



# University of HUDDERSFIELD

## University of Huddersfield Repository

Klapper, Rita and Refai, Deema

A Gestalt model of entrepreneurial learning

### Original Citation

Klapper, Rita and Refai, Deema (2015) A Gestalt model of entrepreneurial learning. In: *Entrepreneurial Learning: The Development of New Perspectives in Research, Education and Practice*. Routledge Studies in Entrepreneurship . Routledge, London, UK, pp. 156-177. ISBN 978-0-415-72324-4

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/21749/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk](mailto:E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk).

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

***A Gestalt model of entrepreneurial learning***

**Dr Rita G. Klapper, Senior Lecturer, Manchester Metropolitan University, All Saints Campus, All Saints,  
Manchester**

**Dr Deema Refai, Lecturer, Department of Strategy and Marketing, University of Huddersfield, UK**

**Acknowledgements**

Special thanks for constructive criticism and support to Paul Upham and Denis Feather; also thanks to the editors for their comments.

## Author bio

Dr Rita Klapper is presently working at the Centre for Enterprise at Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) where she creates leadership programmes which bring together theories in leadership, entrepreneurship, growth and sustainability. Rita specialises in the use of innovative pedagogy drawing on creative arts but also yoga/pilates and mindfulness in her programmes.

Deema Refai is Lecturer in Entrepreneurship in the Department of Strategy and Marketing at the University of Huddersfield. Deema specialises in enterprise education and the utilisation of experiential and interactive learning approaches as means for developing graduates' enterprise skills, with a special interest in healthcare disciplines.

## Abstract

In this chapter we propose a learner-focussed, teaching model appropriate for entrepreneurship and enterprise that aims to trigger change in the way educators and senior managers in Further and Higher Education think about enterprise and entrepreneurship. We use Wenger's (2009) social theory of learning, which consists of four dimensions: learning as doing; learning as experiencing; learning as becoming; and learning as belonging and combine these dimensions with seven guiding educational design principles: Who learns what, how, why, with whom, where and when. We propose that these seven guiding principles influence the impact and quality of entrepreneurship education and also students' motivation for studying and learning.

## INTRODUCTION

Aware of the economic and social significance of entrepreneurial activity, and responding to student demand, universities train entrepreneurship students on every continent. Policymakers too are showing an increasing interest in entrepreneurial education, with a recent European report (EC, 2013) seeking to bolster activity in this area. Entrepreneurial educators are experimenting with innovative pedagogical approaches that use different ways of learning to create entrepreneurial and enterprising mindsets among a variety of student populations (see for instance Bechard & Gregoire 2007, Istance & Shadoian 2009, Klapper & Neergaard 2012, Klapper & Tegtmeier 2011, Robinson 1996, Verzat et al. 2009). This is in many ways a response to a growing dissatisfaction among learners and educators with the classical way of teaching entrepreneurship in Europe and the US, namely through lectures and case studies. In addition, it reflects an increasing recognition of the need to equip students with a mindset that is open to entrepreneurial action (Hytti & Kuopusjärvi 2004).

As Klapper (2004,8) and Klapper & Neergaard (2012) have argued, most higher education institutions teach students to become employees for either the public or private sector, but not to become enterprising and potential entrepreneurs themselves. Moreover Higher Education institutions rarely offer personalised, life cycle-, motivation- and context-appropriate entrepreneurship teaching programmes, but instead deliver large-scale, off the shelf teaching content tailored only to broad cohorts of undergraduate and

postgraduate students. This teaching material ignores the specificities of the learners in terms their particular motivation for studying enterprise, as well as their varied personalities and life stages. While this appears to reflect the need to reach a large number of students, we would argue that there remains scope for more personalised approaches. Indeed and to some extent ironically, the internet and digital advances simultaneously offer the potential for more personalised teaching delivery while at the same time offering the potential to reach much larger audiences. The emerging MOOC (Massive Open Online Courses) are a clear case in point.

In this chapter we propose and illustrate a learner-focussed, teaching model appropriate for entrepreneurship and enterprise that aims to trigger change in the way educators and senior managers in Further and Higher Education and government departments think about enterprise and entrepreneurship. For this purpose we use Wenger's (2009) social theory of learning, which consists of four dimensions: learning as doing; learning as experiencing; learning as becoming; and learning as belonging. We combine these dimensions with seven guiding educational design principles: Who learns what, how, why, with whom, where and when. We draw on our teaching experience in different cultural contexts, in which we have experimented with ways in which alternative learning initiatives may enhance entrepreneurial and enterprising thinking among students. We propose that it is necessary to consider the seven guiding principles that influence the impact and quality of entrepreneurship education and also students' motivation for studying and learning. Our approach is comprehensive in that we consider both entrepreneurship and enterprise. We follow Gartner (1988:11) who proposed that entrepreneurship is "the creation of organizations, the process by which new organizations come into existence". In comparison, we understand enterprise and enterprising behaviour as activities outside the domain of venture creation; intrapreneurship is one form of such enterprising behaviour.

Underlying our approach is the premise that entrepreneurial learning needs to be considered from a holistic perspective in which each dimension contributes to the others to create a sense-giving Gestalt, a concept that can be translated as organization or configuration (Koehler 1947, Phillips & Soltis 2009). By bringing Gestalt theory and Wenger's social theory of learning together, we advocate a more

comprehensive way to designing entrepreneurial teaching programmes than is the norm, intended to bring the learner closer to the realities of entrepreneurial practice. Our ultimate aim is to render learners and ultimately society more entrepreneurial and enterprising.

In advocating a comprehensive approach to entrepreneurial learning we acknowledge the multi-dimensional nature of entrepreneurship as an inherently dynamic phenomenon that goes beyond a sole focus on new venture creation. Following Rae (2000), Cope (2005) expressed this: “a contextual process of becoming” (Cope 2005:374), focusing on what entrepreneurs do and with whom, but also who they are (Gartner 1988). We argue for the person, i.e. the one who learns, to be considered in his or her holistic nature, as a multi-faceted being, as part of a collectivity, a context, a location, motivated by different objectives. We consider the importance of context in entrepreneurship education, a topic which has more recently been emphasised by researchers such as Klapper (2008, 2011), Welter (2011), but underestimated in education despite earliest work by Lave & Wenger (1991) and Lave (2009) on situated learning.

Seeking to communicate this in a less abstract way, we use interrogative descriptors to draw attention to the specificities that need to be attended to in course design. Students learn in context with others - hence we integrate and consider the notion of *With whom?* We examine the motivation for learning (*Why?*) as well as the *When*, referring to the learner’s life cycle. The contents dimension (*What*) covers a spectrum reaching from learning about entrepreneurship, learning for entrepreneurship and learning ‘into’ entrepreneurship (Gibb 1999), to learning through ‘witness’, i.e. from within (Klapper & Neergaard 2012, Shotter 2006). The *How* dimension considers alternative ways of learning and teaching such as through lectures, running a new venture as well as role play and simulation (Gibson et al. 2009), as well as through innovative pedagogy involving art, music, theatre, dance and collage (Adler 2006, Klapper & Tegtmeier 2011, Shrivastava 2010). While there is some overlap between our seven guiding design principles, this interrelatedness is indeed important to fully grasp the Gestalt of entrepreneurial learning and allow for more holistic educational approaches to emerge.

## **THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS**

## **The Gestalt Theory of Learning**

As Bluckert (2012: 81) notes, the German word 'Gestalt' is difficult to translate and approximates to pattern, shape, configuration or meaningful organised whole. Gestalt which is a 'needs-based approach to understanding human functioning and behaviour (Bluckert 2012: 81) draws on a variety of influences coming from psychoanalysis, Gestalt psychology, Gestalt therapy, field theory, existential philosophy and the humanistic therapy movement (Bluckert 2012) and one of its earliest written manifestations is by Perls, Goodman and Hefferline's (1951) and their seminal paper on Gestalt therapy, which Latner described (1992: 15) as 'the cornerstone of the Gestalt approach'. Early Gestalt psychologists such as Max Wertheimer, Wolfgang and Kurt Koffka sought to understand how humans make sense of their experience, moment by moment, 'against the background of the field which includes our current mental models and historical experience' (Bluckert 2012:81). To be clear, in Gestalt thinking, 'field' includes the local physical environment of a person as well as their cognitive and emotional reality.

Hence Kurt Lewin's work on interconnectedness proposed that human beings are part of an environmental field and that their behaviour can only be understood in relation to that field (Bluckert 2012). As part of this field humans actively seek to impose order and perceive meaningful wholes in what they see and experience. Gestalt theory also draws on philosophical roots provided by Kierkegaard, Sartre and Heidegger and in particular the themes of personal responsibility, freedom and authenticity have enriched the theory. Gestalt thinking implies looking for balance in human functioning through effective self-regulation to eliminate tensions in an individual's personal and professional life. The notion of balance is very important in entrepreneurship teaching. In fact achieving a balance between theory and practice (What) in a practice-oriented subject such as entrepreneurship is demanding and considering the Who, with Whom, Where, Why, How and When is even more challenging.

## **A Definition of Learning**

As Phillips & Soltis (2009) comments, there is more than one type of learning and attempts to establish a single comprehensive learning theory have not met with great success. Beach (1980:22) defined learning as

“the human process by which skills, knowledge, habits and attitudes are acquired and altered in such a way that behaviour is modified”. Honey and Mumford (2006:1) proposed that learning happens “when people can demonstrate that they know something that they did not know before (insights and realisation as well as facts) and/or when they can do something they could not do before (skills)”. These definitions of learning emphasise a subsequent and consequent change in behaviour, emphasising the social aspects of learning rather than viewing it merely as a cognitive process (Wenger 2009). As a result, in addition to knowing something cognitively and understanding it, the learning process is associated with a change in actions (Guirdham and Tyler 1992, Gibb 1993a, b, c). We follow these definitions as we seek to trigger more entrepreneurial and more enterprising mindsets in our learners, with consequent change in behaviour.

### **Our Conceptual Framework**

Building on this ontological base, for our conceptual framework we particularly draw on the work of Etienne Wenger (2009) who developed an initial inventory of a social theory of learning. For Wenger the concept of learning consisted of: a) learning as doing, which represents the notion of practice; b) learning as experience which relates to students making meaning through experience; c) learning as becoming, which relates to the learner identity; and d) learning as belonging, i.e. a learner belongs to a community. We relate these four dimensions to our guiding questions of Who learns, what, why, when, how, with whom and where, in the context of entrepreneurship/enterprise education.

We also acknowledge the importance of prior work by, for instance, Rae (2005) who suggested a triadic model of entrepreneurial learning, consisting of three major themes: personal and social emergence, contextual learning and negotiated enterprise; to be applied, both in entrepreneurial practice and by educators. Seikhula-Leino et al. (2009) also applied Shulman and Shulman’s (2004) model, which aimed to develop a new frame for conceptualizing teacher learning and development within communities and context in Finland. The latter’s model illustrates the ongoing interaction among individual student and teacher learning, institutional or programme learning, as well as the characteristics of the critical policy



environment in which the educational programme is happening. Cope's (2005) work on a dynamic learning perspective of entrepreneurship, which acknowledges the processual nature of learning, the entrepreneurial learning task orientation as well as the social side of learning, have also informed our work.

INSERT TABLE 1 NEAR HERE

### **Educating and Learning as Doing – Practice**

We associate Wenger's (2009) dimension of learning as doing with the 'What to learn' guiding learning principle. In this we follow Gartner (1988), who suggested that research should concentrate on what entrepreneurs do rather than who they are. The 'What' perspective deals with the need to tailor the contents of our courses/programs in entrepreneurship. What we teach needs to be in alignment with the context and the stage of the life cycle of the individual, but also in line with the societal aim of creating entrepreneurial awareness/preparedness in our student population (Cope 2005, European Union 2013). In most universities, 'fact-learning' is still the predominant approach (Klapper & Neergaard 2012), which involves a detached learning of theories about the phenomenon of entrepreneurship (Krueger 2007). Cope (2005) made some practical recommendations as to what the what-dimension should embrace. He mentioned in particular learning about oneself, about the business, about the environment and entrepreneurial networks, but also about small business management. Rae's (2005) triadic model of entrepreneurial learning with its focus on personal and social emergence, contextualisation of learning and negotiated enterprise provides further inspiration as to what contents an entrepreneurial learning programme could comprise.

Education and learning 'about' entrepreneurship is of a predominantly theoretical nature and aims to develop awareness of the concept of entrepreneurship and the role that entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship play in the development of economies and societies (Gibb 1999, Carter and Jones-Evans 2000, Glancey and McQuaid 2000, Swedberg 2000). Learning about is usually provided through business schools to those interested in this type of learning (Jamieson 1984). Such 'formal learning' aims to develop theory and conceptual frameworks (Broad 2007) and learning takes place through structured systems and

organised programmes (Conner 2009). Much of this learning focuses mostly on developing left-brain processing of data, numbers, logic and symbols (Lewis 1987, Ornstein 1986), where educators focus initially on acquiring, arranging and instructing information to learners who then absorb that information passively (Barrows 2000, Wee and Kek 2002, Wee et al. 2003). The functional skills developed through formal learning include writing business plans, understanding and managing finance, managing legal and statutory requirements, product and service development, understanding marketing and sales strategies, setting standards for operational performance and understanding business environments (Broad 2007). However, education 'about' entrepreneurship does not equip students with the necessary entrepreneurial skills to become successful business people (Solomon and Fernald 1991), neither does it add to their creativity or their ability to act strategically in changing environments (Kirby 2004). Therefore, education 'about' entrepreneurship is not seen to be capable – by itself – of 'producing' students who can handle real-life entrepreneurial problems since they would lack the necessary skills to integrate and relate their knowledge (Berry 1993, Doyle 1995).

### **Educating and Learning 'for' Entrepreneurship**

In comparison, education '*for*' entrepreneurship and learning for entrepreneurship are about preparing learners to become self-employed, with the specific objective of developing practices and motivation supportive of start-up and running of one's own business (Jamieson 1984, Rae 1997, Jack and Anderson 1999, Solomon *et al.* 2002, Henry *et al.* 2005, Edwards and Muir 2005). Newby (1998) advocated that education '*for*' entrepreneurship should be delivered in balance with education '*about*' entrepreneurship. He argued that the development of business and management skills through education '*for*' entrepreneurship should enable individuals to effectively manage the different functional skills developed through education '*about*' entrepreneurship, and, thus, should be combined so that individuals could ultimately have the skills and personal qualities that would allow for behaving entrepreneurially.

Education '*for*' entrepreneurship which makes the student learn for entrepreneurship is basically achieved by training the various managerial aspects with a focus on how to ensure growth and the future

development of the business (Henry *et al.* 2005) through a learning process that acts as a 'push into entrepreneurship (Jamieson 1984, Hjorth and Johannisson 2006). Gibb (1999) described this objective as '*learning to become entrepreneurial*' which is concerned with developing individuals who are capable of holding responsibility of their own learning, lives and careers. Learning '*for*' entrepreneurship is expected to develop in learners a sense of responsibility, initiative, creativity, organisation, as well as motivation and commitment, which are necessary for the success of enterprise (Broad 2007).

Very often the development of business and managerial skills in education '*for*' entrepreneurship is associated with business plans. However, Gibb (1997) suggested that this approach does not expose students to hidden or indirect knowledge. Wan (1989) identifies a number of other criteria besides the business plan that practitioners consider when evaluating new business proposals, particularly the entrepreneurial skills and abilities of a person. However, in many entrepreneurial learning initiatives we find that the development of business plans is the predominant part. Timmons *et al.* (1987) also argued that entrepreneurship training programmes can only pass limited knowledge and skills and that real personal experience is the only way to learn. Drawing on Rae (2004) we conclude that entrepreneurship learning as a dynamic and changing process needs more experimental and experiential, potentially innovative teaching methods.

### **Educating and Learning '*into*' Entrepreneurship**

Education '*into*' entrepreneurship, also referred to as education or learning '*through*' entrepreneurship deals more with helping individuals adopt an enterprising approach throughout their lives, by stressing the importance of effective student engagement at all stages of learning. Education '*into*' entrepreneurship is linked to the development of business understanding and enterprise skills through new venture creation processes (Fayolle and Gailly 2008) that support adopting life-long enterprising approaches. In addition to this value of education '*into*' enterprise in business disciplines, Refai (2012) emphasised the value of this learning in non-business, and more specifically science-related disciplines. Here, education '*into*' entrepreneurship is applied by embedding experiential learning approaches within the curricula in ways

that lead to developing a range of transferable enterprise skills and personal traits, which are valuable to all people whether employed or self-employed (Refai 2012).

The skills developed through education *'for'* and *'into'* entrepreneurship are referred to as 'behavioural skills' since they affect the way by which different tasks are carried out; these skills are developed through means of 'informal learning' (Broad 2007), with informal learning understood as a continuous life-long learning process that is self-directed usually within a social context, and can be adapted to fit certain needs and interests (Falk, 2001; Dierking et al. 2004). Such learning provides individuals with the experience and drive for life-long self-learning and activity (NSF, 2006). According to Broad (2007) and Conner (2009), informal learning is the means by which skills, attitudes, values and knowledge are built daily through experiences, educational impacts and the surrounding environment including people, resources and media.

In addition to these three ways of educating and learning entrepreneurship we add a fourth dimension which is very much based in practice. In particular we refer to Shotter's (2006) work on 'aboutness' and 'witness' thinking. Shotter's witness thinking suggests that the learner learns from 'inside the entrepreneur's mind' or through 'witness' thinking. The aim of such teaching is for the student to experience the 'lived experience' of entrepreneurs to acquire 'a second kind of knowledge' (Shotter 2006:585), a 'subsidiary awareness of certain felt experiences as they occur to us from within our engaged involvement' (Shotter 2006: 586) in order to combat the prevailing 'aboutness' thinking. As Reid et al. (2005) argue 'lived experience' offers a subjective and reflective process of interpretation, which allows a deeper understanding than traditional approaches to learning entrepreneurship. However, what entrepreneurs do has so far largely been interpreted as writing business plans or making decisions using various business management tools and marketing approaches. Such thinking overlooks, however, that what makes an entrepreneurs is the mindset, and you cannot learn how entrepreneurs think through business plans and the like (Klapper & Neergaard 2012, Krueger 2007).

This witness approach brings us to the important topic of 'work-placed learning' (Hoyrup 2006) and extends the notion of practice. Wenger (2009:211), for instance, relates learning as doing to practice,

defining this as “a way of talking about the shared historical and social resources, frameworks and perspectives that can sustain mutual engagement in action”. At about a similar time as Wenger, the French sociologist Bourdieu (1977) developed his vision of practice and his concept of *practice* in the broad sense (as compared to a specific practice), with practice denoting routinised behaviour comprised of elements that include physical, cognitive, knowledge, affect, and motivation-related aspects (Reckwitz 2002, in Warde 2004). The term practice is thus integrated and composite relative to contemporary psychological analytical constructs such as attitude, behaviour, values and norms. Schatzki (1996) adds to this the distinction between integrated and dispersed practices, with the former being relatively domain specific (e.g. cooking) and the latter being relatively generic (e.g. describing) (Warde 2004). Practices may also come to be socially nurtured, protected and institutionalised (ibid). Significantly, practices necessarily involve shared understandings and templates of organisation and behaviour; they take place in fields but are not synonymous with fields (ibid).

### **Learning as Experience: How to Learn?**

This learning dimension focuses on the way learners create meaning. Hence the key question is how to learn from the learner’s point of view and how to teach from the educator’s perspective. As Wenger (2009) suggested, meaning is a way of talking about a learner’s ability, albeit changing, on his own, but also as part of a collectivity, to experience life and the world as meaningful. Arguably, we obtain meaning through different ways of learning. Hence the question of how different types of learning trigger meaning is important.

Whilst recognition is growing that entrepreneurship is vital to the well-being of economies and many teaching initiatives exist world-wide, there has been inadequate research conducted on the efficacy of programs and their effectiveness in instilling entrepreneurial skills and aptitudes and as a consequence while educators have preferred approaches, we do not really know what works or why it works (Klapper & Neergaard 2012). Entrepreneurship education does require different approaches to do justice to the heterogeneity of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs but, as Fletcher and Watson (2006) emphasise,

entrepreneurship is about processes of creativity and innovation which asks entrepreneurs to conduct their work in innovative and sometimes unorthodox ways, which is very different from the way that educators traditionally educate students.

As Fiet (2000) notes, there is a growing shift from tutor-centred to learning to student/learner-centred approaches. Tutor-centred approaches are widely practiced and are referred to as passive or reactive since learning is based on acquiring information without empowering learners or enhancing their skills to adopt a continuous life-long learning process. Learner-centred approaches, on the other hand, suggest learning through methods that provoke thoughts such as projects, presentations, videos and case studies that encourage learning about both the 'subject' and 'process'. Dolmans and Schmidt (2000) argued that learning should be an active process of constructing knowledge, rather than a passive process of memorising information; they also argued that involving learners in the learning process helps them relate their knowledge and structure new knowledge over existing one. Students have to get their hands dirty, so to speak, they need to 'work with the autonomy of self-reward' (Bruner 1971:88). Thus, learning is approached as a task of discovery, and students are taught something that touches their lives in some fundamental sense (Frick 1987).

Little is known, however, about which type of innovative pedagogy could enhance students 'entrepreneurial action' and students' ability to introduce creative solutions to 'real-world' problems (DeTienne and Chandler 2004). Klapper (see in European Commission 2013) and Klapper & Neergaard (2012) have, over a number of years, experimented with the integration of art, music, theatre, collage in her course design, aiming to encourage out-of-the box-thinking and bridge the practice/theory divide. We also take inspiration again from Cope (2005) who suggested that entrepreneurs are very action-orientated and hence the question of how to learn needs to respond to this need. More research is, however, necessary to establish whether such action-learning approaches are more effective and efficient than traditional approaches - and if yes, why. We suggest that a traditional lecture theatre is not amenable to the type of entrepreneurial learning in line with Shotter's (2006) witness approach and the question is what type of classroom *will* facilitate entrepreneurial learning and whether such learning should be

classroom bound at all. The requirements may well change from class to class hence, from learner to learner, from age to age, from context to context, from motivation to motivation.

### **Learning as Becoming: Who Learns, Why and When?**

The Who dimension – the Who of the learner, the Who of the entrepreneur, the Who of the educator

Arguably, the Who dimension of our teaching model incorporates three dimensions: the who of the learner, the who of the educator and the who of the entrepreneur. We argue that both dimensions are intimately interrelated when teaching entrepreneurial as well as enterprising thinking and behaviour. The learner, their pre-understanding (Gummesson 2000) and their habitus (Bourdieu 1986) determine who they are and what they want to know about the entrepreneur and enterprise and what they want to experience in the classroom. Is the person sitting in front of the educator a fledgling entrepreneur already, does he have the innate abilities to become one? Are they an undergraduate, postgraduate student, with or without professional experience? In terms of the educator, we need to consider this person, in this particular context. Is the educator also a practitioner, i.e. an entrepreneur, a pure academic or an educator who has the benefits of both academia and practice?

The nature of the educator and their background and experience will make a difference to the way that this person educates about entrepreneurship and enterprise. In understanding the roles of both learner and educator, the notion of their *habitus* is also useful in relation to practice. Shulman and Shulman (2004) and Seikhula-Leino et al. (2009), for instance, focussed on developing new frames for conceptualising teacher learning and development within communities and contexts. Bourdieu's (1986) work about habitus, which he defined as a system of dispositions, i.e. lasting, acquired schemes of perception, thought and action, seems to be particularly appropriate in this context. Bourdieu argued that the individual agent develops these dispositions in response to the objective conditions, e.g. through family life and education. Bourdieu aimed to relate objective social structures to the subjective, mental experience of agents. Bourdieu's (1986) 'habitus' is, according to Lizardo (2004:375) a "useful and flexible way to conceptualise agency and the former's ability to transform social structure". Bourdieu (1989:1) observed that there is a close

relationship between “social structures and mental structures, between the objective divisions of the social world ... and the principles of vision and division that agents apply to them” (Bourdieu 1996, read in Lizardo 2004:376).

Equally important as the learner and educator identity is the *who*, that is the identity of the entrepreneur with his/her characteristics and traits as presented in seminars/courses etc. Learning about the entrepreneurial nature and what it takes to be enterprising is essential, as pointed out by Rae (2005). Hence the nature of the entrepreneurial character is of key interest. In the literature we find the entrepreneurial personality to be a continuing theme and a range of different models have aimed to shed light on the entrepreneurial personality such as Kets de Vries (1977)’s psychodynamic model, Gibb & Ritchie’s (1981) social development model and the trait approach which all aim to discover the traits or cluster of traits that distinguish the entrepreneur from other groups. Indeed much research into entrepreneurship has endeavoured to discover a single trait or constellation of traits which would distinguish the entrepreneur from other groups in society (Gartner 1988), which, to some extent, has been a futile attempt not resulting in one single model of the entrepreneur, but a long list of entrepreneurial traits and characteristics associated with entrepreneur. We find, for instance, that much attention has focussed on ‘need for achievement (nAch), locus of control, desire for autonomy, deviancy, creativity and opportunism, risk-taking ability and intuition (Kirby 2004), with the most commonly applied theories being McClelland’s (1961) theory of the need to achieve, and Rotter’s (1966) locus of control (Littunen 2000). Shane et al. (2003) identified similar concepts, yet also added tolerance for ambiguity’, self-efficacy, goal setting, independence, drive and egoistic passion.

There are also researchers such as Casson (1982) who included the ability to take risks, innovativeness, and knowledge of how the market functions, manufacturing know-how, marketing skills, business management skills and the ability to cooperate. In addition, Caird (1993) put forward aspects such as a good nose for business and the ability to identify and grasp business opportunities as well as correct errors effectively. Given this vast literature on the entrepreneurial character the important question remains, however, how this is translated in our actual teaching practices and to what extent this theory relates to the learner and



his existing characteristics/traits but also those he wishes to endeavour. For us as educators the challenge is now to bring the learner's pre-dispositions for entrepreneurship and enterprise together with what the literature suggests an entrepreneur is about, in alignment with actual entrepreneurial practice.

### **Why Learn?**

Much research has endeavoured: to establish: i) entrepreneurial intentions of different audiences of learners (e.g. Klapper & Jarniou 2006) as intentions are understood as a precursor for entrepreneurial action. In addition, research such as by Hedegaard (1999) and Herzberg (1966, 87) have focused on motivation, as motives are generally related to goals and this is no different in the entrepreneurial classroom. Goal-oriented learning assumes, however, that the educator is aware of the student's goals. Whereas the individual traits of the individual learner will play a role in his/her intention to create an entrepreneurial venture Frederick Herzberg's (1966, 1987), motivation theory takes Maslow's ideas and his hierarchy of needs further by identifying the job or work itself as the source of motivation. Herzberg's motivation belongs to the category of content theory of motivation (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd 2005).

Herzberg's theory is based on research that aimed to establish the different factors that lead to greater employee satisfaction. Herzberg identified certain characteristics, also called *intrinsic factors*, such as achievement, recognition, work itself and responsibility as consistently associated with job satisfaction and *extrinsic factors* such as supervision, company policy, relationship with supervisor, working conditions, salary, relationship with peers, as the source of job dissatisfaction (DeCenzo & Robbins 2008). In addition, he distinguished between two classes of factors: *hygiene factors* which make up a continuum ranging from dissatisfaction to no dissatisfaction. The relevant factors could be pay, interpersonal relations, supervision, company policy, working conditions, job security (Fulop & Linstead 2004, based on Herzberg 1966: 71-91). Whereas these factors do not promote job satisfaction their absence can create job dissatisfaction. If these factors are present they only eliminate dissatisfaction. These hygiene factors are also referred to as 'context of work' (Fulop & Linstead 2004: 285). The second type of factors, the so-called *motivation factors*, which are internally generated drives, can be found on a continuum from no satisfaction to satisfaction.

Examples are the job itself being challenging, gaining recognition and scope for achievement, with the possibility for growth, advancement and greater responsibility (Fulop & Linstead 2004:85). For an employee to be truly motivated the job itself must be the source of that motivation, i.e. the job content. Herzberg recommended emphasising '*motivators*' that increase job satisfaction as a mentally healthy person is a motivation seeker who requires a balance of both motivation and hygiene factors. One of the aspects Herzberg underlined is the idea of developing the job content of motivation seekers and he emphasized the need for job enrichment. This would imply an increase in basic skills such as giving whole tasks to individuals requiring more complex skills and greater expertise on the horizontal level (DeCenzo & Robbins 2008). For most entrepreneurship courses in the UK the intrinsic motivation of students is the pursuit of a degree, not necessarily in entrepreneurship, very often as a means to becoming an employee. There are presently three degree programmes in the UK, one at the University of Huddersfield, one at the University of Coventry and a third at the University of Buckinghamshire which are different as they require students to create their own business from the first day they join the university. These degree programmes are very demanding as they carry a very strong practical dimension but also require the students to build a sound theoretical foundation related to their ventures. One of the authors was the former head of the BSC in Enterprise Development at one of those universities and thus involved in the development and running of the programme. A driving motivator for the students is the intrinsic motivation of being in charge of one's own entrepreneurial venture, gaining financial rewards and external recognition for one's own venture, creating one's own workplace, and being in charge of one's own destiny.

### **When to Learn?**

Following Wenger (2009) the notion of identity is intimately linked to the idea of the becoming of the learner in the context of a community. Such thinking implies a process of learning, which arguably may be different in different stages of the learner's life cycle. The 'When' guiding principle we propose addresses the question of age and career stage at which the learning is taking place. For this purpose we draw on Super (1957, 1980) and Super et al.'s (1996) research into chronological age and life cycles (the 'life career rainbow'). Super indicated the parallels between an individual's chronological age, his/her state of

development and his/her career stage. The stages include: a) childhood growth (up to the age of 14), b) search and inquiry (up to the age of 25), establishment (up to the age of 45) and continuity or maintenance – up to the age of 56, followed by decline or disengagement for the rest of the life.

In the life career rainbow, the growth stage (a) deals with becoming concerned about the future, increasing control over one's own life, committing to school and work and acquiring competent work habits and attitudes (Super et al. 1996). During the exploration stage (b) individuals encounter crystallizing, specifying and implementing occupational choice. The establishment phase (c) follows at the beginning of one's career and the associated tasks are stabilizing, consolidating and progressing in one's chosen professional orientation. The last phase – disengagement (d) – is about phasing out. In Europe, entrepreneurship education generally starts at the university level, but there are also an increasing number of initiatives at secondary schools in France (see for instance Byrne and Fayolle 2008). This begs the question of how early students should learn entrepreneurship and be encouraged to think in an enterprising way. And of course what should we teach in different life cycles of the learner? According to Super (1957/1980), at university educators have a unique opportunity to influence the career choices of their students. They are in what he calls the 'search and inquiry phase or exploration stage' up till the age of 25 and during this period they start 'crystallizing, specifying and implementing their occupational choice (Super et al. 1996). Consequently educators as well as Higher and Further education institutions should benefit from this opportunity to integrate entrepreneurial and enterprising courses across the different disciplines in their organisations.

### **Learning as Belonging: Where and With Whom to Learn?**

Wenger (2009) proposed the fourth dimension of his learning paradigm, i.e. learning as belonging which considers in particular the idea of community. We take this further and argue that we need to consider where and with whom an individual learns and for this we need to look at the wider term of context. The consideration of context is relatively recent in entrepreneurship literature (Zahra & Wright 2011, Welter 2011, Klapper et al. 2012, Klapper 2008). In the learning literature it was in the 1990s that Lave (2009: 201) emphasised the importance of context and that "learning is ubiquitous in ongoing activity though often

unrecognised as such". Lave was particularly concerned with the context of socially situated activity and the role of learning as socially situated activity. The context in which we learn and the social configurations of which the learner is part are essential to the way an individual learns, his/her motivation to learn and the meaning (s)he gives to learning. For this purpose, Bourdieu's notion of habitus is useful, as it represents: "the store of cultural and subcultural knowledge that people carry around in their heads and which condition their everyday practices" (Morrison 2005: 314). Habitus is also about with whom people learn, in their family, with their friends, in kindergartens, schools, in universities, in their home country.

The 'Where' dimension proposed here as part of our learning paradigm may be understood both from a macro and micro dimension. Macro refers to locality of learning in terms of countries, the North and South of a country, cities (small and large as well as rural), as well learning in countries which are not part of the learner's home country, i.e. part of his usual habitus. The micro dimension of the where is about learning in classrooms, but also out there in 'real world' places such as companies through work-placed learning and in unexpected places such as museums, art galleries, sport halls and kitchens. Gibb (1987) argues that it is impossible to impart entrepreneurial, present-oriented, dynamic, 'real-world' learning in a static, past-oriented classroom-teaching context. Thus, in Gibb's interpretation it is not possible to recreate or enact entrepreneurial situations unless students are exposed to real world situations. Starting their own venture may be one situation to acquire such knowledge, but not the only one.

In the light of the above discussion that combines Wenger's learning theory with 7 interrogative words and pro-adverbs who, when, why, where, with whom, how and what we propose a learning model that is learner focussed, but also represents a multi-perspectival, Gestalt view of learning (Figure 1).

INSERT FIGURE 1 NEAR HERE

## **CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER WORK**

In this chapter we have developed and justified a Gestalt learning model intended to support educators engaged in entrepreneurial and enterprising education development. The model provides a rationale for a holistic approach that is based in the German Gestalt thinking. It aims to achieve a balance between theory

and practice, between the learner, the educator and their context. As such it has potential for practical applications both in the educational and business practitioner's habitus, as a conceptual basis for developing teaching/training programmes and related research.

In terms of further research, there is a need to put this model into practice, i.e. to relate the theoretical approach to learning to teaching interventions, both in terms of understanding processes and in terms of evaluation research focused on assessing appropriateness and effectiveness. This need has been partially fulfilled by Klapper (2014) who investigated the impact of an innovative learning tool, repertory grids from George Kelly's (1955) Personal Construct Theory (PCT), on two postgraduate student audiences, one in France and one in Poland. As part of this work, the author investigated some of the model's aspects as part of a cross-national research project. Given the model's complexity it is suggested, however, that a more comprehensive research programme is necessary to investigate *all* aspects of the model, an endeavour the authors are presently envisaging. Such a comprehensive approach would also take a critical look at the contemporary appropriateness of the theories underpinning the model, given that in some cases these may be viewed as normatively structural in their epistemology (e.g. Maslow and Super's approaches).

We believe that the comprehensive approach that we propose has the potential to support more appropriate and effective learning strategies, learners and educators and that this potential is applicable across disciplines. For ultimately a Gestalt learning model is a highly specific one that takes close account of the learner's particular situation. While we only briefly allude to the role of digital advances in facilitating this style of learning and teaching, there is surely much work to be done in this area. Structured learning programmes that allow the learner to proceed at their own pace fit well with the bespoke approach we advocate. At the same time, it is 'real' experience that students need. There are limits to the role that digital learning can play in this regard, but even here, computer-based gaming, role-playing and visualisation all have the potential to assist an experiential approach. In many ways, despite the many and varied pressures on learners, educators and their institutions in an increasingly globalised and competitive educational environment, this is also an interesting time indeed for the educational researcher.

Furthermore as Rae (2005) has suggested, no theory of entrepreneurial learning presently exists that is

based on social constructionist thinking. Given that both authors have a research competence in the latter there is potential to develop the said theoretical underpinnings.

## REFERENCES

- Adler, N. (2006) The Arts & Leadership: Now That We Can Do Anything, What Will We Do? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5, 4, 486–499.
- Barrows, H.S. (2000) *Problem-based Learning Applied to Medical Education*, Springfield, Illinois, Southern Illinois University School of Medicine.
- Beach, D. (1980). *Personnel: The Management of people at Work*. McMillan, New York, NY.
- Béchar, J.P. and Grégoire, P. (2007) Archetypes of pedagogical innovations in Entrepreneurship in French Higher Education (Archétypes d'innovations pédagogiques dans l'Enseignement Supérieure de l'entrepreneuriat : modèles et illustrations), *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, 8(2), 35-57.
- Berry, L.L. (1993). Our roles as educators: present and future. *Journal of Marketing Education*, Vol. 15, Fall, pp. 3-8.
- Bluckert, P. (2006) *Psychological Dimensions of Executive Coaching (Coaching in Practice)*, Open University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996) *The State Nobility*, Stanford University Press
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) The forms of capital, In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, pp.241-258. New York, Greenwood.
- <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/fr/bourdieu-forms-capital.htm>  
(accessed 28 July 2013).
- Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1971) *On knowing: Essays for the left hand*. New York: Atheneum

- Byrne, J. and A. Fayolle (2008) *Global University Entrepreneurial Spirit Students' Survey (GUESS 2008)*, National Report France, EM Lyon
- 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
- Caird, S.P. (1993) What do Psychological Tests suggest about Entrepreneurs? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 8, No. 6, pp. 11-20.
- Carter, S. and Jones-Evans, D. (2000) *Enterprise and Small Business: Principles, Practice and Policy*, Pearson Education, USA.
- Casson, M. (1982) *The Entrepreneur: An Entrepreneur Theory*, Martin Robertson, Oxford.
- Conner, M. (2009) *Informal Learning* [Online]. Available at ([www.marciacconner.com/intros/informal.html](http://www.marciacconner.com/intros/informal.html)). Accessed 13/10/2011.
- Cope, J. (2005) Toward a Dynamic Learning Perspective of Entrepreneurship, *ET&P*, 29(4), 373-397, July.
- Dierking, L.D., Falk, J.H., Rennie, L., Anderson, D. and Ellenbogen, K. (2003). Policy statement of the "Informal Science Education" Ad Hoc Committee. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 108-111.
- DeTienne, D.R., Chandler, G. 2004. Opportunity identification and its role in the entrepreneurial classroom: A pedagogical approach and empirical test. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(3), pp. 242-257. Reprinted in *The International Library of Entrepreneurship*, Volume 9, 2006. P. Greene and M. Rice (Eds.), Elgar Reference Collection, Cheltenham, UK.
- Dolmans, D. and Schmidt, H. (2000) What directs self-directed learning in a problem based curriculum? In Evenson, D. and Hmelo, C. (eds) *Problem Based Learning: A research perspective on learning Interactions*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, 251–262.
- Doyle, P. (1995). Marketing in the new millennium, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vo1. 29 No. 13, pp. 23-41.

- Edwards, L.J. and Muir, E.J. (2005) Promoting entrepreneurship at the University of Glamorgan through formal and informal learning, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 613-26.
- European Commission (2013) *A guide for Educators European Commission*, Brussels.
- Falk, J.H. (2001). *Free-choice science education, how we learn science outside of school*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Fayolle, A. and Gailly, B. (2008) From craft to science: Teaching models and learning processes in entrepreneurship education, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 32 No. 7, pp. 569-593.
- Fiet, J.O. (2000) The pedagogical side of entrepreneurship theory, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 101-17.
- Fletcher, D.E. & Watson, T.J. (2006). Social Change in the Countryside: the role of entrepreneurship and shifting life orientations in processes of counter-urbanisation, in C. Steyaert and D. Hjorth, (eds.), *Entrepreneurship as social change, Third Movements in Entrepreneurship book*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Frick, W.B. (1987) The Symbolic Growth Experience: Paradigm for a Humanistic-Existential Learning Theory. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 406-423
- Gartner, W.B. (1988) Who is an Entrepreneur? is the Wrong Question. *American Journal of Small Business*, Vol. 12 No. 4, 11-31.
- Gibb, A.A. (1999) 'Can we build 'Effective' Entrepreneurship through Management Development?' *Journal of General Management*, Vol. 24. No.4, Summer, pp. 1-22
- Gibb, A.A. (1997) 'Small Firms' training and competitiveness, Building upon the small business as a learning organisation, *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 13-29.
- Gibb, A.A. (1993a). The enterprise culture and education. Understanding enterprise education and its links with small business, entrepreneurship and wider educational goals. *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 11-34.



- Gibb, A.A. (1993b). Key factors in the design of policy support for the small and medium enterprise (SME) development process: an overview. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Vol. 5 pp.1-24.
- Gibb, A.A. (1993c). Small business development in Central and Eastern Europe: opportunity for a rethink. *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 8.
- Gibb, A.A. (1987). Enterprise culture – its meaning and implications for education and training. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 1-38.
- Gibb, A. and J. Ritchie (1981) “*Influences on Entrepreneurship: A study over time*” in Bolton Ten Years On – Proceeding of the UK Small Business Research Conference, Nov. 20-21, Polytechnic of Central London.
- Gibson, D.; Harkin, A.; Scott, J.M., (2009). Towards a pedagogical model of new venture based learning. *Paper presented at the efmd Entrepreneurship Conference, 2009.*
- Glancey, K.S. and McQuaid, R.W. (2000) *Entrepreneurial Economics*, Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Gummesson, E. (2000) *Qualitative methods in Management Research*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition Sage Publications: London.
- Guirdham, M. and Tyler, K. (1992). *Enterprise Skills for Students*. Butterworth Heinemann Ltd, UK.
- Henry, C., Hill, F. and Leitch, C. (2005) Entrepreneurship education and training: can entrepreneurship be taught? part I. *Education + Training*, Vol. 47 No. 2, pp. 98-111.
- Herzberg, F. (1966) *The work and the nature of men*, Cleveland: The World Publishing company.
- Herzberg, F. (1987) One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 65 No. 5, pp. 109-120.
- Hjorth, D. and Johannisson, B. (2006). Learning as an entrepreneurial process. In Fayolle, A. (Eds.). *Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Honey, P. and Mumford, A. (2006). *The Learning Styles Questionnaire, 80-item version*. Maidenhead, UK, Peter Honey Publications
- Hytti, U. and Kuopusjärvi, P. (2004) *Evaluating and Measuring Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Education: Methods, Tools and Practices*, Small Business Institute Business Research and Development Centre, Turku School of Economics and Business Administration.

- Istance, D. and Shadoian, V. (2009) *Innovative pedagogy* (Education innovante), OECD Observatory (l'Observateur de l'OCDE), 270/271, Dec. 2008-Janvier 2009.
- Jack, S.L. and Anderson, A.R. (1999) Entrepreneurship education within the enterprise culture. Producing reflective practitioners, *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Behaviour and Research*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 110-25.
- Jamieson, I. (1984) *Education for enterprise*. In Watts, A.G. and Moran, P. (Eds), CRAC, Ballinger, Cambridge, pp. 19-27.
- Kirby, D. (2004) Entrepreneurship education: can business schools meet the challenge? *Education + Training*, Vol. 6 Nos 8/9, pp. 510-9
- Klapper, R. (2014) A role for George Kelly's repertory grids in entrepreneurship education? Evidence from the French and Polish context, *International Journal of Management Education*, in press.
- Klapper, R., Biga, M. and Lahti, A. (2012) *Small Business Support and enterprise promotion: the case of France*, in R. Blackburn & M. Schaper (eds) *Entrepreneurship, small business and government support*, Gower Publications.
- Klapper, R. (2011) *The role of social capital in French entrepreneurial networks: Using contacts for successful start-ups*, Lambert Academic Publishing, Germany.
- Klapper, R. and Tegtmeier, S. (2010) Innovating entrepreneurial pedagogy: examples from France and Germany, *Journal of Small Business Enterprise and Development*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 552-568.
- Klapper, R. (2008) *The role of Social Capital in French Entrepreneurial Networks*, unpublished PhD thesis, Leeds University.
- Klapper, R. and Neergaard, H. (2012) *Five steps to heaven: from student to entrepreneur - an agenda for innovative pedagogy*, European Summer University conference paper, Kolding, Denmark, 19.08-25.08.2012.

- Klapper R. and Léger-Jarniou C. (2006) Entrepreneurship intention among French Grande Ecole and University students: an application of Shapero's model, *Industry & Higher Education*, 20 (2), 97-110, April.
- Klapper, R. (2004) Government goals and entrepreneurship education – an investigation at a Grande Ecole in France, *Education and Training*, 46 (3), 127–137.
- Koehler, W. (1947) *Gestalt psychology: an introduction to new concepts in modern psychology*, New York: Liveright, A revised edition of the 1929 book. Norton 1992 reprint: ISBN 978-0871402189
- Koehler, W. (1969) *The task of gestalt psychology*, Princeton University Press. ISBN 978-0691086149
- Krueger, N. F. (2007) What Lies Beneath? The Experiential Essence of Entrepreneurial Thinking, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 1540-6520.
- Latner, J. (1991) The Theory of Gestalt Therapy, In E.C. Nevis *Gestalt Therapy: Applications and Perspectives*, New York: Garden Press, Inc.
- Lave, J. (2009) The practice of learning, in Philips, D.C. and Soltis, J.F. (2009) *Perspectives on Learning*, Teachers' College Press, 200-208.
- Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning legitimate peripheral participation*, Cambridge University Press.
- Lewin, K. (1997). 'Field theory and learning'. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Field theory in social science & selected theoretical papers* (pp. 212-230). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. (Original work published 1942).
- Lewis, D. (1987). *Mind Skills: Giving Your Child a Brighter Future*, London: Souvenir press.
- Linstead, L, Fulop, S. and L. Lilley *Management and Organisation: a critical text*, Palgrave Macmillan: Hampshire

- Littunen, H. (2000) Networks and Local Environmental Characteristics in the Survival of New Firms, *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 15, pp. 59-71.
- Lizardo, O. (2004) The Cognitive Origins of Bourdieu's Habitus, *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, Vol. 34 no. 4, pp. 375-401.
- McLelland, D.C. (1961) *The Achieving Society*, Van Nostrand: Princeton NJ
- Morrison K. (2005) Structuration Theory, Habitus and Complexity Theory: Elective Affinities or Old Wine in New Bottles? *Br. J. Sociol. Educ.* 26(3), 311-326.  
[01/07/2014 11:37:01]
- Newby, P. (1998) After enterprise in higher education-holding the ground or sustaining the momentum? *Education + Training*, Vol. 40 No. 6/7, pp. 307.
- NSF, National Science Foundation. (2006). *Informal science education programme solicitation (NSF 06-520)*. Retrieved from ([www.nsf.gov/pubs/2006/nsf06520/nsf06520.htm](http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2006/nsf06520/nsf06520.htm)). Accessed 29/12/11.
- Ornstein, R. (1986). *The Psychology of Consciousness*. Penguin. Harmondsworth.
- Perls, F.S., Hefferline, R. and Goodman, P. (1951) *Gestalt Therapy: Excitement and Growth in the Human Personality*, Gestalt Journal Press, New edition edition (1 Jan 1994)
- Peterman, N. E and Kennedy, J. (2003) Enterprise education: influencing students' perceptions of entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship and Theory and Practice*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 129-144.
- Philips, D.C. and Soltis, J.F. (2009) *Perspectives on Learning Teachers'* College Press.
- Rae, D. (2005) Entrepreneurial learning: a narrative-based conceptual model, *Journal of Small Business Enterprise and Development*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 323-335.

- Rae, D. (2004) Entrepreneurial learning: a narrative-based conceptual model. *Paper presented at the Institute for Small Business Affairs 27th National Conference, Newcastle, 2-4 November.*
- Rae, D. (2000) Understanding entrepreneurial learning: A question of How, *International Journals of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, Vol. 6 No. 3, 145-159.
- Rae, D.M. (1997) Teaching entrepreneurship in Asia: impact of a pedagogical innovation, *Entrepreneurship Innovation and Change*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 193-227.
- Reckwitz, A. 2002 'Toward a theory of social practices: a development in culturalist theorizing', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2): 243-63.
- Refai, D. (2012). *Developing enterprise skills through enterprise education: the significance of the contribution of experiential learning approaches in the pharmacy education context in the UK HEIs.* University of Huddersfield. Unpublished PhD.
- Refai, D. (2009) The significance of problem-based learning in developing enterprise skills for pharmacy students in UK HEI, *Business and Organisational Survival and Sustainability – Papers from the Northern Leadership Academy Fellows 2009 Conference*, pp. 73-84.
- Robinson, P.B. (1996) The MINEFIELD Exercise: —The Challenge in Entrepreneurship Education Simulation & Gaming, 350-363.
- DeCenzo, D. A. & S.A. Robbins (2008) *Fundamentals of Management Mixed Media.*
- Reid, K., Flowers, P. and Larkin, M. (2005) Exploring lived experience, *The Psychologist*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 20-24, January.
- Schatzki, T. (1996) *Social Practices: a Wittgensteinian approach to human activity and the social*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966) Generalised expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement, *Psychological Monographs*, Vol. 609.

- Seikhula-Leino, J., Ruskovaara, E., Ikavalko, Mattila, J. and Rytkola, T. (2009) *Teachers as Learners Promoting Entrepreneurship Education*. Paper presented at the 20<sup>th</sup> Biannual NFF Conference 'Business as Usual', Turku/Abo, Finland, August 19-21, 2009.
- Shane, S., Locke, E. and Collins, C. (2003) Entrepreneurial motivation, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 257–279.
- Shotter, J. (2006) From minds hidden in the heads of individuals to the use of mind-talk between us: Wittgensteinian developmental investigations, *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 279-297.
- Shrivastava, P. A. (2010) Pedagogy of Passion for Sustainability, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, September 2010.
- Shulman, L.S. and Shulman, J.H. (2004) How and What Teachers learn: A shifting perspective, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol. 36 No. 2, 257-271.
- Solomon, G.T., Duffy, S. and Tarabishy, A. (2002) The state of entrepreneurship education in the United States: a nationwide survey and analysis, *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 65-86.
- Solomon, G.T. and L.W. Fernald, Jr. (1991) Trends in small business management and entrepreneurship education in the United States, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Spring, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 25-40.
- Super, D.E., Savickas, M.L., & Super, C.M. (1996) 'The life-span, life-space approach to careers', in Brown, D., Brooks, L, & Associates (Eds) *Career Choice & Development*, (3rd Edn), San Francisco, California, Jossey-Bass, pp121-178.
- Super, D.E. (1980) A Life-Span, Life-Space Approach to Career Development, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 16, 282-298.

- Super, D. E. (1957) *The psychology of careers*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Swedberg, R. (2000) *Entrepreneurship: The Social Science View*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Timmons, J.A., Muzyka, D.F., Stevenson, H.M. and Bygrave, W.D. (1987) Opportunity recognition: the core of entrepreneurship, in Churchill, N. (Ed.). *Frontiers of Entrepreneurial Research*, Babson College, Babson Park, MA, pp. 42-9.
- Verzat, C, Byrne, J. and Fayolle, A. (2009) Tangling with spaghetti: Pedagogical Lessons from Games, *Academy of Management of Learning and Education*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 356-369.
- Vries de, K. (1977) The Entrepreneurial Personality a Person at the Crossroads, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 34-57.
- Wan, V. (1989) The enterprise workshop programme in Australia. *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 23-34.
- Warde, A. (2004) *Practice and Field: revising Bourdieusian concepts*, CRIC discussion paper 65, University of Manchester, Manchester <http://www.cric.ac.uk/cric/Pdfs/dp65.pdf>
- Wee, K.N.L. and Y.C. Kek (2002) *Authentic Problem-Based Learning: Rewriting Business Education*. Prentice Hall, Pearson Publications.
- Wee, K.N.L., Kek, Y.C. and Kelley, C. (2003) Transforming the marketing curriculum using problem-based learning: a case study. *Journal of Marketing Education*, August.
- Welter, F. (2011) Contextualizing Entrepreneurship—Conceptual Challenges and Ways Forward *ET&P*, 165-184.
- Wenger, E. (2009) *A social Theory of Learning* in Philips, D.C. and Soltis, J.F. (2009) *Perspectives on Learning*, Teachers' College Press, 209-218.

Zahra, S.A. and Wright, M. 2011. Entrepreneurship's Next Act. *Academy of Management Perspectives* 25, no.4: 67-83.

Table 1: A conceptual framework of different learning styles and associated guiding design principles based on Wenger (2009)

<b>Learning Dimensions</b>	Learning as doing	Learning as experience	Learning as becoming	Learning as belonging
<b>Design principles</b>	What to learn?	How to learn?	Who learns why and when?	With whom?
<b>Represented as</b>	Practice	Meaning	Identity	Community

Figure 1:



