999) who thoroughly examined approaches of general-to-specific modeling. He regarded process models as privileged tools in situations of high uncertainty. It is important that process approaches applied in planning and implementation fundamentally change the logic of organizational and management behavior.

We concentrated especially on two types of modeling: spiral models and iterative models. In spiral models, processes are considered nonlinear. Here, processes proceed horizontally, but in addition there is an upward movement including new elements, new relations, and conditions constantly changing in time. Iterative models allow for enhancing the outcome of processes in parallel with a continuous activity of analyzing obtained results and adjusting previous processes (McConnell 2010).

Models might be general in epistemological terms. Their specificity is defined by pragmatic and contextual elements and is a result of a situational interpretation. Based on a series of teaching experiments (Elbeshausen et al 2012) carried out in the compulsory MA-courses, we analyzed three process models with respect to the contingency approach:

- the "logic of effectuation" introduced by Sarasvathy in 2001;
- a collaboration model with a focus on the deconstruction of mono-disciplinary approaches and the construction of relational configurations;
- a creativity model, where creativity and innovation are at the heart of the teaching activities.

4.1 The effectuation model

In one of her early articles, Sarasvathy (2004) maintains that "entrepreneurship creates value in society that is disproportionate to its role within the economy [and] persists over longer periods of history than any other functional area in business" (p.708). Entrepreneurs do better in unpredictable environments due to the logic of effectuation.

The concept was described in a study (Sarasvathy 1998) with data from interviews with expert entrepreneurs who were presented with a varying set of decision problems typical for venture creation. Similarities in decision making were identified and became known as the basic principles for effectuation. Effectuation, unlike causation, is seen as a process where certain means are taken as given and where the focus is on choosing from among possible effects created with that set of means (Sarasvathy 2001).

Considered as process, effectuation has exploratory and participatory aspects. Exploration means refining given resources (persons, tools, expertise) and selecting from among possible effects. Involvement consists of associating relevant actors, tools, and expertise more closely with the process. Exploration and involvement are iterative processes. Considered as practice, effectuation represents a specific kind of action. Actions can be motivated by future goals. Effectuation actions are motivated via specific contexts. The steps taken are legitimized by means, values, or competencies prominent in the original context.

4.2 The Café model

The Café model (Bager et al 2010) is a minor element in a broader educational concept, combining theoretical knowledge and analytical skills with entrepreneurial activity. The concept's theoretical perspectives are drawn from Spinosa et al and Sarasvathy et al.

The broad concept consists of five successive phases called assignments. The essence is to find and substantiate anomalies and qualify opportunities. The core of the model is to identify anomalies (as opposed to creativity).

The Café model is a general feedback model. It is used in entrepreneurship education at HEIs. Multidisciplinary groups meet to discuss "lessons learned" after having resolved each of the five assignments. The role of the dialogues is to strengthen the cross-disciplinary cooperation within and between groups. Deconstructing a narrow academic self-understanding will expand knowledge horizons of groups and individuals - that is what is expected. Emphasis on appreciative feedback will generate knowledge and sharpen interest. At the same time, the Café model reinforces the understanding that entrepreneurial processes have many different challenges. To sum up: The method used in the Café model is similar to that of appreciative inquiry.

While the assignment approach is an activity-based model consisting of interdependent phases, the Café-model rests on the understanding of dialogues as iterative processes. Understanding of and approaches to the project case are not a linear process; they develop in loops. The Café model is expected to expand the knowledge horizon and the process understanding on the part of participants by providing for frequent dialogue meetings. Responding "with heightened sensitivity" to anomalies is the aim of the meetings in the metaphoric café.

4.3 The KIE model

The KIE model (Danish Acronym: creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship) has been developed to support entrepreneurial activities and innovative processes based on creative ideas. The three elements are not sharply separated. The model is designed as a general didactic tool to enhance innovative learning in all parts of the educational system. The focus is not on creativity as such but on teaching students to become creative. It is a pragmatic and

commercial model justified by macroeconomic and welfare policy arguments (Kromann-Andersen & Funch Jensen 2009).

The KIE model is a linear process model where learning is conceived as a process in three phases. All phases must be passed to realize the original idea starting the creative process. Similar to the synectic method, the process starts with a brainstorming session designed to stimulate unconscious creative thinking. The aim is to break up conventional and stereotypical reasoning and find innovative solutions with great practical value. The basic premise is to release the creativity inherent in everyone. When the process is nearing the end, divergent thinking will increasingly be replaced by convergent thinking.

To sum up: the process models are conceived as conceptual tools used to guide the students' learning through entrepreneurial practice. At a minimum, the models should provide insight into the multiple facets of the theory-practice relation, into creativity as a driving force behind entrepreneurial actions, and into the wider societal context of the students' project activities. Understanding and practicing the dialectic between involvement and reflection should be supported as well.

5. Methods and findings

It should be noted that the teaching experiments were not conducted for the purpose of testing the applicability of the process models. The opposite is the case. Criticisms made in the interviews and assignments gave rise to an analysis of the models' applicability especially in relation to socio-cultural entrepreneurship.

The findings are based on data from interviews with selected students and on written assignments forming the basis for oral tests at the end of the courses. In particular, data from two courses held in autumn 2011 and spring 2013 was collected and analyzed. The two courses consisted of 60 lessons each and are included among the so-called constitutive modules reflecting the content and goals of the entire program. 37 students participated in the courses.

Our text corpus consists of 17 written assignments and four interviews. The interviews focused on the students' interests and objectives relating to their projects, their project experiences, and reflections on the course and their learning. The written 20-page assignments contained detailed information documenting the students' practical experience during their field work.

Discourse analysis (Fairclough 1992) combining analysis of context with intratextual structures served as our methodological framework. Our choice was based on the assumption that entrepreneurship and especially the teaching of entrepreneurship are subject to a politically motivated discourse determining what is meant by accepted knowledge, proper communication and approved forms of social practice.

At the microanalytical level, we focus on the number of utterances regarding process models and particularly on two qualitative aspects: modality and force. Modality indicates affiliation within discourses and positive or negative adherence to what is said (Fairclough 1992; p. 160). Force is defined as the text's ability to give expression to ideas and arguments. Both concepts present a reflective intensity. They are used to analyze the students' comments concerning the usefulness of process models in order to qualify their projects and learning.

As the text corpus mostly consists of "written assignments", one can expect a slight bias in the material. Considered as a genre, the assignments preconfigure a specific way of acting and interacting. It is therefore conceivable that the criticism made by the students appears more distinct and prominent than necessary. As the students were not trained in using the models, only more evidence can determine whether the process models need to be differentiated.

Teaching entrepreneurship and learning through entrepreneurial practice was the purpose of the experiments. Therefore, "out-of-school activities" became an important part of "in-school learning", and "in-school activities" supported learning in and through practice. However, goals, processes, management tools, forms of knowledge, and roles differ in these learning environments due to contrary institutional expectations and requirements (Löbler 2006). Tensions between "in-school" and "out-of-school" learning were seen in the written assignments. "Valuable moments where ideas are born cannot, unfortunately, be organized in such a way that they coincide exactly with the lessons in entrepreneurship" (Friis & Hunov 2013; our translation). Student comments like this one show both the opportunities and the limitations of teaching entrepreneurship at universities.

The three process models have different features. While the KIE model and the effectuation model primarily organize social interaction structures, the Café model deals mainly with discursive processes of understanding and learning with regard to the field of practice. The field of practice is defined as a dialectical process consisting of "in-school" and "out-of-school" activities. That is because otherwise fixed institutional boundaries were crossed during the experiments with entrepreneurship education.

Creating innovative ideas or clarifying already-created ideas with the help of divergent thinking is one of the strengths of the KIE model. The KIE model is functionalistic with a linear process logic. Assessments of the model differ considerably depending on whether the student's project was business-oriented or socio-cultural. In socio-cultural projects, it was a criticism that discursive processes are somewhat underexposed. The entrepreneur's role as a language-maker or creator of culture seemed to be overridden in favor of goal-oriented actions. In business oriented projects, it was noted that efficient actions should be emphasized in order to achieve the projects' goals fast and without wasting resources. There was some indication that specific theoretical concepts, not the process model, had an active role in improving entrepreneurial processes.

"The logic of effectuation" is considered to be a powerful tool for structuring the project process and out-of-

school activities. Notably, this tool opens the possibility of rethinking the relations between means and ends in innovative projects. That is believed to be an important prerequisite for exploring unknown territory and finding new opportunities.

In particular, two points have been criticized in the socio-cultural projects. First, based on an iterative approach, the effectuation model loses sight of circular and spiral processes. In innovative projects, new actions and new opportunities as well as new knowledge and new discourses are interdependent. The duality of understanding and acting is believed to be more optimally represented in spiral process models. Secondly, the effectuation model sheds light on entrepreneurial processes from the perspective of social actors and the means used in projects. However, the interdependence of structures, means, and actions is underexposed. The students' projects indicate that structures in socio-cultural fields deviate from those in business-oriented fields. As a consequence, it is possible that entrepreneurial actions encounter different limitations and must choose other paths to realize new opportunities.

By expanding the students' analytical skills, the Café model makes sure that action-oriented learning leads to a better understanding of entrepreneurial processes. The feedback comments on the socio-cultural and the business oriented projects were almost identical. The opportunity to reflect on past experiences in a dialogical and appreciative manner is highlighted as one of the model's strengths. However, it was also learned that the model is not sufficiently close to the actual entrepreneurial process. The discussion of gained experience points backward while innovative processes are directed toward the future.

Overall, our findings show that the process models have improved students' capacity to discover, structure, and develop personal as well as relational resources when it comes to creating opportunities or to performing innovative actions in given projects and contexts. As for the various objectives of teaching entrepreneurship, each model has strengths and weaknesses. In projects with a socio-cultural focus, more criticisms and constructive additions were put forward by the students. This is especially true for the KIE-model and "the logic of effectuation". All things being equal, both models appear to be useful symbolic tools in business-oriented projects, and no adjustments are needed.

Accordingly, for projects focusing on social and cultural matters, elaboration is needed. Why should these process models be elaborated? A tentative explanation could be that socio-cultural entrepreneurs, in an analogy to Alvord et al (2004), need to understand social and cultural systems - including their discursive practice - in order to introduce new paradigms in changing structures.

The discovery and exploitation of new opportunities or the resolution of anomalies have become the new nucleus of entrepreneurial teaching. The aim is to provide tools for students to assist in the navigation and development of paths characterized by uncertainty and unpredictability. Honig integrates those supporting tools into a model he describes as the contingency approach (2004).

To overcome shortcomings of the contingency approach, other theories must be taken into consideration. Engeström expands on existing concepts of knowledge by suggesting a distinction between stabilization knowledge and possibility knowledge. "Possibility knowledge is agentive knowledge" (Engeström 2007; p. 271) supported by an interventionist approach and aimed at exploring non-knowledge. Exploring non-knowledge is viewed as a process of expansive learning with an escalating cyclic character.

6. Conclusion

In the past decade, much attention has been paid to social and cultural entrepreneurship. Teaching in, with and through entrepreneurship has been based on models drawn from the economic sphere. Experience from the teaching experiments shows that students engaged in social or cultural projects have provided more comments on the models than students working on an economic project. The students' comments also indicate that the projects' discursive and structural aspects have not been supported to the extent desirable.

To facilitate learning activities, especially in the field of socio-cultural entrepreneurship, more specific process models that are viable and suitable in the socio-cultural domain are needed. Hence further investigation and analysis are called for. Such investigation and analysis become important theoretical and practical tasks given that the share of non-material production in overall economic activity will increase further.

References

Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W., 2004. Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An Exploratory Study. *The journal of applied behavioral science, 40*(3), 260-282.

Andersen, B., 1999. *Business process improvement toolbox*. ASQ Quality Press.

Aronsson, M., 2004. Education matters - but does entrepreneurship education? An interview with David Birch. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 3*(3), 289-292.

Bager, L. T., Blenker, P., Rasmussen, P., & Thrane, C., 2010. *Entreprenørskabsundervisning -proces, refleksion og handling*. AU Center for Entreprenørskab og Innovation.

Blenker, P., Korsgaard, S., Neergaard, H., & Thrane, C., 2011. The questions we care about: paradigms and progression in entrepreneurship education. *Industry and Higher Education, 25*(6), 417-427.

Blenker, P., Frederiksen, S. H., Korsgaard, S., Müller, S., Neergaard, H., & Thrane, C. (2012). Entrepreneurship as everyday practice: towards a personalized pedagogy of enterprise education. Industry and Higher Education, *26*(6), 417-430.

Deming, W. E., 1986. Out of the crisis. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology. *Center for Advanced Engineering Study*, *6*.

Elbeshausen, H., Lunddahl Jensen, A., & Riis, R., 2012. *Tag en bid af praksis: Pædagogisk værktøj til entreprenørskabsundervisning i praksis indenfor informationsvidenskab og kulturformidling*. See: https://www.yumpu.com/da/document/view/18285529/laes-rapporten-tag-en-bid-af-praksis-fonden-for-entreprenrskab

Engeström, Y., 2001. Expansive learning at work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of education and work*, *14*(1), 133-156.

Engeström, Y., 2004. New forms of learning in co-configuration work. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, *16*(1/2), 11-21.

Engeström, Y., 2007. From stabilization knowledge to possibility knowledge in organizational learning. *Management learning*, *38*(3), 271-275.

Fairclough, N., 1992. *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press

Friis, M. & Hunov, A.C.A., 2013. *Børnenes Underground - en koncert for børn.* Unpublished.

Gibb, A., 2005. Towards the entrepreneurial university. Entrepreneurship education as a lever for change. National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (NCGE). *Policy paper*, *3*, 1-46.

Hannon, P.D., 2005. Philosophies of enterprise and entrepreneurship education and challenges for higher education in the UK. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation* 6, no. 2: 105-114.

Higgins, D., Smith, K., & Mirza, M., 2013. Entrepreneurial education: reflexive approaches to entrepreneurial learning in practice. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, *22*(2), 135-160.

Hodge, B., Anthony, W., Gales, L., 1996. Organizational Theory: A Strategic Approach. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Honig, B., 2004. Entrepreneurship education: toward a model of contingency-based business planning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 3, no. 3: 258-273.

Klamer, A. (2011). Cultural entrepreneurship. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, *24*(2), 141-156.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (Vol. 1). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kromann-Andersen, E. & Jensen, I.F., 2009. *KIE-modellen: innovativ undervisning i videregående uddannelser*. Erhvervsskolernes Forlag.

Löbler, H. 2006. Learning entrepreneurship from a constructivist perspective. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, *18*(1), 19-38.

McConnell, S., 2010. *Rapid development: taming wild software schedules*. O'Reilly Media, Inc..

Pittaway, L., & Cope, J., 2006. Entrepreneurship Education: A Systematic Review of the Evidence. See http://gees.pbworks.com/f/entrepreneurshipeducation.pdf

Rae, D., 2010. Universities and enterprise education: responding to the challenges of the new era. Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, *17*(4), 591-606.

Sarasvathy, S. D., 1998. *How Do Firms Come to Be?: Towards a Theory of the Prefirm* (Doctoral dissertation, Carnegie Mellon University).

Sarasvathy, S. D., 2001. Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review* 26, no. 2: 243-263.

Sarasvathy, S. D., 2004. The questions we ask and the questions we care about: reformulating some problems in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *19*(5), 707-717.

Sarasvathy, S.D. & Venkataraman, S., 2011. Entrepreneurship as method: Open questions for an entrepreneurial future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 35, no. 1: 113-135.

Shane, S. & Venkataraman, S., 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review* 25, no. 1: 217-226.

Spinosa, C., Flores, F., & Dreyfus, H. L. (1999). *Disclosing new worlds: Entrepreneurship, democratic action, and the cultivation of solidarity*. MIT Press.

Подано до редакції – 23.12.2018
Рецензовано –17.01.2019
Прийнято до друку – 07.02.2019