

Enterprise Education: Revisiting Whitehead To Satisfy Gibbs

Colin Jones

School of Management
University of Tasmania
Private Bag 16
Sandy Bay
Tasmania 7005
Australia
Phone: +61 (0) 3 6226 2826
Fax: +61 (0) 3 6226 2808
Email: Colin.Jones@utas.edu.au

Enterprise Education: Revisiting Whitehead To Satisfy Gibbs

Abstract

Purpose: This paper seeks to demonstrate that a truly learner-centred enterprise education programme can be developed within a traditional business school environment.

Approach: This paper unites the broad teaching philosophy of Alfred Whitehead with that of Allan Gibbs's enterprise specific teaching philosophies to consider the fitness of the recently developed *hic et nunc* enterprise framework. This is largely achieved by testing the framework for constructive alignment.

Findings: It is argued that the *hic et nunc* framework is consistent with the philosophies of both Whitehead and Gibb. That the framework illustrates a process through which enterprise education programmes can be developed independently of the any pressures to conform to more traditional pedagogy.

Practical Implications: Through careful consideration of the process of constructive alignment, an analytical approach to developing and/or refining an enterprise education program exists. It importantly represents an approach that is explicitly learner-centred, and therefore free from the constraints of the environment within the programme is delivered.

Value of Paper: This paper brings to life the wonderful ideas of the great philosopher, Alfred Whitehead, combining them with the contemporary ideas of Allan Gibb. In doing so, the complementary nature of their thoughts helps to illustrate the minimal requirements of a learner-centred approach to enterprise education.

Keywords: Enterprise Education, Learner-Centred, Constructive Alignment

Introduction

Enterprise education programs continue to be incorporated into many business schools throughout the world. Entrepreneurship, it would seem has arrived as an essential subject area. Whether as a future remedy against business failure, unemployment, or as a means to generate an enterprising culture, much responsibility rests with those institutions charged with providing such programs. Gibb (2002) cautions against assuming that traditional business schools will be capable of delivering such programs appropriately. This paper, whilst fully agreeing with the

concerns of Gibb, provides an overview of the (ongoing) devolvement of an enterprise education program at the University of Tasmania.

Adopting a Gibbian approach to enterprise education requires the development of a learner-centred approach. Enterprise education requires a teaching style that is action-oriented, encourages experiential learning, problem-solving, project-based learning, creativity, and supportive of peer evaluation (Jones and English, 2004). Higher education however, tends not to be so flexible in this regard (Matlay and Mitra, 2002). Throughout this paper, the ideas of Gibb and the great philosopher Alfred Whitehead will be united. An outcome of this union is that two specific factors, seldom associated with textbooks, emerge as the central drivers of enterprise education. For the practicing entrepreneur, not surprisingly these two vital inputs are energy and excitement.

For anyone passionate about teaching, the time spent considering Whitehead's (1929) *The Aims of Education and Other Essays* will be worth the investment. Whilst the ideas of Gibb will be continually present throughout this paper, the philosophical underpinnings are unashamedly Whiteheadian. It will be argued that in order to provide students of entrepreneurship access to high-involvement experiential learning techniques that facilitate deeper learning (Cooper, Bottomley and Gordon, 2004), a fundamental requirement is high levels of energy and excitement on the part of both the students and lecturer. A by-product of this discussion is the claim that there is a diminishing role for traditional textbooks within enterprise education, not an entirely new claim (Fiet, 2001).

The ideas of Whitehead

For Whitehead (1929, 93), the aim of any business school is to produce students with a zest for business that have an ability to apply their acquired wisdom to all future tasks with intellectual imagination. Further, Whitehead maintains the role of the university is to preserve “the connection between knowledge and the zest of life”. The ultimate aim of education should be the development of an urge within our students towards new creative adventure. He also cautions against knowledge being presented as mere scraps of information. The transfer of inert knowledge must be avoided at all cost. What is required is a focus on a few large ideas. Ideas, that when taken together form principles from which one may eventually generalize. It is not surprising that Whitehead’s *Aims of Education* was written as a protest against dead knowledge. For Whitehead, the issue is how knowledge is used, and specifically the time and place within which it is contextualised. He states that:

The mind is never passive; it is a perpetual activity, delicate, receptive, responsive to stimulus. You cannot postpone its life until after you have sharpened it. Whatever interest attaches to your subject-matter must be evoked *here and now*; whatever powers you are strengthening in the pupil, must be exercised *here and now*; whatever possibilities of mental life your teaching should impart, must be exhibited *here and now*. That is the golden rule of education, and a very difficult one to follow (1929, 6, my emphasis).

The role of the lecturer is to elicit energy and excitement by resonance of his or her personality. To ensure the learning environment does not dwell on and shift from one dung-hill of inert ideas to another, but rather maintain a focus on the underlying

principles from which future generalization is possible. For Whitehead, the only sure path towards the development of such wisdom is marked by considerable freedom. So, how might Whitehead's ideas be applied to the study of entrepreneurship? The remainder of this paper sets forth to illustrate the value of Whitehead's philosophy when combined with accepted ideas that relate to enterprise education.

To begin with, a framework for organizing enterprise curricula is presented and explained. Second, the underpinnings of the framework are then discussed using Biggs (2003) constructive alignment process to evaluate its current soundness. Third, the framework is considered as to its compliance with Whitehead and Gibb's requirements for appropriate teaching within a business school/enterprise education context. Finally, the paper concludes by stating the importance of energy and excitement as necessary factors through which the process of enterprise education is enhanced.

Educating in the here and now

The developing nature of a student-centred enterprise program at the University of Tasmania has provided the setting for the introduction of the *hic et nunc* framework, illustrated in Figure 1. Inspired by Whitehead's ideas, the framework's name is derived from the Latin translation of the term 'here and now'.

Take in Figure 1

Let us now consider the nature and use of the *hic et nunc* framework. The framework is now used throughout all units in the Entrepreneurship Major. To avoid confusion, this discussion will limit itself to the introductory unit, *Foundations of Entrepreneurship*. The *hic et nunc* framework produces a replicating process through which several specifically chosen journal articles (and other sourced material) reinforce one major concept whilst enabling a cumulative learning process. Within other units, the framework may move beyond the development of one major concept, to support learning outcomes related to a series of specific tasks (e.g. conducting market research and preparing financial statements). The full reasoning to not use a single textbook will be explained in more detail shortly. Suffice to say, in general they are seen to be too broad in the breadth of information presented, but too shallow in depth of any information from which useful future generalisation is possible. Essentially, the learning outcomes of the unit *Foundations of Entrepreneurship* precede the selection of a theory source, and textbooks are deemed an insufficient source of theory to address the (soon to be discussed) learning outcomes.

The sources of literature

Whitehead (1929, 2) comments that we should not teach too many subject areas, but what we teach, we should teach thoroughly. That we should “let the main ideas which are introduced into a pupil’s education be few and important, and let them be thrown into every combination possible”. That this process should represent a process of discovery, that the “general ideas give an understanding to that stream of events which pour through his [or her] life”. The first issue clearly relates to what one important idea related to the study of entrepreneurship could our students acquire and therefore gain valuable insight into their past, current, and future lives? Before

attempting to answer this important question, it is pertinent at this stage to reveal the author's view of what is entrepreneurship.

Within this paper, entrepreneurship is seen as a function of the interaction occurring between human nature and the general environment. It can be succinctly defined as any new form of new enterprise, or, any new form of business activity (Davidsson and Wiklund, 2001). Whilst such activity can range from merely attempting to reproduce the business forms of others to introducing a new innovation (Aldrich and Kenworthy, 1999), the new enterprise definition is easily comprehended by all manner of students. It is therefore used as it is accurate and simple and allows students to move forward with a clear understanding of what entrepreneurship is, and who the entrepreneurs are, in their varying degrees. Is it possible that one important idea may provide illumination of the process, context, and outcomes of entrepreneurship, one that could also serve as a sense-making framework for students from all walks of life? This paper argues that it is. That recent developments surrounding an evolutionary approach to the study of entrepreneurship contain an overarching idea within which all other relevant issues can nest. That idea is the Darwinian process of selection, variation, and retention. Aldrich and Martinez (2001, 42) state that an:

Evolutionary theory unites in a single coherent framework a concern for the entrepreneurial outcomes and the processes and contexts making them possible. An evolutionary approach studies the creation of new organizational structures (variation), the way in which entrepreneurs modify their organizations and use resources to survive in changing environments (adaptation), the circumstances under which such organizational arrangements lead to success and survival

(selection), and the way in which successful arrangements tend to be imitated and perpetuated by other entrepreneurs (retention).

A indication of the strength of calls to adopt an evolutionary perspective is that two of the domain's leading journals (i.e. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* and the *Journal of Business Venturing*) have organised special editions devoted to consideration of the increasing application of evolutionary theories to the study of entrepreneurship. Importantly, an evolutionary approach provides a connection between business situation, social situations and the personal situation of all students. It provides a medium through which students can learn about entrepreneurship and its many facets in the *here and now*, with reference to the past and the future.

The readings within *Foundations of Entrepreneurship* build up towards an explicit understanding of an evolutionary approach to the study of entrepreneurship. They are chosen not because they support or discuss an evolutionary perspective, but because they complement each other, and provide a means of cumulative knowledge development. The outcome of which is an ability to generalise about the process, context, and outcomes of new enterprise. The first articles used provide insights into the uniqueness of entrepreneurship (Smilor, 1997), the inseparability of the entrepreneur, their new enterprise and the environment within which it occurs (Bruyat and Julien, 2001), and the first explicit consideration of the process, context, and outcomes of entrepreneurship (Aldrich and Martinez, 2001). Further to those articles, a section of Aldrich's (1999) landmark monologue outlining the nature of an evolutionary approach, the formation of populations and the issue of legitimacy is used. Then, the work of Agarwal, Echambadi, Franco and Sarker (2004) is introduced

to consider the nature of knowledge transfer, the occurrence spin-outs and issues of survival. The last piece of literature used is an article by Levinthal (1991) related to the interrelatedness of the selection and adaptation processes.

Within this collection of readings, a satisfactory degree of understanding of the context, process, and outcomes of entrepreneurship is generally achievable for all students. However, and importantly, the readings while limiting the horizontal boundaries of enquiry, place no vertical limits on the minds of those who wish to explore the issues more deeply. Contained within the readings are no premature and unnecessary sidetracks into issues such as business plans, marketing, financing, environmental scanning, etc. Such issues while important, require proper attention at an appropriate time when their consideration can occur within a *here and now* context for those students engaged in the project-based elements of their study. Having justified the reason for and inclusion of specific literature, the next section of the paper will outline the learning activities that have been developed to achieve the (soon to be discussed) desirable learning outcomes.

Student presentations

Student presentations have always been used since the program's inception (Jones and English, 2004) as a means of fostering entrepreneurial behaviours. Arranged in small teams, students are encouraged to take independent initiatives, exploit perceived opportunities, solve problems creatively, take risks in an uncertain environment, and flexibly respond to challenges, all forms of entrepreneurial behaviour (Caird, 1993). Throughout the course of the semester, the following concepts are gradually introduced; Reproducer, innovator, resource profile, human capital, financial capital,

social capital, the I \Leftrightarrow NVC dialogic, r & k strategists, specialist & generalist, established & emerging populations, communities, societal influences, knowledge spillovers and transfers, spin-offs, population and relational density, learning and legitimacy, variation, selection, retention & struggle, and adaptation & selection. Student presentations provide a forum through which evidence of the above-mentioned concepts is presented. The presentations tend to introduce much variety regarding how the presence of such concepts (occurring in practice) can be viewed and understood. Students learn from both their peer assessment of each other's presentations, and through appreciation of how each team interprets the presence of the theoretical concepts in practice. At the conclusion of the presentations, a very brief lecturer is given to preview the literature for presentation during the next workshop. This lecturer would generally last between five and ten minutes.

Workshop game

Student presentations are followed by a game which provides another way for the students to interact with the concepts in the *here and now*. The actual game requires students (in teams of three) to make resource allocation decisions. The context of the industry, nature of the environment, and the objectives of their team are outlined in a 'game scenario' that links the appropriate theoretical concepts related to a specific workshop to a constant game model. Each team also has the opportunity to influence the payoffs received by all competing teams. The game creates a deep and repeated focus on how different types of organizational forms (i.e. r & k strategists) are favoured under specific conditions through the life course of an industry. Once each game has been a play, a 'game scenario solution' is distributed to enable students to reflect upon how well they interpreted the 'game scenario' provided before the game.

Case study discussion

Upon completion of the workshop game, a case study discussion session is conducted. This represents a process through which students engage in a reconstructive analysis of a local industry, this time using the theoretical concepts to make sense of a historical case study situation. Despite criticism of the merits of the Harvard Case method (e.g. Mintzberg, 2004), it cannot be denied that this method (in the hands of a competent facilitator) creates much excitement and energy. It energises students to go beyond the obvious, to dig deeper and assess the underlying issues present within the case. First hand observation of this method can be a compelling experience. It must however be noted that not all business schools will be as fortunate as the Harvard Business School to be attended by so many quality students. Clearly a challenge exists, how to capture the energy, attention to detail, and empowerment of this method whilst working with varying degrees of undergraduate students?

Within the *hic et nunc* framework, the case study discussion session is not premised on an assumption that students have already gained a sound understanding of the appropriate theoretical concepts during previous education and/or workplace experience. Rather, it is assumed that such an understanding does not exist. Therefore, the student presentations and workshop game provide learning activates during which students are primed with the necessary degree of understanding to contribute constructively to a study discussion. Whilst inspired by the Case Study method as delivered at Harvard Business School, the nature of the cases selected is quite different.

One single case study is used to illustrate an industry history. It is highly descriptive and does not seek to highlight specific decision makers or issues. It merely seeks to describe the nature of change in the industry and the drivers and consequences of such change throughout the entire life course of that industry. The chosen case then forms the sole case used during that semester. Students become very familiar with the process and patterns of change in that one industry. To begin with, this one industry is revisited during the case study discussion sessions using case study addendums. The addendum provides a link between the appropriate theoretical concepts related to a specific workshop and the industry context in the case study.

Half way through the semester, the addendums are dispensed with, and a format called an 'empty case study' is used. An empty case study is a process that relies only upon a context (i.e. the starting point) and an outcome (i.e. the end point). Students are required to construct multiple explanations that would logically explain the behaviour of firms and individuals within the discussed industry at any point in time between the starting and end points. The industry background remains the same as previously discussed so as to remove any unwanted ambiguity and to ensure students have a sound appreciation of the nature and process of change occurring in that specific industry.

Reflection journal

Student reflection on their participation in presentations, games, and case study discussion is encouraged. This is facilitated through a journal entry shortly after each workshop. The reflection journal aims to provide students with the opportunity to pause and reflect on how they as individuals are contributing to the success of their

team presentations during the workshops. How they are doing with the development of a successful strategy for the workshop game. How they are participating in the case study discussion. Students are encouraged to consider what they have learnt about themselves during the period from one workshop to the next. As the semester progresses, they are encouraged to engage in meta-reflection and consider how they have improved throughout the entire semester. This is a vital process that allows the students to take stock of their behaviours and consider what personal changes are required to improve or maintain their individual outcomes. This process is considered a critical element of the *hic et nunc* framework because “learning takes place through the reactions he [or she] makes to the environment in which he [or she] is placed” (Tyler 1949, 63).

Major assignment

In addition to the learning activities already described, students are required to meet with and document a specific occasion in which an entrepreneur has, was, or is engaged in the new enterprise, as defined previously. While each assignment will vary in content, the structure of their work is very similar. Students are required to outline the context of the new enterprise, discuss the main character/s, the predicament/opportunity encountered, the process through which the new enterprise unfolded, an assessment of the outcomes, and conclude as to what can be learned from considering the events discussed. Students are required to blend whatever theoretical concepts they feel assist in articulating the events considered. The aim is to get students to connect practice and theory, and to articulate themselves in an interesting way that still relates to the theory and situation at hand.

Final exam

The last task for students is the final exam. The final exam represents a final check on the students' ability to demonstrate their understanding of the relationships between the various theoretical concepts used throughout the semester. An 'empty case study' format is used, with the task being to construct a coherent explanation that connects the case study context and outcomes. The students may use as many of the concepts (and any others they deem appropriate) to develop one or more explanations that complete the empty case.

Assessment of constructive alignment

Tyler's (1949, 63) states that "learning takes place through the active behavior of the student: it is what *he* [or she] does *he* [or she] learns, not what the teacher does". Shuell (1986, 429) also states "if students are to learn desired outcomes in a reasonably effective manner the teacher's fundamental task is to get students to engage in learning activities that are likely to result in their achieving those outcomes...what the student does in determining what is learned is more important than what the teacher does". Inspired by both Tyler and Shuell, Biggs (2004) outlines his process of constructive alignment, a balancing of desirable learning outcomes, learning activities, and assessment procedures. He also notes the importance of achieving an appropriate learning environment within the confines of what is possible vis-à-vis the institutional climate within which the process occurs.

At the heart of achieving constructive alignment, is a need to move beyond merely displaying information and assuming students have the motivation to absorb it. To extend beyond what the teacher does, to ensure the focus is on what the students do.

Are the students engaged in appropriate learning activities? Lets begin with the desirable learning outcomes for the unit *Foundations of Entrepreneurship*:

On completion of this unit, you should be able to:

- *demonstrate an understanding of theory related to the process, context, and outcomes associated with entrepreneurship in practice in a logical and coherent manner.*
- *demonstrate an understanding of theory related to the generic evolutionary process of variation, selection, and retention as it applies to entrepreneurship in a logical and coherent manner.*
- *demonstrate an understanding of theory related to the process of adaptation and selection as mediated by learning and legitimacy in practice in a logical and coherent manner.*
- *express how well you as an individual are suited to the process of entrepreneurship.*

For the students, the development of an understanding of how a theoretical evolutionary perspective can describe the process, context, and outcomes of entrepreneurship occurring in practice is the primary desirable learning outcome. A secondary desirable learning outcome relates to their own reflection as to how well they might be suited to the process of entrepreneurship. Therefore, the central question is, what specific learning activities would support the stated desirable learning outcomes?

As has been previously detailed, student presentations, workshop games, case study discussions, a reflection journal, and time spent with an entrepreneur of their choice comprise the learning activities for students undertaking *Foundations of Entrepreneurship*. Clearly, the learning activities are based upon what the students do, not what the teacher does. So it would seem that the development of the curricula thus far satisfies Tyler, Shuell, and Biggs. At present, these learning activities represent the outcome of an evolutionary process driven by trial and error and continual consultation with current and previous student cohorts. Importantly, specific activities are subject to change aimed at improving the alignment of the desirable learning outcomes and the learning activities. The last issue is that of assessment.

Assessment is given a significant priority. All assessment related to student presentations, workshop games, case study discussion is completed prior to the distribution of each new reflection journal, so within 24 hours of each workshop. This is an onerous task, but one that provides the tangible (mini) outcomes from which student reflection is essentially driven. Separate assessment criteria are used to guide student peer assessment and indicate the nature of the how the case study discussion and reflection journal will be assessed. These criteria (with the exception of one) have been developed to emphasis levels of understanding. By describing the degree of understanding across a range of differentially acceptable levels (Biggs, 2003), students are more informed as to the nature of assessment. Merely covering a topic is of little importance to assessment; final grading of each student is directly related to his or her degree of understanding according to clearly stated levels of understanding.

The one exception being the assessment process applied to the workshop game. Within this activity, other marketplace forces are at work. Students are encouraged to approach the task knowing that no one can know the perfect strategy to the game before it is played. The aim is to play a strategy that will put you in contention to be favoured by the expected market preferences indicated by the game scenario. Just like in life, there will be winners and losers. Once the teams have played their strategies, individual marks are determined based on how they played as individuals with their team. The students are ranked from highest to lowest. The top quartile awarded 80%, next quartile awarded 65%, next quartile awarded 55%, and the last quartile awarded 45%. Students on the winning team receive a bonus of 20%, so 100% in total.

The relationship between the various assessment criteria and the learning activities is obvious enough to provide ongoing feedback to students as to their individual level of understand vis-à-vis the desirable learning outcomes. Given the nature of the tasks associated with the learning activities, students are able to gain a valuable insight into how suited they are to the process of entrepreneurship. Self-evaluation of one's skills related to communication, teamwork, persistence, acceptance of ambiguity, creativity, self-management, problem solving and initiative occur on a regular basis through the reflection journal entries. Overall, the program has achieved a very satisfactory level of constructive alignment across desirable learning outcomes, learning activities, and assessment procedures.

Alignment with the philosophies of Whitehead and Gibb

To satisfy Alfred Whitehead and Allan Gibb, it would seem that an enterprise education program should in general, support student freedom and encourage

interaction with ambiguity and complexity. Let us first consider alignment to Whitehead, then Gibb, and then the common ground between their philosophies. For Whitehead, there are two essential elements in education, freedom and discipline. “The only avenue towards wisdom is by freedom in the presence of knowledge. But the only avenue towards to knowledge is by discipline in the acquirement of ordered fact” (Whitehead 1929, 30). Education is seen as a process beginning with freedom, ending with freedom, with discipline overriding the presence of freedom during the intermediate stage.

To begin this process (i.e. the stage of romance), it is important to ensure the presence of interest and curiosity by students towards a body of knowledge perceived to be fresh. At this point discipline should not be allowed to dull a student’s enquiry. The environment within which the mind works must be carefully developed. The task of learning must not resemble a routine task. Students must be free to see for themselves and act for themselves, to make their own sense of fact and theory. This stage is followed by the stage of precision, a time when the “inescapable fact that there are right ways and wrong ways, and definite truths to be known” (Whitehead 1929, 34). The role of freedom exists as a subordinate to discipline to ensure that freshness around the topic area is maintained. The challenge is to determine what balance of discipline and freedom will support the greatest rate of progress. Discipline is present in the scheduling of required tasks and within the participating students in the form of self-discipline. The aim of this stage is to ensure a focus and concentration of those facts relevant, and not introduce irrelevant material that may serve only to distract students. The final stage is that of generalization, a time for demonstrating the newly acquired wisdom. Wisdom that reveals itself through the acquirement of principles

derived from specific knowledge, the details of which retreat to one's subconscious habits.

The tempo and energy of the workshops for the *Foundations of Entrepreneurship* are largely driven by the excitement that surrounds the student presentations. A freshness of knowledge is assured through students choosing the empirical setting within which the previously previewed theory will be applied. Essentially, the workshop environment represents a learning (not a teaching) space that has been gladly surrendered to the students. A space highly supportive of their intellectual imagination, wherever that may lead. As students prepare for their presentation, they cross through into the stage of precision, having to make decisions as what to present, and how best to present it. However, while much discipline is required at this point in time, freedom is still present, especially as to how they will perform their presentation. A suitable balance is required between discipline and freedom as each presentation is assessed across levels of understanding (i.e. the content), and for the choice of, and execution of the chosen communication medium (i.e. the context). The extent to which students have the ability to apply emerging principles is further assessed during the workshop games and the case study discussions.

It would seem that there is a consistency between Whitehead's (1929) philosophy on how the process of education should occur and that, which does occur within *Foundations of Entrepreneurship*. The recent work of Gibb (2002) poses the next challenge. Does the approach within *Foundations of Entrepreneurship* promote an understanding of the way entrepreneurs live and learn? Whilst *Foundations of Entrepreneurship* is only one of four units within the Major in Entrepreneurship, it

nevertheless is representative of the approach taken throughout the Major. Gibb proposes seven specific challenges to creating an environment within which students can experience a process akin to entrepreneurial learning. Those being; 1) creating the way of life of an entrepreneur; 2) an appreciation of sharing cultures and values; 3) the development of entrepreneurial behaviours, attributes, and skills; 4) an appreciation and awareness that entrepreneurial learning can be restricted by internal and external factors; 5) ensuring students are able to learn to learn; 6) sensitivity of context; and 7) adding value appropriately.

Within the *hic et nunc* framework, students have much freedom, control, and responsibility for their learning outcomes. Beyond the time and place of the next workshop and the specific task they must address, the rest is up to them. They are surrounded by and challenged by uncertainty, required to experience the life of an entrepreneur. Student motivation and enjoyment is obvious within a framework that allows them explore and create their own relationships between theory and practice. Thus, they experience first-hand the informal, but complex nature of the subject area. As previously discussed elsewhere (Jones, 2005), students are made aware that they themselves are subject to an evolutionary change process; parallel to the one they are studying. While entrepreneurs and their market offerings change over time, subject to selection forces, so do the workshop offerings of the students. Through this process desirable entrepreneurial behaviours, attributes, and skills are encouraged and developed.

The problem of restrictions on entrepreneurial learning is avoided by encouraging student ownership in how the program is delivered. Students are challenged to

proactively have a say in how such a program could best be delivered within a business school environment. In doing so, they constantly learn from each other, using their reflection journals to make sense of their behaviours. This process feeds back into their future decision making, where knowledge is not organized around any pre-existing developmental path, but rather one based on solving problems and exploiting opportunities. A focus on merely doing things differently, rather than on major innovation or explicit growth encourages students to see the big picture. Of how entrepreneurial behaviour permeates through at all levels of society. In summary, at the heart of the *hic et nunc* frameworks design is a desire to add value through creating multiple learning opportunities from different sources. To provide an opportunity for students to apply newly gained principles and ensure the reinforcement of entrepreneurial behaviours. To get them involved in a learning experience that develops a capacity to think for themselves, to be less reliant upon others in that regard, and ultimately, to believe in themselves.

Conclusion

On face value, it would seem that the *hic et nunc* framework allows for the delivery of an enterprise education program that satisfies the minimal requirements of both Whitehead (1929) and Gibb (2002). It encourages student freedom, whilst requiring discipline as well. It also attempts (as much as possible) to create an environment within which students engage in learning activities that seek to mimic the entrepreneur's way of life. Uncertainty and complexity are kept within the delivery process to challenge students to think for themselves, to help them develop new channels through which to learn. Inspired by the past works of Whitehead and Gibb, the *hic et nunc* framework has at its heart an explicit desire to use energy and

excitement as the spark that ignites student enthusiasm in the subject area. Its design has clearly benefited from the space and pedagogical freedom afforded the Entrepreneurship Major.

The challenge would seem to be the development of a learning space where students feel comfortable to fail, excited by the simplicity and focus of the literature used, motivated by the freedom afforded them, yet challenged by the need to engage in various activities through which their personality is drawn out. It would seem that the challenge for the lecturer also includes having more faith in his or her students than they may (initially) have in themselves. To think carefully about which big ideas need appreciation, and which information would simply get in the way. To bring to the table as much trust and enthusiasm for their abilities as is necessary to get the students to fill the void vacated by the lecturer. Put simply, to ensure the “imaginative acquisition of knowledge” (Whitehead 1929, 96).

References

Aldrich, H.E. (1999), *Organizations evolving*, Sage Publications, London.

Aldrich, H.E., and Kenworthy, A.L. (1999), “The accidental entrepreneur: Campellian antinomies and organizational foundings”, in Baum, J.A.C. and McKelvey, B. (Eds), *Organization Science: In Honor of Donald T. Campbell*, Sage Publications, London, pp. 19-34.

Aldrich, H.E., and Martinez, M.A. (2001), “Many are called, but few are chosen: An evolutionary perspective of the study of entrepreneurship”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 41-56.

Agarwal, R., Echambadi, R., Franco, A.M., and Sarkar, M.B. (2004), “Knowledge transfer through inheritance: Spin out generation, development, and survival”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 47 No. 4, pp. 501-522.

Biggs, J. (2003), *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does*, 2nd Ed, Open University Press, London.

- Bruyat, C., and Julien, P.A. (2001), "Defining the field of entrepreneurship", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol.16 No. 2, pp. 165-180.
- Caird, S.P. (1993), "What do psychological tests suggest about entrepreneurs", *Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 8 No. 6, pp. 11-20.
- Cooper, S., Bottomley, C., and Gordon, J. (2004), "Stepping out of the classroom and up the ladder of learning: An experiential learning approach to entrepreneurship education", *Industry & Higher Education*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 11-22.
- Davidsson, P., and Wiklund, J. (2001), "Levels of analysis in entrepreneurship research: Current research practice and suggestions for the future", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 81-99.
- Fiet, J.O. (2001), "The theoretical side of teaching entrepreneurship", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 1-24.
- Gibb, A.A. (2002), "Creating conducive environments for learning and entrepreneurship: Living with, dealing with, creating and enjoying uncertainty and complexity", *Industry & Higher Education*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 135-148.
- Jones, C., and English, J. (2004), "A Contemporary Approach to Entrepreneurship Education", *Education + Training*, Vol. 46 No. 8/9, pp. 416-423.
- Jones, C. (2005), "Firm transformation: Advancing a Darwinian perspective", *Management Decision*, Vol 43 No 1, pp. 13-25.
- Levinthal, D.A. (1991), "Organizational adaptation and environmental selection – interrelated processes of change", *Organization Science*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 140-145.
- Matlay, H., and Mitra, J. (2002), "Entrepreneurship and learning the double act in the triple helix", *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 7-16.
- Mintzberg, H (2004), *Managers not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.
- Shuell, T.J. (1986), "Cognitive conceptions of learning", *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 56 No. 4, pp. 411-436.
- Smilor, R.W. (1997), "Reflections on a subversive activity", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 12 No. 5, pp. 341-346.
- Tyler, R.W. (1949), *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*, University of Chicago Press, London.
- Whitehead, A.N. (1929), *The aims of education and other essays*, Free Press, New York.

Figure I – The *hic et nunc* framework

