Aalborg Universitet

Rebelling against entrepreneurship education

a phronetic approach

Jensen, Steffen Moltrup Ernø

REBELLING AGAINST ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

A PHRONETIC APPROACH

BY
STEFFEN ERNØ

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED 2018

REBELLING AGAINST ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

A PHRONETIC APPROACH

by

Steffen Ernø

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Dissertation submitted 2018

.

ENGLISH SUMMARY

Entrepreneurship is a ubiquitous part of daily discourse and politics in many modern societies. We are increasingly becoming aware of how we are expected to be the creators of our own future jobs. Entrepreneurship promises more jobs for more people, and it incites us to innovate and to disrupt the status quo. Entrepreneurship is also a key component for steady economic growth. As a consequence, a growing interest in entrepreneurship education has followed; one that promises to provide the means to sustain the future demand for entrepreneurial souls. This dissertation is a phronetic exploration of entrepreneurship education. Phronesis, as identified by Aristotle, is a scientific virtue addressing ethical and practical matters related to fields of public interest. Given the context of the study, and based on qualitative data, it is argued how an alternative way of thinking about entrepreneurship education might be more desirable.

Originally, my objective was to examine how entrepreneurship education can help the individual to become more entrepreneurial by approaching the study through auto-ethnography. My own experience of participating in a university summer course level on entrepreneurship, made me consider the potentially harmful consequences of entrepreneurship education. The normative effect that entrepreneurial ideals, which clearly separates winners from losers, can have on new generations of citizens should not be overlooked; it is neither an achievable nor sustainable end. Starting with this realization, I attempt to form a meaningful rebellion against entrepreneurship education. A rebellion because I remain critical of entrepreneurial discourse, yet meaningful since I simultaneously consider how elements also present in entrepreneurship education might provide students with skills that are beneficial not in an entrepreneurial society, but in a democratic one. By considering entrepreneurship education from this perspective, I show how it comes with negative consequences, but also a potential to be more democratically oriented. In a manner, this dissertation attempts to both deconstruct and reconstruct its field.

The dissertation is organized into nine chapters: three of them set frame, while five articles explore entrepreneurship education in different ways, finally, as the ninth chapter, there is a conclusion.

The first three chapters serves as a bird's-eye view on the topic and the making of the thesis. Firstly, an introduction to the specific approach to entrepreneurship education taken in this thesis and the circumstances under which it has been made is given. Following this is a literature review on entrepreneurship education in general, and two smaller reviews. One explores the connection between neoliberalism and entrepreneurship education, while the other explains why social entrepreneurship has not figured more prominently.

Chapter 4 discusses the role of psychology as a science and as an intellectual tool. This chapter does not deal with entrepreneurship education directly, but argues that psychology needs to find its role as a scientific discipline that contributes to making transparent the political, social, and interpersonal relations that define how our lives are shaped. Additionally, it explains my approach to doing psychological research, as it has been applied in the dissertation.

Chapter 5 is an empirical paper which explores how a course on entrepreneurship can move students from an individual to a collaborative understanding of entrepreneurship. Drawing on ethnographic data, it is argued that the collective understanding better reflects the everyday life of entrepreneurs. It therefore better prepares students for life outside of education by setting a more realistic standard for what they should expect to be able to achieve by themselves.

Chapter 6 is a methodological and empirical paper wherein an actor-network theoretical approach to studying entrepreneurship education is applied. Through three vignettes the material and spatial dimensions is explored in depth, which provokes new realizations about the importance of learning spaces in enabling positive learning

experiences. It also brought awareness to the fact that learning need to be sustained and integrated into everyday life to ensure it is performed beyond the educational setting.

Chapter 7 is an autoethnographic exploration examining the type of subject entrepreneurship education constructs. While we recognize that some positive value is promoted, it was our experience that many conflicting interests were present in the educational setting, obscuring the purpose and creating doubt among students. We highlight the possible negative impact of entrepreneurship education on students as a consequence hereof.

Chapter 8 considers the characteristics of the ideal democratic citizen, and explores how democratic traits and values can be promoted. In the chapter I focus on education as a necessary investment if we want a more democratic society. Further, it is argued that entrepreneurship education can provide students with tools and skills beneficial to a democratic citizen, but for it to be a viable approach it has to be re-oriented to embody democratic value rationalities rather than economic ones.

DANSK RESUME

Iværksætteri er efterhånden en allestedsnærværende del af den daglige diskurs og politik i mange moderne samfund. Vi bliver i stigende grad opmærksomme på, hvordan vi selv forventes at skabe vores egne fremtidige jobs. Iværksætteri lover flere jobs til flere mennesker, og det ansporer os til at innovere og "disrupte" status quo. Iværksætteri er dertil en nøglekomponent i skabelsen af stabil, økonomisk vækst. Som følge heraf er en stigende interesse for iværksætteruddannelser fulgt efter. Et uddannelsesfokus, der lover at give os det, der skal til for at imødekomme den fremtidig efterspørgsel på ildsjæle. Denne afhandling er en fronetisk udforskning af en sådan iværksætteruddannelse. Fronesis, identificeret af Aristoteles, er en videnskabelig dyd, der omhandler etiske og praktiske forhold, som relaterer sig til områder af offentlig interesse. Med undersøgelsens kontekst taget i betragtning, og baseret på kvalitativ empiri, argumenteres der for, hvordan en alternativ måde at tænke på iværksætteruddannelse kan være mere efterstræbelsesværdigt.

Oprindeligt var mit mål at undersøge, hvordan iværksætteruddannelse kan hjælpe den enkelte til at blive mere entreprenant ved at udforske feltet auto-etnografisk. Min egen erfaring med at deltage i en sommerskole om iværksætteri på universitetsniveau, fik mig dog til at overveje de potentielt skadelige konsekvenser af entreprenørskabsundervisning. Den normative virkning, som iværksætter idealer, der klart adskiller vindere fra tabere, kan have på nye generationer af borgerne, bør ikke overses; hvilket hverken et opnåeligt eller bæredygtigt mål. Denne erkendelse danner grundlag for denne afhandlings meningsfulde oprør mod iværksætteruddannelser. Et oprør fordi jeg er kritisk over for iværksætterdiskursen, men alligevel meningsfuldt, da jeg samtidig forbliver åben over for de elementer af iværksætteruddannelser, der kan medvirke til at give de studerende færdigheder, som er gavnlige i et demokratisk frem for et entreprenørielt samfund. Ved at se på iværksætteruddannelse ud fra dette perspektiv viser jeg, hvordan der medfølger negative sider, men samtidig indeholder

de et potentiale for at være mere demokratisk orienteret. Således forsøger denne afhandling både at dekonstruere og rekonstruere sit felt.

Afhandlingen er sammensat af ni kapitler: Tre af dem sætter rammen, mens fem artikler udforsker iværksætteruddannelse på forskellige måder, endelig udgør niende kapitel en konklusion.

De første tre kapitler tjener som et fugleperspektiv på selve emnet og på udarbejdelsen af afhandlingen. Først gives en introduktion til den specifikke tilgang til iværksætteruddannelse, der anvendes i denne afhandling samt de omstændigheder, hvorunder den er blevet til. Herefter kommer en litteraturoversigt om iværksætteruddannelse generelt og to mindre afsnit, der giver et yderligere overblik over relevant litteratur. Det ene undersøger sammenhængen mellem neoliberalisme og iværksætteruddannelse, mens det andet forklarer hvorfor *social entrepreneurship* ikke har været mere fremtrædende.

Kapitel 4 diskuterer psykologens rolle som videnskab og som et intellektuelt værktøj. Dette kapitel omhandler ikke iværksætteruddannelse direkte, men der argumenteres for, at psykologi skal finde sin rolle som en videnskabelig disciplin, som bidrager til at øge gennemsigtigheden af politiske, sociale og interpersonelle relationer, der påvirker, hvordan vores liv bliver formet. Dertil forklarer kapitlet min tilgang til psykologisk forskning, som også anvendes i afhandlingen.

Kapitel 5 er en empirisk artikel, der undersøger, hvordan et iværksætterkursus kan flytte elever fra en individorienteret til en samarbejdsorienteret forståelse af iværksætteri. På baggrund af etnografisk empiri hævdes det, at den kollektive forståelse bedre afspejler hverdagen for iværksættere. Det forbereder derfor bedre studerende på livet uden for uddannelsen ved at sætte en mere realistisk standard for, hvad de bør forvente at kunne opnå på egen hånd.

Kapitel 6 er en metodologisk og empirisk artikel, hvor en aktør-netværk teoretisk tilgang til at undersøge iværksætteruddannelser anvendes. Gennem tre casehistorier udforskes indflydelsen af de materielle og rumlige dimensioner, hvilket skaber nye erkendelser om vigtigheden af læringsrummets vigtighed for at muliggøre positive læringserfaringer. Det skabte også opmærksomhed på, at læring skal opretholdes og integreres i hverdagen uden for universitet for at sikre bæredygtig læring.

Kapitel 7 er en auto-etnografisk udforskning, der undersøger hvilken type subjekter entreprenørskabsundervisning er med til at konstruere. Selv om vi erkender, at en vis positiv værdi fremmes, så var det vores erfaring, at mange modstridende interesser var til stede i uddannelsesinstitutionen, hvilket fordunkler formålet og skaber tvivl blandt de studerende. Vi fremhæver den mulige negative virkning af iværksætteruddannelse på studerende som følge heraf.

Kapitel 8 tager den ideelle demokratiske borgers egenskaber i betragtning og undersøger, hvordan demokratiske træk og værdier kan fremmes. I kapitlet fokuserer jeg på uddannelse som en nødvendig investering, hvis vi ønsker et mere demokratisk samfund. Derudover hævdes det, at iværksætteruddannelse kan give de studerende værktøjer og færdigheder, som vil være til gavn for en demokratisk borger. For at denne tilgang for alvor kan komme i betragtning, er der dog behov for, at dens værdiforhold genorienteres mod nogle, der er demokratiske frem for økonomiske.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A simple thank you on this page in my dissertation is the least I can do to show my appreciation for the many people who have made the past four years not only possible, but also tolerable and enjoyable. The greatest thanks, and the only one to surpass my supervisor in terms of thankworthiness, goes to Natasja Moestrup; you have showed me how to be better at life. Every day you put up with the easily distracted being that I am, and you do it with a smile on your lips. You have been the biggest pillar of support and I give you all of my love. To Lene Tanggaard, my supervisor in this endeavor. You gave me the chance to fulfill a dream and stuck with me through it all. You are an inspiration I can never live up to. I appreciate all of your advice (and thank you for always having chocolate lying around when I visit your office). Steffen Korsgaard, my co-supervisor, for all the encouraging talks; I never left a conversation feeling down. Wes Shumar, a thanks for the advice and for the chance to visit you across the great pond. All in all, a thank you to PACE which includes Helle Neergaard, Per Blenker, Jan Warhuus, Sarah Robinson, Signe Frederiksen, Claus Thrane, Stine Elmholdt, and Sidsel Birk). A great thanks to Rasmus Birk, my academic twin and long-time partner in crime, for always holding a whip over me in a friendly manner (despite my obvious annoyance) and for always providing me with entertaining stories and good company. Thank you to David Carré, Sarah Awad, and Maria Lyndgaard for all the hours we have spent together in the office. Your company made "going to work" significantly more fun and interesting. To Mikka Nielsen with whom a taught a lot of students about social psychology. I have learned much from all of you. To Morten Kattenhøj, Lærke Kure, and Nikita Khalamov for all the afternoons spent trying to beat you at board games. Kasper Elmholdt for the many rewarding and thought-provoking talks. Then there is everyone at the center for cultural psychology and the department for psychology who have been familiar faces for the past many years: Brady Wagoner, Svend Brinkmann, Vlad Glaveanu, Jaan Valsiner, Luca Tateo, Thomas Szulevicz, Mogens Jensen, Capser Feilberg, Noomi Matthiesen, Andrea Von

Dosenrode, Annette Christensen, Elsebeth Bækgaard, Marianne Nielsen, and Lis Jensen.

Dedicated to Dan Nørgaard Laursen

– I wish you had stayed

LIST OF PUBLICATION

On this list is the articles included in this dissertation along with their status of publication:

Ernø, S. (2016). Democracy and Cultural Psychology. *Culture & Psychology*, vol. 22(3), 404 – 413.

Ernø, S. (Accepted) Educating for democracy: Entrepreneurship education as a democratic discipline? Book chapter in Wagoner, B., Glăveanu,V. & Brescó, I. (Eds). *Actualizing democracy: A psychological exploration.*

Ernø, S. & Tanggard, L. (In review) A conflicting space: the entanglement of interests in entrepreneruship education. *Ethnography and Education.*

Ernø, S. Korsgaard, S. & Shumar, W. *Things that Do: Exploring the Material and Spatial Dimensions of Entrepreneurship Education.* Originally presented as a full paper for the 19th Nordic Conference for Small Business Research, Riga, Latvia as: Ernø, S., Korsgaard, S. & Shumar, W. (2016) Building Sandcastles: Materiality, time, and space in entrepreneurship education

Warhuus, J. P., Tanggaard, L., Robinson, S. & Ernø, S. (2017) From I to We: collaboration in entrepreneurship education and learning? Education + Training, vol. 59(3), 234-249

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. A PHRONETIC APPROACH TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

"You need to have balls" was one of the last things Torstein ever said to me. Torstein was an entrepreneurial soul who I was in contact with at the beginning of my PhD. From the short timespan wherein we were in contact, I got the impression that he was both passionate and honest. Additionally, he was also the person who placed the final nail in the coffin of my aspiration of ever succeeding as an entrepreneur. It was an idea I had been contemplating for the first several months of my PhD. Ever since attending the summer school conducted by my research group on entrepreneurship education (EEd), I had been instilled with this feeling of "yes, you can do this." Having spent a week during a particularly nice summer in a classroom going through exercises and assignments designed to make me think and act more like an entrepreneur, I was filled with a sense of confidence. In the time immediately after the summer school, I was brimming with ideas. Hyperbolically speaking, I felt as though I was spotting business opportunities everywhere I went. Thus, I considered it likely that I would develop an idea around which to build a venture. Because of this confidence, I increasingly warmed to the idea that my PhD should document the experience of being an entrepreneur, as I was going through the process myself. The idea looks good on paper, which is probably why a former teacher of mine – himself an entrepreneur with a background in psychology – took it upon himself to introduce me to his former colleague, who he believed could help me get started. Even a fellow doctoral student expressed that he would be willing to consider making a financial investment in the project.

It was only once I was on the phone with a living, breathing entrepreneur that reality struck back. I never recorded that conversation, but I distinctly remember the whole worldview that I had built throughout the previous month being shattered. Had my PhD been a novel, this would have been the point of no return. This phone call changed how I saw and understood the world around me. Confidence turned to doubt.

I did not feel ready for the challenge of creating a business, and I began to wonder what that said about me. It did take me quite some time to realize that maybe the problem was not with me specifically. Slowly, I was able to steer my gaze outward. Rather than questioning my own shortcomings, I began to consider if EEd might also express some structural challenges to which I had responded, especially with regard to the value rationality and subjectivity promoted therein. I decided to take this into consideration by mirroring it through my own experiences.

This experience became a catalyst. My entire approach transformed from wanting to document a process of becoming to critically examining the value rationality of EEd while attempting to approach it in a manner that I would consider to be more ethically desirable. That is to say that I had a general reservation about the economic rationality present in the field of EEd.

SO WHAT IS THE POINT?

The above argument is made through five articles that each adds a perspective that somehow seeks to diversify EEd and how it is approached. As stated, the overall purpose of this project is to offer a phronetic contribution to EEd. Thus, the point is not to develop theory, but rather to analyze and elucidate where we are, where we are going, and what would be desirable (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 167) according to a set of values that are relevant to a deliberation of the value rationality of EEd. The title I have chosen for the thesis describes the essence of that which has become the central doctrine of my scholarly efforts. What I am rebelling against is the value rationale of entrepreneurship that is taken, axiomatically, to be positive. In the articles, my co-authors and I either challenge this assumption or apply new value rationalities to the way in which EEd is approached. These texts not only consider what EEd is, but also what it could be. I provide a sketch of each article's contribution, but in an attempt to avoid redundancy, I otherwise allow them to stand on their own.

Each paper is its own chapter. The reader should view the rest of this thesis as a supportive structure rather than an elaborative one; the papers themselves sufficiently

convey their points. What the reader needs, just as it has been for myself, is to understand how these contributions to the field of psychology and entrepreneurship – both in general and as education – tie together into something bigger. The papers compose the final part of the dissertation, apart from a conclusion. The following section briefly outlines the thesis.

STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

First, there is a short overview of each chapter and its contribution to the dissertation. Chapters 5 through 9 contain the articles (five in total) that comprise the bulk of the thesis and my main contribution to the field. These chapters also synthesize and discuss the empirical data along with analytical and theoretical aspects. In the chapters previous to the articles, I focus on unpacking perspectives that cannot adhere to the neat format of a journal article. Thus, this includes a literature review and thought concerning methodology and the study of the entrepreneur. Additionally, another chapter concerns anarchism as a directing ideology for a new understanding of EEd. Lastly, there is a conclusion. The more detailed structure is as follows:

In Chapter 2, I provide an overview of the literature in order to situate my own contribution to the field as well as to demarcate the extent of my contribution. I also briefly engage with neoliberalism and EEd, and social entrepreneurship, because I wish to corroborate the claims made in Chapter 8 with literature that I became aware of at a later stage.

Chapter 3 is where I discuss methods, though I try to avoid doing so in a classical sense. Each article provides its own details on the practical matters related to methodology. Here, I rather attempt a meta-perspective on conducting research when working with an elusive ontological object and the process and concerns that factor into that work.

Chapter 4 contains the first article, titled "Democracy and Cultural psychology," in which I debate the responsibility that we have as researchers, and in particular the appropriate role of psychology. I argue that psychology should be understood as a

value-oriented science that promotes normativity and explain why it is necessary to clearly comprehend the values that we allow to guide our scientific endeavors. In essence, it is an argument in favor of a phronetic psychology.

Chapter 5 presents the second article, "From I to We," wherein my co-authors and I examine pre- and post-interviews with students from the "Promoting a Culture of Entrepreneurship" (PACE) summer school in order to assess if there is any success with moving students from an individual understanding of entrepreneurship toward one that is collective and co-creative. The responses are somewhat mixed, but for a handful of participants, it does seem that the course gave them an understanding of entrepreneurship as an activity one does not have to do alone and for the sake of personal interest, but rather in collaboration with others and for the sake of the collective.

In Chapter 6, we analyze EEd from the perspective of actor-network theory (ANT) in an attempt to gauge the potential contributions of a new methodological focus in terms of conceptual leaps in our understanding of the entrepreneurial learning environment. In the article "Things that Do," we employ empirical material from both PACE and another EEd course ("New Venture Creation," or NVC) in order to compare their learning spaces and evaluate how these might influence how learning takes place.

Chapter 7, titled "A Conflicting Space," presents a critical examination of EEd. We focus our critical gaze on which type of subject EEd constructs. While some positive value is promoted, it was our experience that these are axiomatically accepted as truisms. Yet, also in our experience, many conflicting interests were present in the classroom that obscured the purpose of participating and instead created doubt among students. We highlight the possible negative consequences of EEd, which the literature has largely neglected to do.

Chapter 8 presents, in opposition with previous chapter, a more constructive approach to EEd. In this chapter, I argue that there is a democratic potential in EEd, albeit one that necessitates the right conditions if it is to emerge. As the title "Educating for

Democracy" suggests, I acknowledge how EEd also provide students with tools that are useful outside of venture creation. One area in which EEd does succeed is teaching students to collaborate and to engage in matters of public concern.

Chapter 9 concludes the dissertation. It outlines my general arguments and the themes that I have treated and identifies future paths to explore for phronetic research on EEd.

FRAMING A QUESTION

The experience described above is essential to framing a research question. My research has not been guided by one, but once the articles started to come together I was able to formulate a question to indicate the context that connects the articles – however fragmented they may seem. Actually posing a question can allow the reader to make sense of my work and know my intention, thereby increasing its transparency. Because of the omnipresence of entrepreneurship, it hardly seems necessary to argue why it is interesting to consider it from an educational perspective. Should readers feel the need for such an argument, I direct them to Chapters 2, 6, 7, or 8, as these all contain a review of the status quo of EEd.

A personal interest I have nurtured while growing as a scholar is the political dimension of psychology. It is probably this particular interest that has influenced my view of EEd the most. As a bachelor and master student I was quite influenced by Svend Brinkmann (2011), whose perspective on normativity highlights the political role of psychology in view of moral questions pertaining to how we, as human beings, should live among one another. This interest eventually lead me to figures such as Hannah Arendt (2008), Nikolas Rose (1998), John Dewey (1939), and of course Bent Flyvbjerg (2001), all of whom have addressed the political impacts and the impact of values in the human sciences on ordinary life in some form or another. My initially critical attitude toward entrepreneurship education evolved as I came to realize that being critical was not enough in and of itself. I deemed it unacceptable to stop my effort and research on EEd after a critique. Could we not modify the old motto from the Spider-Man comics and say that "with great knowledge comes great

responsibility"? This does not mean that I want scientists to take full political responsibility; I do not argue for technocracy. On the contrary, I see it as a democratic problem when people who have been privileged enough to pursue expertise do not partake in public debates in ways other than by pointing out problems. As researchers, we have a duty to society to not only deconstruct, but also help in the difficult process of re-constructing the new that should follow that which we find to be problematic. We can do this by engaging with the citizenry and its elected politicians in debates about facts and values and how these should or should not be allowed to influence the direction in which society moves. It is an ongoing process to always evaluate what we know and what we should do with that knowledge. Doctoral students, such as myself, are provided with time to become knowledgeable, and we therefore often end up with something interesting to say about our field of study. We represent "new research," but some conditions simultaneously make it difficult for us to enter into the arena of public debate. The fact that we are "students" has the potential to undermine the significance of our contribution since we are seen as "still learning" and inexperienced. Through the titles of "doctoral" or "PhD," the opposite happens. To some ears, it sounds elitist and can potentially be misconstrued in political debates: "Here they come from the ivory tower with no knowledge of how the real world works, wanting to tell us how things should be done." As a doctoral student, I have had to realize that I am in an unfortunate position in that regard. It is by no means impossible to exercise influence in matters of public concern – especially with the social media available as outlet – but the question is whether anybody listens. The ideas will of course be introduced to academia (they already are because of the articles) once the dissertation is published. However, we, as a society, are slow to absorb and process scientific ideas.

Let us return to the matter of framing a research question. According to Bent Flyvbjerg (2001, p. 130), the focus on values that is central to a phronetic approach is so important because it forces the researcher to question his or her stance on the values in action and develop better alternatives or re-valuations through new interpretations.

> "If a better interpretation demonstrates the previous interpretation to be 'merely' interpretation, this new interpretation remains valid until another, still better interpretation is produced which can reduce the previous interpretation to 'merely' interpretation" (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 132).

Flyvbjerg's argument here seems to be in line with abductive reasoning (Douven, 2016), or as it is also known, "interference to the best explanation." In a phronetic approach, however, it becomes more than a way of reasoning; it is a principle that guides social science so that we continuously work toward improving explanations of the phenomena we study. Instead of adhering to foundationalism (that values are universal and transferable from one context to another) on one hand or relativism (that one set of values is as good as another) on the other with regard to understanding values, Flyvbjerg holds that a phronetic approach rejects both positions and replaces them with situational ethics through contextualism. This essentially means that we should consider what is desirable within a given context (Ibid.). Context in this case entails not only the small and local, but also the global and international contexts wherein the phenomena emerges (ibid., p. 136), and the results are therefore also dependent on the interpretations of the researcher. This forms the basis for the direction of my inquiry into EEd. What kind of EEd is desirable given its specific context? The context here is situated in my own experience of participating in an EEd at a university summer course level and, following that, seeing other students go through the same process, which has made me consider the potential consequences of EEd (both negative and positive).

CHOOSING THE RIGHT LENS

The question then becomes, "through what lens does one decide what is more desirable?" Surely this question is ultimately a matter of preference and perspective, to some extent. As a phronetic researcher, I simultaneously attempt to reject universal values and avoid considering any set of values as good as another; thus, I cannot decide what is desirable arbitrarily or define it specifically. Still, I did need to identify a set of principles, since these can be both pliant and rigorous, that I could use to assess my empirical data in order to determine and evaluate values present therein compared to the values to be desired. Although a principle is rigorous in theory, it is

pragmatically pliant. For example, I could hold as a principle that we ought to provide people with enough food for them to lead good lives. This would be true in any given context in which I find myself. How I abide by this principle could, however, differ drastically. In one case, I might see the need to increase food production if there was an inadequate supply to feed people. In another, it might be a matter of controlling distribution to make it more equitable. Third, it could be a question of limiting consumption and production if people were eating so much it made them miserable. I admit that this is a silly and simplistic example, but it illustrates my point that there are many ways to uphold a principle – depending on situational context.

An interesting development was that, by finding a lens through which I wanted to understand my field, I was forced into rethink my research project. In Chapter 3, I detail the process that I underwent in order to determine how to approach EEd. However, choosing a lens had a profound impact on the end result of my dissertation. It is therefore worth remembering that this is only one way to interpret EEd, and the interpretation is based on highly local experiences with a specific summer school. Any conclusions must therefore be understood as what they are: contingent on contextualism. This applies both in terms of the field I had access to and the way in which democracy and anarchism became anchor points for my approach to conducting research. In the following section, I reflect on both democracy and anarchism with the purpose of extracting values from these notions to demonstrate how and why they have come to influence my thinking and research.

ON DEMOCRACY AND ITS VALUES

The lens through which I came to perceive EEd was developed through a particular interest of mine in the notions of democracy, liberty, and egalitarianism and their roles in psychological science. It is an interest that evolved in tandem with my engagement in the world of entrepreneurship because I realized that EEd does not release the potential that it promises. After having written my first paper in which I explicitly included democracy (in the article "Democracy and Cultural Psychology"), I asked myself why democracy seems so axiomatically good to me and many others. When

trying to re-orient EEd towards democratic values, it is necessary to both justify why it is being done and specify those other values. For this reason, the next few paragraphs examine democracy, its values, its problems, and why it is the most just system with which to align ourselves educationally.

In the World Value Survey, 91.6% of participants answered affirmatively when asked whether they believe democracy is a good method of governance (Van Reybrouck, 2016, p. 1; World Value Survey). So strong is the notion of democracy that it has been used to argue for war. The mantra is that it is one of the greatest exports of liberal democracies (sometimes in lieu of other motives, perhaps), and we should bring democracy to those who do not have it. It is an odd obsession considering that we do not necessarily live in democracies ourselves. Jean-Jacques Rousseau remarked on this in 1762 in his book, *The Social Contract*:

> The People of England deceive themselves when they fancy they are free; they are so, in fact, only during election of Members of Parliament: for, as soon as a new one is elected, they are again in chains, and are nothing. (p. 85)

There are hardly encouraging words. Rousseau wrote this about an elective representational democracy, the type of democracy that is practiced in most of the world. The rhetoric that surrounds democracy invokes extensive pathos. We must act to safeguard our values, ideas, rights, and way of life – and ensure that others get to enjoy them as well. Although the modern idea of democracy means holding elections (Van Reybrouck, 2016), which liberal democracies have an oddly fetishized relationship with, it is possible to highlight several instances of either founders or leaders of democratic societies revealing how they also harbor opinions that contradict democracy. John Adams, a founding father and second President of the United States, wrote the following in a letter addressed to John Taylor, another politician at the time:

> Remember Democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes exhausts and murders itself. There never was a Democracy Yet, that did not commit suicide. It is in vain to Say that Democracy is less vain, less proud, less selfish, less ambitious or less avaricious than Aristocracy or Monarchy. (Adams, 1814)

In addition, James Madison – also an architect of the Great Experiment and credited as the father of the United States' Bill of Rights – expressed similar anti-democratic sentiments, claiming that democracies are as short lived as they are "*violent in their deaths*" (Madison, 1787). Elective representative democracy in its modern form is not ruled by "we, the people," but is instead a system that allows for the people to choose who rules in their stead or on their behalf. After Britons voted themselves out of the EU in the summer of 2016, Danish politician Mogens Lykketoft, the former head of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said that David Cameron had made a mistake by allowing the people to vote on the question, and several notable Danish politicians reinforced this sentiment (Barfoed & Mølholt, 2016). It is an odd instance in which seemingly people trust their elected politicians less and less, while the politicians in turn grow increasingly tired of those they have been elected to govern.

Today, there is an increasing opposition that is much more pro-democratic and which is giving voice to hypocrisies in the way democracy is practiced (see: Rancière, 2013; Van ReyBrouck, 2016; Achen & Bartels, 2016). One perspective is that we are provided with the illusion of democracy in order to ensure stability. It is Paul Cartledge's educated guess that the people of ancient Athens would consider the current system no more than a "*disguised oligarchy*" (Cartledge, 2016, p. 1). All that is needed is the vote of the people once every term and, in the mean time, those in power can rule with minimum interference from those who provide them with the mandate to rule. Karl Marx has famously been paraphrased for writing that religion is opium to the people. [1] Currently, when reading some of these proponents of democracy, the same can be said about democracy. Jacques Rancière has noted how democracy has fostered its own ruling class (2013), echoing Rousseau to some degree, albeit nearly 250 years later. It was the same observation that incited the *Occupy*

---

[1] The real quote by Marx is:"Religious suffering is, at one and the same time, the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people." (Marx, 1982)

movement in 2011. At its height, the Occupy movement consisted of people who felt that their voices were not heard by those in power, leading to a lengthy sting of global protests and experiments in participatory democracy (Gautney, 2011). As long as "we, the people" perceive ourselves as having a modicum of freedom, are content with basic comforts, and are kept busy with work and consumption, we rarely consider complaining. In order for democracy to truly work, it requires that people engage with the problems of the state, become involved at the local level where many decisions of great importance for our daily well-being are made, and participate, help, and cooperate to ensure society works. This is the potential that resides in EEd. What is unique about EEd is that it is a type of education that actively seeks to encourage students to assume responsibility for value creation, albeit not simply for the sake of being a good citizen, but rather to become a good businessperson.

Despite this only being a superficial analysis of democracy and how it has been debated, it should be adequate to illuminate the discrepancies between the real and the ideal. It should also make the reader join me in questioning why we should even talk about democracy when it is exploited to the extent that some critics have indicated. While it can be debated how we should shape democracy into a widely acceptable form of government, it is still the best option we have for balancing the two most important factors considered by any form of government: legitimacy and efficiency (Van Reybrouck, 2016). This is the advantage of democracy, and it accomplishes this better than any other way of governing, although the act of balancing might be difficult for some to recognize in its current representational form. Many critics of the elective representational democracy have opined that efficiency is too strongly prioritized, consequently sacrificing legitimacy. Balancing the two are naturally difficult when nations have to navigate the global scene of politics. A certain degree of flexibility and political autonomy is needed, but at the same time, political decisions are made on behalf of a group of people that is impossible to ignore if stability at the national level must be preserved. Still, democracy promotes the idea of "the rule of the masses, the political empowerment of the poor, on the basic of some workable definition of freedom and equality." (Cartledge, 2016, p. xviii). While it is up for

discussion how much weight should be put on either efficiency or legitimacy, the principles of freedom and equality are the defining traits of democracy. For this reason in particular, I believe democratic values are worth protecting. One way of doing so is by re-orienting educational effort – more than is already the case – to align with the values we expect from democratic citizens. I also lean toward agreeing with critics who view legitimacy as more important than efficiency. I recognize that it is not the sole responsibility of those elected to ensure legitimacy; as a people, we bear a great deal of that responsibility ourselves. Through education for democratic citizen, we can create the means through which we slowly but steadily increase the base of people able to act through diversified points of involvement in legitimizing our way of governing. To properly uphold it, we are required to commit not only to ourselves, but also to each other and the ideals, values, and hopes we share. One way in which we can influence how current and future generations relate to and engage with each other is through education. We need awareness and tools (both factual and intellectual) if we are to feel equipped to lift the responsibility and duties required in a democratic society, especially if the hope is to have a more direct democracy.

Direct democracy is anarchistic (Rancière, 2013), as it depends a great deal on random selection and free association between participating citizens who rule and govern themselves through mutual agreement and a cooperative effort toward sustaining a working society. When employing a framework of orientation that emphasizes equality and freedom as well as responsibility, commitment to the community, and no figure-head rulers, it is difficult not to think of anarchism. That is exactly what happened to me. Just as the notion of democracy has greatly influenced my work (see Chapters 4 and 9), albeit explicitly, so too has anarchism come to shape my eventual perception of EEd, although it is a far more implicit perspective. I highlight how anarchism has inspired me not only for the sake of transparency, but also because I believe there is great potential in uniting EEd with anarchism as a way to reinforce it, and it would therefore be a shame to omit it entirely.

ON THE ROLE OF ANARCHISM AS AN IMPLICIT IDEOLOGY

It is my interest in democracy that eventually lead me to the anarchist movement inspired by the work of Noam Chomsky (2005). Its values and intellectual ideas, such as mutualism, participatory democracy, self-governing, scepticism towards authority, and an aversion to hierarchy, has allowed me to grasp the potential that is present in EEd and has equally shaped how I have directed my criticism. It should be said that I intend to neither affirm all of anarchism nor provide a complete account of anarchist thinking, as it stretches across all parts of the political spectrum (from anarcho-syndicalism to anarcho-capitalism, although Chomsky does hold that anarchism is a socialist ideology (Chomsky, 2005, p. 123)), and into several factions with specific aims. A proper account is therefore beyond the scope of this thesis. At one point, my ambition was to attempt an alchemical experiment whereby I would try to achieve a chimeric combination of anarchism and EEd. That project was abandoned for this thesis, but remains as a future ambition. For that reason, it is necessary to define how I have come to understand anarchism, which is not as radical as many people with whom I have discussed this had initially believed.

I rely closely on Noam Chomsky's understanding of anarchism:

> "This broad tendency in human development [that] seeks to identify structures of hierarchy, authority and domination that constrain human development, and then subject them to a very reasonable challenge: Justify yourself" (Chomsky, 2014).

According to anarchist sentiments, if a structure cannot justify itself, then it follows that it needs to be dismantled, which I have realized might be necessary to do with EEd. Chomsky essentially holds that the purpose of governing is to ensure a good and happy life for each citizen. It is only when the governing body steers away from this path that a reaction is necessitated. Chomsky's approach to anarchism lacks the rigorous dedication to the idea of ultimate freedom that many libertarians have championed (for example Hayek, 1944/2007). This facilitates a nuanced approach that also comes to terms with power distributed (therefore not residing in one place, i.e. the state (May, 1994)) and the understanding that the influence of power is not

negative per se. Some state institutions are justified. Our educational system is one of them, and is thus not one we would want to dismantle at first glance, as it contributes overall to the well-being and beneficial development of society. In the moderate form of anarchism that Chomsky represents, we can reject the premise of neoliberalism, for example as in the present context, and instead have anarchism act as the catalyst for asking whether EEd can be justified as leading toward a desirable end. According to anarchism, this outcome should be defined by the desire for equality and freedom for each individual, in other words: democracy. Jacques Rancière has argued that democracy is based on an anarchic form of governing because, in the Athenian sense of democracy (direct democracy), it is based on the absence of privileges (Rancière, 2006, p. 77; see also: Carson, 2017; Graeber, 2009; Milstein, 2010). Democracy is a way of governing for those who believe that no one is entitled to govern, but agree that collaboration on larger matters is beneficial. I have come to view democracy as a political extension of the economic principle of social anarchism, such as in Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's ideas about mutualism and voluntary collaboration (Graham, 2014), or the ideas about mutual aid formed by Peter Kropotkin (1972).

Anarchism is the one aspect of my dissertation that is only implicit in the papers, although I am quite specific about shaping psychology and EEd for democracy. It is sufficient for this dissertation to note that anarchism, because of its strong cultivation of democratic principles (in an Athenian and not representative sense), has come to inform the values that I have used to analyze EEd, and therefore has also partially cultivated my engagement in phronetically examining EEd.

A PHRONETIC RESEARCH PROJECT

Rather than determining desirability on the basis of preference, then, it comes down to identifying how it matches principles that are especially potent in anarchism and, in extension hereof, democracy. These principles, egalitarianism and libertarianism, can be both defended and criticized philosophically and morally, which assigns more weight to them since they can be discussed through professional debate – in a sense rendering them academically tangible. With these tangible principles in mind, we

should again turn our gaze towards EEd. The subtitle that I have chosen for the dissertation tells the reader that I am using a phronetic approach. Relevant questions at this point would be: in what way, exactly, is the present thesis phronetic? The basis for making phronesis part of this project comes from the above principles, and how I have been influenced by both anarchist and democratic thinking during my work. Alongside these sources of inspiration, we have Flyvbjerg's (2001) book that asks us to consider how we can make social science matter – or more pointedly: how can I make my research matter? Coming from the field of psychology, how can I make a worthwhile contribution to EEd research that takes advantage of my position and my specific experiences? Especially by approaching the field as a psychologist, I felt the need to do something different from the way psychologists have mainly contributed to entrepreneurship research. The psychological approach to entrepreneurship research has been a decisive contributor in assigning the individual a prominent role in how we understand the entrepreneurial process. One of psychology's main objectives has been to identify how the entrepreneur is different from the non-entrepreneur, which has served to bolster the notion of the entrepreneur as a special person with a specific set of abilities – a topic that I have covered more extensively in my master's thesis (Ernø, 2013, but it is also criticized in Gartner, 1989; Gaglio & Winter, 2009; Rauch & Frese, 2007; Schoon & Duckworth, 2012). In my master's thesis, I argue that this has been holding entrepreneurship research back in terms of developing a more beneficial framework for understanding the becoming of entrepreneurs. What my previous work on my master's thesis and the research done for the present dissertation did was to lead me slowly towards the realization that the general direction taken in EEd needs to come under scrutiny. The purpose here – to examine the value rationale of EEd – is precisely what makes the dissertation phronetic.

It should now be possible to fully state the research question that guides this thesis:

How can entrepreneurship education be re-oriented as a democratic discipline when considered phronetically?

The overall argument that I develop throughout this dissertation is that there is significant potential for EEd to become a democratic discipline compared to its current state as a primarily economic one (Hannon, 2005; Ricketts, 2006), as is evident from the venture-creation aspect that dominates the focus of EEd. For example, the introduction to the *Handbook for Research Entrepreneurship Education, Volume 2* states the following:

> Additionally, they [the teachers] also need to teach students concepts and skills that can be directly applied toward starting, managing, and growing an enterprise. Skills that require nonlinear learning and thinking (…) may become critical to the survival of their business (Fayolle & Kickul, 2007, p. 1).

The same is made clear in a following chapter of the same handbook, wherein the authors distinguish between three main types of entrepreneurship course: (1) those that focus on venture creation, (2) those that view EEd within the broader perspective of identifying opportunities that are not limited to entrepreneurship, but also include intrapreneurship (i.e. innovation that takes place inside an already-established business), and (3) managing an existing firm and/or managing growth (Brand, Wakkee & van der Veen, 2007: p. 55). Clearly, the highlight of EEd is the focus on business. Even though this view may be broadened by extending it to include pursuit of opportunities, it is nonetheless firmly rooted in the economic realm. I also start the problem statement with a 'how' rather than asking a 'why' question. This is significant to a phronetic project, since the 'how' creates a dynamic question that does not require us to arrive at one specific answer. It helps encapsulate the dynamics that characterize phronetic research, where we are looking both for an understanding and an explanation, whereas 'why' questions are much more structural (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 136) in that a specific answer is sought. My point in this dissertation is that the democratic potential is more desirable than what is currently practised, and therefore needs to be explored - whether or not the ideological alignment is attractive to the field at present (Ogbor, 2000). The nature of the question guides us towards thinking phronetically about EEd, since the goal of a phronetic approach is to 'add to society's

capacity for value-rational deliberation and action' (Flyvbjerg, 2016), although I have chosen to specify my problem statement with 'as a democratic discipline' in order to narrow the focus of the thesis and to create an analytical purpose. So, the question leads me towards a threefold consideration: what is the current state of entrepreneurship education (understanding); what is meant by a 'democratic discipline' (explanation); and finally, how can these be combined and does this contribute towards a more desirable end? I intend to provide answers to most of these questions, and tentative answers to the rest – specifically, the question concerning how EEd as a democratic discipline will look, since any reflection on this matter will be hypothetical due to the nature of my study and the premises on which it has been carried out. And so, the question starts with a 'how' which points us in a direction that is phronetic, because we are implicitly moved to consider four sub-questions that are defining for a phronetic project according to Flyvbjerg (2001, pp. 145 – 162). These are:

1) Where are we going?

2) Who gains and who loses, and by which mechanism of power?

3) Is this desirable?

4) What, if anything, should be done?

These questions have not been present from the beginning, but, looking back, I have been able to identify how the papers and the dissertation each contribute answers to the sub-question, which in turn allows me gradually, through the papers, to close in on an approximation to an answer to the problem statement. The first two sub-questions are answered partly in the next chapter and through the papers *Democracy and Cultural Psychology* and *From I to We*. The paper *A Conflicted Space* explicitly focuses on who the gainers and losers are and whether what we have observed is desirable (to which the answer is a 'no'). Finally, *Educating for Democracy* is my attempt at conjoining EEd and education for democracy, which ultimately is how I, albeit hypothetically, would answer the fourth sub-question. My guess is that you are

now wondering why a chapter has been left out. Well, it is not because I did not want it to be included in this grand scheme of apparent order that I am fitting my otherwise sporadic research into. As an aside, you can almost say that by writing this thesis I have worked abductively with my own research by coming up with what I think is the best explanation for what I have been doing and what it has been leading to. Returning to the article not included, *Things that Do,* the truth is that it does not fit into what I had thought would be a genius way of organizing my research as an example of best-practice phronetic research. Fortunately, it does do something completely different that is still very, if not extremely (although that may be going a bit too far) relevant, since it helps us attain a better sense of another dimension important in phronetics, namely, an ontological level (whereas we have previously concerned ourselves primarily with epistemological matters) where phronetic research seeks to transcend dualisms (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 137). *Things that Do* describes how I, and later we, the authors of the paper, wanted to look beyond agency and structure by applying actor-network theory to become aware of the role materiality plays. The things that surround us not only provide a structure, but also convey meaning, shape actions and act themselves in ways that influence the way students learn and are taught.

PACE, and to a lesser extent NVC, are cases that provide the context necessary for me to study EEd's value rationale, which I embark on to move past instrumental rationality, viz. wanting to explore the end that EEd is moving towards and how to deal with it. It is precisely in this domain that Flyvbjerg argues that social science (or in this case human science, depending on where you place psychology on the academic spectrum) is strong, and natural science weak (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 60f). While Flyvbjerg addresses social science directly, one would be justified in asking whether what I am doing here is even psychological, or how it is psychological. I have no clever answer, but… I am a psychologist, so in a manner of speaking we could say that this area of study becomes psychological because I choose to study it. Better yet, this is an attempt to practise a phronetic psychology. Does it differ from social-science phronetics? I do not know, but I do think that psychology needs to address value rationality in more explicit terms when it comes to its various fields of study, and that,

at least, is what I am doing here. Even disregarding whether it is psychological or not, the matter of value is important when dealing with education, but is unfortunately too often overlooked (Biesta, 2010, p. 13), As Biesta (2010, p. 2) argues, we need to address the question of good education as explicitly normative to assert democratic control over education. And that is what this thesis intends to do with EEd.

PART OF A RESEARCH PROJECT – A DESCRIPTION OF PACE

In the later chapters, I describe PACE in terms of its function and purpose from a practical perspective. It is also in these chapters that my co-authors and I describe the summer schools that PACE arranges (see Chapters 6, 7, and 8). In order to forego any redundancy, I avoid reiterating those facts here. This part of the chapter is instead intended to provide some insight into PACE from my own perspective as well as their general goals.

I became involved with the research group PACE during my doctoral scholarship as one of the PhD students granted for the project. The overall ambition in PACE was to find a knowledgeable approach to EEd that facilitates an entrepreneurial mindset in everyday practices (Blenker et al, 2011). Often, many initiatives were taken on the basis of belief more than anything else (Blenker et al, 2014). The reason for this was the lack of evidence for one truly superior approach to teaching entrepreneurship. Thus, in PACE, we wanted to apply learning theory, pedagogy, and didactics in order to acquire an understanding of the formation of entrepreneurial identities and creative processes (Robinson et al, 2016). The attitude of PACE toward teaching entrepreneurship was inspired by the phenomenological approach outlined in the book *Disclosing New Worlds* (Spinosa, Flores & Dreyfus, 1997), wherein entrepreneurialism is framed as practice and a mindset for how one engages in everyday life (Blenker et al, 2012). Being entrepreneurial is to be more in in touch with one's surroundings (ibid.). A concept I initially failed to grasp was the close connection that the authors of *Disclosing New Worlds* identified between entrepreneurship and a democratic way of life – despite the fact that this was part of the subtitle of the book. A passage in the book reads as follows:

> A civil democracy with a market economy has three essential interests. First, it has an interest in enabling people to sense that they all share a disclosive space of ultimate consequence in which they live and work (…) Second, a civil democracy must occupy itself with the structures of ownership, agreement, and association among its people (…) this is where cross-appropriation takes place, and we deem this discourse native to politics because it is based on advocating reorderings of concerns through sharing practices in a way that respects subworlds. Third, there is the domain of productivity (…) Here we suggest that thinking about productivity that does justice to human beings as history makers requires thinking of it in terms of institutionalizing the innovative aspect of entrepreneurial skill. (Spinosa, Flores & Dreyfus, 1997, p. 269f)

In the quote above, the authors tie together the virtuous citizen, solidarity, and entrepreneurship as three legs that each needs support in order to enable people to live fuller lives. However, it is important to also note the following statement in their introduction: "We write in support of entrepreneurial practices within capitalist market economies, of citizens' action groups in modern representative democracies, and of the culture figures who cultivate solidarity among diverse peoples in modern nations" (ibid., p. 1). I suppose that when I read the book, my understanding of the field was not developed enough to see beyond the entrepreneurial aspects, but now I have started to do so. Especially with the inspiration of anarchism, this thesis is written in support of neither capitalist market economies nor elective representative democracies. In my view, an entrepreneurial way of life is not a precondition for a democratic way of life, but within EEd there is potential for heightening how students can be taught to engage in public life, which is a way of changing the status-quo towards a more desirable way of life.

The PACE project, which ended in December 2016, had three levels where it wanted to provide results:

1) Didactical implications on course level: Indicating how courses should be constructed depending on target group and entrepreneurial learning goal.
2) Entrepreneurial curriculum level: Indicating how a number of courses could be combined in order to move students through a coherent learning path, integrating progression in learning goals.

3) Educational policy level: Suggesting how to allocate resources to education in ways that promote creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship.

(mgmt.au.dk)

In examining these goals, it is difficult to recognize the democratic connection. It did surface in the courses, which were designed to move students – and their own skills, competences, and networks – from an inner focus to a collective focus (treated more in depth in Chapter 7). During our meetings, I was met with resistance whenever I presented entrepreneurship in an entirely economic light and was told that it was about more than venture creation. So, while this conviction was present in the group, it was still an aspect that seemed to be lacking when it came to carrying out the concepts. Instead, it became a combined business start-up and self-development course. I think that the attitudes present in PACE greatly inspired me to focus on which factors made it difficult to design a course according to the guiding principles of the group – major themes in Chapter 6, 7, and 8. Here, I offer a third position in which EEd is seen as the means to liberate students, not in the sense of individual self-development, but as a collective effort by which responsibility is taught for how we both create and sustain values.

Not only has PACE provided me with many insights into the process of planning a summer school, it has also been a forum for sharing ideas and engaging in discussions about entrepreneurship. However, all the benefits that I gained from the group did not mean that it was easy; being part of a relatively large research project was also a source of immense frustration. Apart from the difficulty associated with studying entrepreneurs (explained in Chapter 3), I also had to determine how to contribute in my own way to the array of methods already being employed at the moment of my entry into the project. I entered as a qualitative researcher, but found that we already had an anthropologist doing pre- and post-interviews and making observations during the course. Then there was the constraint of the summer schools themselves. I initially suggested ways of going beyond them to better understand how participating in the summer school would affect students in the long term, but the prospect of getting

anything of significance from this convinced me to abandon the idea. Additionally, I got the strong sense that PACE wanted me to focus on the summer schools. This significantly limited my chance of doing fieldwork to two weeks each year for two years. At one point, I decided to follow another EEd course that we compare with PACE courses in one of the articles (see Chapter 7) since the two courses exhibited similarities in their key points but differed in other parameters, such as time and intensity.

While PACE provided me with a great opportunity and a wealth of resources, it also contributed to frustrations that have partly obstructed the development of this dissertation. Because of this, my contribution to PACE – which includes EEd – is one that attempts to provide a new approach to the field, and one that is actually in line with the principles on which PACE was founded. Although the principles were present, they were not communicated in their entirety to the students, who were the supposed benefactors. The dissertation is written in acknowledgement of the difficulty of the pedagogical venture that PACE attempted. This is also why I have ultimately suggested a more radical approach to thinking about EEd that is still in accordance with the democratic principles that are actually part of how PACE imagines EEd.

2.GETTING TO KNOW THE FIELD – A LITERATURE REVIEW

Until now, I have mentioned EEd[2] rather casually. In this chapter, I clarify how the term is understood and researched in a broader sense while simultaneously attempting to avoid redundancy with regard to the information that is already in the articles. As is customary, each article contains a review of some kind to contextualize its contribution. This chapter therefore serves as a short, general summary.

A SHORT OVERVIEW OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

Needless to say, EEd covers anything that concerns the education of entrepreneurs or students who might become entrepreneurs. Beneath this simplified understanding – which is by no means wrong – a more nuanced world is hidden that lacks a true unifying philosophy (Hannon, 2005; Middelton & Donnellon, 2014). Paul Hannon has argued that the lack of such a philosophy in EEd has been damaging to the field since an underlying philosophy partly determines the educational outcome and experience (Hannon, 2005). In other words, EEd – despite its growing popularity – is not founded on any commonly held principles or theories of how students are best educated in entrepreneurship. However, this has not stopped the supply of available entrepreneurship courses from growing. In 2003, Jerome Katz estimated that more than 2,200 courses were offered in colleges in the United States alone (Katz, 2003). This ties directly into current understandings of entrepreneurship as a skill or set of skills that can be taught (Mwasalwiba, 2010, p. 30) and is therefore not dependent on a special mindset, gene, or ability that cannot be acquired and must already be

---

[2] I do not distinguish entrepreneurship education from enterprise education, since the debate about what they each cover seems too murky and would require too much attention to clarify, robbing it of any productive contribution in this thesis (Gibb, 1993; Hannon, 2005, p. 247).

possessed (Nicolaou & Shane, 2009). This is an impression one would otherwise get from reading two of the giants in entrepreneurship literature: Joseph Schumpeter and Israel Kirzner. Additionally, Katz later estimated that EEd and training has a positive effect on the survival rate of start-ups; receiving a form of education could increase the likelihood of survival by 80% over a span of five years (Katz, 2007, p. 209). However, this correlation should not be taken as a fact, as it is notoriously difficult to determine causality across greater spans of time, and EEd cannot be established with certainty as the cause of the increased survival rate. So, despite the lack of a unified philosophy, there is a belief in the effect of EEd. Hannon has written that major programs share one common feature: they focus on new venture creation, with business plans playing a significant part in establishing real or simulated project-based activity (2005, p. 237).

One area in which courses differ is their treatment of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship can be understood as either an activity or an academic subject. The educational intents that follow vary depending on whether they are an education "about" or education "for" entrepreneurship (Levie, 1999). A 2012 paper has estimated that most entrepreneurship courses are still of the "about-type" since these are relatively easy to plan and offer (Pittaway & Edwards, 2012). There is also a third type, which is classified as learning "through." Along with "about" and "for" learning, "through" learning is one of the most commonly applied conceptualizations of EEd and is also the one to which my work with the PACE research group has exposed me. The philosophy of learning "through" is inspired by pragmatic pedagogical principles in opposition to the output of classical didactics, which academic programs often use (Mwasalwiba, 2010; Taatila, 2010). The "through" courses focus on the process and how it helps students develop and enhance entrepreneurial skills (Taatila, 2010), which can be achieved not only through venture creation, but also in other contexts with an embedded need for skills that are also applicable to entrepreneurial undertakings, as is the case in a educational setting. Research has indicated that it is the "through" type that has the greatest chance of evoking entrepreneurial behavior, but at the same time, they are the hardest to design, plan, and execute (Neck & Greene,

2011; Ollila & Middleton, 2013). This leaves us at a place where EEd continues to be thought about extensively, with many aspects still being clarified or challenged.

One example is the role of the individual in venture creation. In these times, we have no problem identifying "the entrepreneur." Bill Gates, Steve Jobs, Elon Musk, Mark Zuckerberg, and Richard Branson all vividly stand out as knowledgeable, social, effective, influential, talented, and hard-working people who have achieved success with grand business ventures. The usual discourse has fostered myths about such characters as special – an idea that has its roots in traditional academic views on entrepreneurship (Ogbor, 2000, p. 614 – 618). The tendency to glorify the individual has proven to be resilient despite studies indicating that most companies are actually started by teams (Brüderl & Preisendörfer, 1998; Klyver & Schøtt, 2011; Neergaard, 2005).

My own research group is an example of this active search for better ways of practicing EEd. A project like PACE that I have spent most of my efforts studying does not fit neatly into any single approach to EEd, but instead provides a mix of "about," "for," and "through" learning strategies along with a strong focus on getting individuals together in groups as a forum where they can further cultivate their ideas. Because of its theoretical foundation and emphasis on personal growth and development, it would most likely fall into what Gibb categorizes as the humanistic approach to education and learning (Gibb, 2002, p. 110). In the paper "A conflicted space" (see Chapter 8), we describe a feeling of surprise upon realizing that we (my co-author and supervisor, and myself) were among a group of teachers that seemed more psychological in their approach than even we, as psychologists, felt we were.

Next, I cover how neoliberalism ties to EEd. It is because of the neoliberal influence that I initially came to reject EEd. Yet, it is also a result of my objection to neoliberal agendas that I shifted my view and began to develop a phronetic approach to EEd as the means to formulate a meaningful rebellion against neoliberalism.

NEOLIBERALISM AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

In this section, I shortly elaborate on the connection between market ideologies and EEd. A similar theme is treated in Chapter 8, but I would like to give some space to two perspectives that corroborate the points that we make in Chapter 8. The aim in this section is not about establishing a link between the market and entrepreneurship, but rather an exploration of the meaning of this link when it becomes part of an educational setting in which it directly influences students. Neoliberalism easily becomes a truism in arguments against the direction of progress in society, but in regard to its influence of student subjectivities, I do see it as a noteworthy element (McNay, 2009). When analyzing EEd phonetically, it is nearly impossible to overlook. I understand neoliberalism to be the liberal economic rationality that has turned competition and competitiveness into an unquestioned social and economic good that also promotes finance-driven capitalism (Davies, 2014). Neoliberal ideas are prominent in EEd, which in itself is not particularly mysterious considering business ventures rely heavily on economic rationalities aimed at monetary gain. The reason it is interesting for me and for this dissertation is how this affects students and their self-understandings.

The first perspective that I will introduce is an account from Christina Scharff (2015), who has studied the contours of the entrepreneurial self among musicians, and the second is a recent Swedish study by Magnus Dahlstedt and Andreas Fejes (2017) on the shaping of the entrepreneurial citizen. Reading this work from both Scharff and Dahlstedt and Fejes makes it possible to see the contours of the entrepreneurial citizen, both in terms of how the people themselves experience it and how it has developed at the policy level. The musicians Scharff has interviewed come from London and Berlin and mirror the development described in Sweden by Dahlstedt and Fejes. Thus, it would not be unreasonable to assume that the influence of neoliberal discourse on citizen subjectivities applies to Westernized societies on a broader level since we see the same in Denmark with the example of PACE, in Finland (Korhonen, Komulainen & Räty, 2011), and across Europe (Kelly, 2006).

The entrepreneurial citizen who emerges can be described as follows:

> (…) a person who should focus on the self as a way to face constantly changing future, rather than as someone who should take responsibility for themselves and other in the name of solidarity (…) one who should capitalize on their learning in order to be responsible, creative problem-solvers. (Dahlstedt & Fejes, 2017, p. 12)

Through these means, they become employable and thus productive for society (ibid.) This mirrors how Scharff's participants talk about competing against themselves in order to become the best (and thus most employable) version of themselves (Scharff, 2015, p. 117). There is an ideal that they try to embody, but it prompts the question of the implications for those who cannot fulfill the ideal that is promoted throughout society.

Dahlstedt and Fejes have traced the emergence of the entrepreneurial self through curriculum texts from 1969, 1980, 1994, and 2011 that pertain to the public school of Sweden. They see the entrepreneurial self as subjugated by the liberal economic rationality that characterizes neoliberalism. What they are able to identify is a discursive shift that happened between 1980 and 1994 whereby a re-orientation of the values the school was supposed to promote had taken place:

> "(…) a shift of responsibility from the self and other in order to contribute to the development of society, to the responsibility for the self in order to adapt to the constantly changing future." (Dahlstedt & Fejes, 2017, p. 12)

It is interesting to note how both the 1969 and 1980 curricula mention democratic values and democratic principles. The outward gaze of solidarity oriented towards helpfulness and cooperation was dominating. The curriculum of 1969 also states that the purpose of the school is to "(…) induce respect for truth, for the self-worth of humans, the inviolability of human life, and thus the right for personal integrity" (ibid., p. 7). In contrast, Scharff presents the example of her research participant who referred to her own skin color as her unique selling point when comparing herself to other musicians (Scharff, 2015, p. 111f), which illustrates well how the entrepreneurial gaze is turned inwards, thus creating a discourse of people considering

themselves as businesses. As already noted, the same development is evident in the Swedish curriculum. Scharff's participants talk about themselves as being constantly active and searching for ways to optimize their time management. Rather than only watching television, that time can be used to knit as well (ibid, p. 112). They consider themselves responsible for their own happiness and try their best to stay positive, e.g. by framing a setback as an opportunity to learn rather than as a failure (ibid, p. 113). Yet, this also provokes feelings of anxiety and insecurity since they have to endure the pressure of surviving independently, which is understandable when a deregulated marked leads to precarious work conditions. This also makes them prone to covering up injuries and continuing to work through them (ibid). The worst sin one can commit in a neoliberal society is that of being idle.

In the article "A Conflicting Space," we question the neoliberal discourse instilled in students through their educational lives (be that musical or entrepreneurial), which Scharff elaborates on better than we do ourselves. We remain critical of entrepreneurial discourse, but at the same time consider how elements also present in EEd (such as the emancipatory, self-developing, and social responsibility) can be highly productive, and how EEd might pedagogically reveal novel ways to provide students with skills that are beneficial not in an entrepreneurial society, but in a democratic one. Entrepreneurial discourse yields the notion of the active citizen, but through entrepreneurship, this citizen is individualistic; he or she practices self-disciplines, takes control, and transforms to meet expectations (Brunila, 2012, p. 481). The rhetoric of the active citizen should be analyzed to determine what is meant by an active citizen and how exactly they are shaped into being (ibid), for us to then determine a path that can be ethically justified.

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Before proceeding to the next chapter, which accounts for the methodological considerations that arose during my research, I would like to make a brief note about the idea of social entrepreneurship since it would be an obvious sign of neglect if there was no mention of it at all in a dissertation about the values in EEd. The reason it does

not have a more prominent place in my work derives from two working assumptions. One is that PACE worked with entrepreneurship in a general sense and was not oriented toward its social counterpart. Next, it is a field that studies social enterprises as they have happened or are happening, whereas my project is more concerned with identifying a path toward a more democratic understanding of EEd. Social enterprises as they are defined in social entrepreneurship literature could easily be seen as representing part of the goal that a re-oriented EEd could promote (although I would remain skeptical about a complete privatization of social responsibility), but it has been important for me to understand how to arrive at this perspective in the first place. In this way, it is possible to talk differently about the educational effort focused on entrepreneurship.

The European Research Network has defined social entrepreneurship as "the creation of a social value that is produced in collaboration with people and organisations from the civil society who are engaged in social innovations that usually imply an economic activity" (Hulgård, 2010, p. 4). Economic activity should be understood in a broad sense. In view of the present economy, it would be impossible to be a social actor and not be economically minded. However, economy and monetary gain are not goals in themselves, but means to enabling action. Hulgård has noted about this definition that the inclusion of "civil society" is of utmost importance in order to separate social entrepreneurship and social enterprising from corporate social responsibility (CSR). Social enterprises move in the intersection of the public sector, the private sector, and civil society (Hulgård, 2010, p. 5), whereas CSR entails social activities instigated by actors from the commercial sector. That is to say, a social enterprise sprouts from civil society, and often they focus on helping vulnerable communities in cooperation with non-governmental organizations, cooperatives, voluntary associations, and community groups (ibid.). As Hulgård has argued, there are two sides when it comes to understanding social enterprise and social entrepreneurship. On one side is the similarities between the language used in social entrepreneurship and the trends of privatization and marketization. This is where my worry about the privatization of social responsibility factors in, as a means through which the state would allow its

responsibility towards its people to erode and leave the responsibility to us individually as private citizens. As Hulgård has mentioned, welfare researchers have voiced the same concern, particularly Niel Gilbert (2002). However, Hulgård has also reminded us of the other side of social enterprise: it can also be seen as a reaction to increased individualization, transforming the social enterprises into manifestations of collectivism and solidarity – cornerstones of democratic governance (Hulgård, 2010, p. 9). It has the potential to be both, and this is accompanied by its own set of problems that I do not address here. However, it highlights how discussions present in social entrepreneurship fields differ from the one that I am examining. Through a phronetic approach to EEd, I hope to inspire conversation and discussion about how to make EEd into a field that is more concerned with re-creating the second side rather than the first.

I would be making a poor point if I were to simply say that general EEd ought to be re-oriented more toward social entrepreneurship. While they are part of the same nomenclature, the two fields do differ, which is why EEd needs to be studied and treated on its own premise. Change has to come from the inside. One could almost be tempted to say this thesis is a work of intrapreneurial intent – almost. So, this section has conveyed that I have been aware of social entrepreneurship, but have intentionally avoided it.

In this part of the dissertation, I have provided an outline of the literature that is found within the academic field of EEd. I have demonstrated how there are various approaches to teaching entrepreneurship that are employed in the effort to create more entrepreneurs. In addition, I have provided two examples that link EEd to neoliberalism in order to support the claims we make in Chapter 8, which are mostly based on our own limited experience from PACE. These examples establish a stronger link between the neoliberal subjugation imposed on students and EEd that we problematize. Lastly, I have covered social entrepreneurship. Hopefully this has been sufficient to satisfy the curiosity of any reader who is pondering the lack of inclusion of social entrepreneurship.

In the next chapter, I explore the methodological dimensions of my research. It urges us to dwell a bit on the fickle nature of the entrepreneur and the challenge its figure has imposed on my dissertation. It also allows me to diverge somewhat from the strict form of presentation that usually characterizes method sections in journal papers and consider some points that are important, but were not able to be accommodated in the articles. Even though I study the education of entrepreneurs, I have not been exempted from dealing with the ontological question of who or what an entrepreneur is, nor the epistemological question that follows: how does one study what one cannot find?

3.LOCATING THE HEFFALUMP – METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES WHEN DEALING WITH ELUSIVE PHENOMENA

Heffalumps are fictional creatures primarily known from stories written by A.A. Milne about the lovable, philosophical bear, Winnie the Pooh. The Heffalump is

> (…) a rather large and important animal. He has been hunted by many individuals using various ingenious trapping devices, but no one so far has succeeded in capturing him. All who claim to have caught sight of him report that he is enormous, but they disagree on his particulars. (Kilby, 1971, p. 1)

This is how economist Peter Kilby described the Heffalump when using the creature as a metaphor for the entrepreneur in a 1971 paper. Joseph Schumpeter thoroughly described the importance of entrepreneurs for economic development – the development of wealth for the sake of well-being of a country's inhabitants – and viewed them as benefits to society (Schumpeter, 1934). They are reported on in such a manner that they seem like enormous creatures, or like more of a force than an actual person. Hereby, they resemble the Heffalump, which further extends to the entrepreneurs because of how elusive they are when it comes to studying them. In an effort to identify entrepreneurs, psychologists became involved in the Heffalump hunt in the middle of the 20th century. The most notable example is David McClelland, who published findings in 1963 (although the same study can be found in an earlier published book called *The Achieving Society* from 1961) that demonstrated a positive correlation between a person's Ach score (a score measuring one's need for achievement) and successful entrepreneurship in the following years (McClelland, 1963). Even with the grander theories of entrepreneurship and the beginning of psychology's intervention, it apparently was not sufficient to provide a clear picture of the Heffalump, according to Kilby.

McClelland's effort was the catalyst to psychologists' involvement in describing the personality of entrepreneur, as they would try to answer McClelland's question about whether entrepreneurial dispositions were pre-existing or adaptable (ibid, p. 390), but it was not until 1980 that David Hull, John Bosley, and Gerald Udell published another paper in which they called for a renewal of the hunt for the Heffalump. The new premise was inspired by McClelland and argued that identifying characteristics of the personality of the entrepreneur was a promising avenue for future research (Hull, Bosley & Udell, 1980). Since this has been a research focus for more than 40 years prior to 2007, one might be surprised to read the preface of a volume from that year titled *The Psychology of Entrepreneurship* that reads: *"(…) the psychological factors and relationships that play a role in successful entrepreneurship are not clear"* (Baum, Frese & Baron, 2007, p. xiii). The persistence certainly warrants admiration. William Gartner has published a now-seminal paper in entrepreneurship literature just nine years after Hull, Bosley, and Udell published theirs. In it, Gartner argues that the current search for psychological characteristics would amount to very little since the methods and tests employed allow the entrepreneur to be the cause of entrepreneurship, and would therefore offer little predictive value (Gartner, 1989, p. 48). Ian MacMillan and Jerome Katz have attempted to account for the elusive nature of the entrepreneur by identifying eight topics (among them: creative solution to obstacles, habitual entrepreneurs, business failures, and consistently entrepreneurial firms) that are difficult to study using traditional methods (case studies, large-scale surveys, or document analysis) since they are obscured viz. difficult to get access to (Macmillan & Katz, 1992, p. 1f). MacMillan and Katz have called for a more cohesive theory that is both informed and challenged by various methodological approaches, borrowing also from more practice-oriented fields that could provide a better comprehension of the micro-level of entrepreneurship. Both papers are examples of early warnings that were not heeded in a timely fashion, which can explain why we can read a sentence like the one cited above decades into the research.

This briefly summarizes the history prior to the beginning of my own research on EEd. Little did I know that I was supposed to study a phenomenon that no one has been

able to clearly capture, which also means that no one is really certain about the ontological status of the entrepreneur. I was unknowingly enrolling myself in a decade-long hunt for the Heffalump. More precisely, I was committing to study an effort to educate entrepreneurs – undisputedly a highly difficult task given the circumstanced I have just described. I might not study entrepreneurship in general, but I believe that the ontological uncertainty present in the field of entrepreneurship was a major cause of a great deal of methodological confusion in those first years when I tried to fully comprehend what I was supposed to study. Education is, after all, a process of becoming or coming into the world (Biesta, 2010, p. 105). My initial understanding was that the students were supposed to become entrepreneurs. If we are to study how something moves from A to B, it generally comes down to good reasoning to have an idea of what A and B are. Yet, being educated to become an entrepreneur does mean that one actually becomes an entrepreneur. Maybe it was not even the intention of PACE to educate for entrepreneurship as such to begin with, but still, given various condition, the summer schools appeared to do exactly that. This conundrum haunted me, and is probably the reason why I have had such difficulties grounding my own research.

I did not happen to encounter the Heffalump metaphor before I was well into my work. Retrospectively, it explains many of the struggles that I went through trying to determine a methodological approach – or an ingenious trapping device, if we are to stick with Kilby – that would allow me to understand more about how entrepreneurs come to be viz. how they are educated. While I was an "unknowing participant," I was still engaging in the hunt. Students are studying to become something new or improve in what they know; for that reason, it makes sense to try and understand not only the educational process, but also what the students want to become. In the final products (the articles) I have considered entrepreneurship and EEd in a completely different manner than I initially had for a long time as a doctoral student. I abandoned the hunt. I believe that there is a relevant advantage to be found in considering the difficulties I experienced in establishing a field of research. Although I ultimately did not shine a brighter light on the Heffalump, my initial research still became essential

for the shift into a more critical and phronetic approach. To an extent, I also unwittingly followed the recommendation of MacMillan and Katz (1992) to borrow methods from other fields when I turned to ANT in the second year of the summer schools. This was done in an attempt to see if the introduction of a new method, and consequently a new methodological gaze, would yield new insights into the learning process. I think it did provide that opportunity. In addition, ANT can also be seen as a more democratic method in view of its inclusiveness of objects. So, while the hunt was ultimately in vain, it brought with it some insights into the educational process that have been valuable in a different manner than originally intended by highlighting the parts that I rebel against in this thesis.

THE HEFFALUMP HUNT

While we might approach an investigation in a systematic manner, it does not make the world more systematic. Scientific investigations reveal part of the order that hides in this complex monstrosity that is our world (Urry, 2003). I have been particularly concerned about my own empirical data and its ability to order the world in the expected fashion – an anxiety I have adopted from some pre-conceived notion of what methods ought to do. In the beginning of my study, I had a clear sense of the object of my interest, the entrepreneur, but a less obvious understanding of how truly messy the field was and what I could possibly hope to achieve. My hope was to illuminate the process of becoming an entrepreneur by undergoing the process of becoming myself and writing about it phenomenologically. When deciding to undertake the study of a topic, we can hardly be faulted for not considering how serendipity has a considerable role in shaping the final outcome. In my own case, I probably would not call it serendipity since the obstacles and coincidences that made me re-evaluate my path often turned out to be inaccessibilities of some kind. The notion of serendipity is one that acknowledges that chance does influence qualitative discoveries. Some discoveries are stumbled upon in the research process when the researcher is carrying out planned interactions, but instead becomes aware of something interesting that had not been important, relevant, or even present beforehand (Fine & Deegan, 1996).

So, the field is messy. One might decide to perform interviews or observations, but the yield of these approaches can be unpredictable. We are so affected by the social representations we help create and keep alive (Moscovici, 19681) that we are often surprised when our ordinarily held beliefs are reified in the research process, even though at times it is ourselves that cause this reification. For this to happen, researchers must get their hands dirty. Human beings are decidedly unsystematic, so in order to study them, our methods need to be adaptable. What characterized my stumbling journey is not lucky breaks, but rather barriers. These have forced me to re-evaluate how to conduct the hunt for the Heffalump. This has happened on multiple occasions since my feeling has been that there was little to achieve by adding to the bulk of literature that has tried to shape our perception of the entrepreneur for decades. David McClelland, who took an interest in the personality of the entrepreneur, has noted a difference between the study of "*the behavior of entrepreneurs*" and "*entrepreneurial behavior*" (McClelland, 1961, p. 206). By this, McClelland means that if we are to study entrepreneurs, it would be beneficial to know which characteristics to seek beforehand. Concerning education, it would be relevant to add that it is necessary to know what one is *educating for.* The behavior of entrepreneurs is not necessarily entrepreneurial at all times; they might be passing the time on social media, drinking coffee, or reading a book, and so we must not mistake that behavior to be entrepreneurial when it really is not. Likewise, this should make us assess the kind of behavior we wish to promote through the education offered to students. In Chapter 8, I engage with this question more extensively by attempting to demonstrate how EEd is good for promoting not only economic values and behaviors, but also democratic ones. It is the intrinsic link between democracy and EEd (education in general (Biesta, 2010)) that led me to abandon the hunt and instead focus on our goals in PACE.

McClelland's research on the personality of entrepreneurs was the trigger for psychology's involvement in entrepreneurship research. Various images of the entrepreneur have been conjured only to be challenged, abandoned, or changed. For example, the consensus on risk-taking as an entrepreneurial trait is still unclear to me.

There is no prototypical entrepreneur; we are dealing with Heffalumps, after all. It has been more than 50 years since McClelland's original contribution, yet we seem just as far away from a true understanding of entrepreneurship as we were then. William B. Gartner has questioned if it is even possible to "know the dancer from the dance" (1988, p. 11). He answers his own question by writing that being an entrepreneur is not a fixed state of existence, but merely a position one takes in the process of launching a venture (ibid., p. 28). So, while I do agree with McClelland's point that one needs to be aware of what one is looking for, I have concluded that we have reached a level of complexity where it makes very little sense for yet another psychologist to add himself to the mix of voices trying to determine who the entrepreneur is. I have deemed it impossible for me to claim any mastery of a scientific field that no one has come close to mastering. Persistence can be an admirable trait, but I ultimately concluded that I could contribute only minimally compared to the work that has already been accomplished.

CHOOSING THE RIGHT TRAPPING DEVICE

I have often felt as though I am under obligation to produce a certain kind of narrative or knowledge about EEd, or a certain result, and in a certain way. My initial understanding of good research was mirrored in the scientific virtue that Aristotle called the "episteme," or the knowledge that is "[u]niversal, invariable, context-independent. Based on general analytical rationality" (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 57). If my eventual contribution is to be worth something, it must adhere to standards characterized by this virtue. Eventually, as recounted above, I arrived at the conclusion that I could contribute little to science defined as episteme. The opportunity afforded to me through PACE simply would not allow me to come closer to an ontological clarification of the entrepreneur. Maybe, I thought, the question was not about "what" or "whom," but "*why*." A "what" does precede the "why," as we need to know what is being taught in EEd, but asking "why" matters when it comes to making a decision about what to do with what we have learned from the investigation. Do we consider whether students become more or less entrepreneurial by participating? And compared to what factors? This is where the phronetic approach

enters. Compared to episteme, a phronetic approach does not strive for universality because the emphasis is rather on context-dependency and variability of what is studied. Framing my thesis through phronesis put it in a new perspective that allowed me to create a different purpose for this dissertation – the one explained in Chapter 1. In short, Flyvbjerg describes the central points of the virtue to be about ethics. It is a "[d]eliberation about values with reference to praxis" (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 57). Luckily, I had already embarked on a qualitative research journey that opened up the field in such a way that I could see on my own body how I was affected by participating in the course, and could subsequently observe other students go through the same experience. In an interview, Jean Lave and Steinar Kvale (1995) have discussed how it is only though our own existence as researchers that we are in possession of an instrument sufficiently complex to capture the details of human existence. In that sense, I never wavered in how I wished to conduct my project methodologically; it was always qualitative. My first inspiration was phenomenological, which would also have been in line with the overall framework of PACE and its theoretical basis in a phenomenological approach to teaching entrepreneurship. I wanted to convey the experience of becoming an entrepreneur from a first-hand perspective. In this way, I could forego the trouble of actually trapping a Heffalump by transforming myself into one instead.

A FAILED TRANSFORMATION CAN LEAD TO NEW INSIGHTS

In my introduction for Chapter 1, I describe the turning point at which I stopped my brief career (or attempt at a career) as an entrepreneur. Until that point, I had managed to convince myself that stepping into the shoes of an entrepreneur would be the best way forward. As I touched upon earlier, I entered PACE as a small node in a great system designed to study the entrepreneurship courses designed by the research group. So, while there is a horde of concerns related to the epistemological and ontological sides of the study of entrepreneurship, at least my field had been narrowed down for me. My research was supposed to be centered on the summer schools arranged by PACE. Yet, it was probably the presence of other, more experienced researchers

already performing most of the tasks I could imagine doing that made me consider extending the scope of my study beyond the summer schools.

The way I wanted to do this was by becoming an entrepreneur. It was not necessarily that I had to become an entrepreneur; all I had to do was to be a student and experience the course like any other student did. However, I had not considered the process this would lead to at a great length to begin with, and thus the realization that I would not succeed in my endeavor was felt quite deeply. In my head at the time, I had planned for it to continue for the better part of the years in which I was supposed to conduct my PhD. The point that Kvale and Lave have made is especially crucial to keep in mind here. One of my greatest flaws, and a major regret throughout my time as a doctoral student, is my lack of a systematic approach to studying my field (although this has generally been lacking in my life). Yet, I cannot help but agree with Jean Lave in her interview on anthropological research that the method in itself is not what is important:

> I think it is complete nonsense to say that we have a method. First of all I don't think that anyone should have a method. But in the sense that there are ''instruments'' that characterize the ''methods'' of different disciplines – sociological surveys, questionnaire methods, in psychology various kinds of tests and also experiments – there are some very specific technical ways of inquiring into the world. Anthropologists refuse to take those as proper ways to study human being. I think the most general view is that the only instrument that is sufficiently complex to comprehend and learn about human existence is another human. And so what you use is your own life and your own experience in the world. (Kvale & Lave, 1995, p. 220)

Being adept at structuring a study is part of the scientific craft, but that is not to say that no good can come from a more unstructured and eclectic study of a given phenomenon – maybe we can even call it a personal one. Much of the time I could have spent empirically studying the field I have instead spent coming to terms with my topic and figuring out how to approach it, understand it, and find my own position within it as a researcher – and not just any researcher, but one especially concerned with ethics, values, and the political responsibility of science. While I failed at becoming an entrepreneur, I left the course with profound insight that took me years

to process and put into words. However, these experiences were the seeds that made me approach EEd through a meaningful rebellion. Each article contributes in its own way to explaining various parts of the narrative that I would like to be present in EEd. Despite engaging properly with only the auto-ethnographic method during the first summer school, one aspect that stuck with me was its emphasis on storytelling. So, each article included in the dissertation represents different stories about EEd that ties into the greater narrative told in these first three chapters. It would be a stretch to call my dissertation as a whole an auto-ethnographic work, but it is an attempt to tell another story about EEd – a story full of possibilities (Jones, 2000). Stories can convey and overcome complex and existential struggles, as I have struggled in engaging with EEd and the field of entrepreneurship in general. Using one's story as the means to create disturbance, provoke thought, and encourage dialogue (ibid) goes hand in hand with the strengths of auto-ethnography and my approach of analyzing EEd through phronesis.

Of course, some critics who maintain a more realist conviction are still present, and I think their main points of critique are worth taking into consideration. The points can be summed up as follows: 1) there is a loss of clarity when the focus is on verisimilitude, as it becomes speculative theorizing, and 2) there is too much focus on the hidden and tacit parts of the world that are unknowable (Erickson, 2011). The critique emanates from researchers rejecting a tacit state of things no matter what they might be. Scientific studies should strive to "make clear" that which is "not clear." I am incredibly sympathetic to this and do think that it is entirely possible to become overwhelmingly post-modern and experimenting. Yet, I also understand the lure of dealing with the unknowable dimensions of our existence and the excitement of discovering unspeakable truths that seem inexpressible within the traditional academic form. Indeed, some phenomena are beyond difficult to describe clearly, which necessitate us being open to various approaches to the scientific. Thus, I have tried to strike a balance between the two. The title of this chapter indicates that there are some things that are difficult to verbalize. There is no unified likeness of the

entrepreneur to which educators strive to mold students. We are dealing with a mottled creature of which each course only grasps a part.

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL STANCE – OR LACK THEREOF

Performing research in which one self-identifies as a democrat or an anarchist is no different from how we are accustomed to science being conducted; we are simply used to seeing a different kind of label, such as cognitive scientist, post-modernist, ANT researcher, cultural psychologist, or empiricist. Every position excludes certain views and emphasizes others. However, I am none of those. I have employed ideas, methods, and intellectual tools from a variety of fields, but I am not a zealot of any discipline.

Take Chapter 6 as an example. The paper "Things that Do: Exploring the Material and Spatial Dimension of Entrepreneurship Education" draws inspiration from ANT. The entire paper is an empirical exploration of the entrepreneurial learning space viewed through the lens of ANT. It came about because my co-supervisor (Steffen the Elder) and I share a curiosity about what the method has to offer as well as what it would mean to view EEd through a lens centered much more on materialism. My own sense was that it actually yielded some exciting new ideas about the ephemeral quality of knowledge and learning. Knowledge can be certainly be acquired, but it can also be lost. If nothing is done to sustain what has been learned, it fades and remains a remnant of a memory until something (a certain situation, a specific need, or a request from friend) stirs it. At least, that is the hypothesis at which we arrived after conducting the research and analyzing our empirical cases. I should be stressed that my role in this paper was not that of the auto-ethnographer, but merely as an observer with ANT present in mind.

To me, one of the most appealing aspects of this methodological approach is its showdown with anthropocentric thinking. It has a specifically egalitarian goal all the way down to the ontological level, holding that any one thing – be it a human, a machine, or a coffee cup – should receive equal opportunity to be recognized as influential for understanding a given phenomenon. It is a methodology that practices

democracy in it epistemic approach. The coffee cup might not be of influence, but the point is rather to avoid making this assumption a priori. I am not championing materialism as such, but I sympathize with the inherent viewpoint that we should consider everything of potential interest when seeking to understand something, as we might be surprised by what we find. Our experience writing the paper was that we did notice aspects that we would not otherwise have considered beforehand, and these could be significant for increasing our understanding of the activity of the entrepreneurial classroom. For example, it was by using ANT that we became aware of the infrastructure and its crucial significance for structuring the learning space. Infrastructure is so basic that it is often forgotten from a research point of view. It is knowledge that people are well aware of elsewhere, but when it comes to teaching and research, it can quickly be overlooked, as much of the learning takes place more obviously through discourse. Actor-network theory has yielded great insights into how the learning space affects student learning and has provided valuable information about directing learning toward something that is understood not only as a transfer of information from one person to another, but also as something that has to be sustained through the environment. If not, the learning might fade.

I only relied on ANT in that one chapter. I employ critical perspectives in another, and personal experience and the auto-ethnographic reflections of my first year inform the article, but is not the method employed. In chapter 5 we have analyzed interviews rather than using observational data, as was the case for the ANT study. We did this in order to get a sense of how students think about themselves and others and whether there is a change after participating in the PACE course. The interviews were not conducted by myself but by a colleague, and all content was made available for the entire research group to study. My methods mirror the messy world in which we live. I cannot decide whether this messiness is good or bad. It is good in the sense that it has allowed me to be explorative and study any topic that seemed to be of interest. On the other hand, I am in overwhelming danger of being accused of superficiality and a lack of depth in my analysis, and not unfairly so. It is a trade-off. In retrospect, I wish

that I had been more systematic and consistent, but whether this would have yielded a more satisfying product in the end, I cannot say.

DESIGN AND APPLIED METHODS

To ensure that everything is in order and provide readers with a coherent overview, I briefly summarize the changes made to my original research design and the methods I have used to study EEd. This causes some redundancy among topics that have previously been covered and which are covered in the following chapters. Yet, it would be ill advised not to provide a systematic account of the process. In the following section, I review the development of the design for PACE and the methods employed before briefly discussing the second course (NVC) that I followed for a short period of time.

PACE

I was enrolled in PACE when the group had already decided upon an overall mixed methods research design involving pre- and post-questionnaires, interviews, and think-aloud protocols, with several researchers already attached to manage the studies. In between these comprehensive efforts, I had to design my own path – a daunting task for "just hired" new doctoral student. My ambition was to assume a longitudinal perspective. Since the students were already being studied extensively, I decided enroll in the PACE summer school and, by doing so, engage with the experience as an auto-ethnography, albeit one that continued beyond the course itself. While I had not considered the real potential of auto-ethnography until later in the process, it was a lucky choice that provided me with unique insights into the student process that have largely shaped this thesis. Auto-ethnography embraces the researcher as a subject through which we can understand scientific processes, which enables authors to identify problems that are otherwise shrouded from the scientific gaze (Ellis, Adams, Bochner, 2011, p. 280). The researcher's interpretation is part of a re-constructive process, which influences the author's sympathy and antipathy that are also shaped by the meaning-making tools available through the author's language and culture and

which provide the basis for values that are interwoven with the writing (Baarts, 2010, p. 154; Bruner, 1993, p. 38). During the first annual course, I attended 40 hours as a student. This amounts to only one week, as I was prevented from attending the final week of the course due to other academic obligations – through it really came down to poor planning on my part. During the week I participated, I kept a diary in addition to partaking in all student assignments. Although I was exempt from most research-related tasks, I was included in the first think-aloud protocol. When this failed due to a number of factors that have already been covered, I changed my focus for the next summer school.

Rather than assessing how students develop in the long term, I became curious about the conditions the learning environment provides and the constraints and opportunities this affords for students' learning abilities. A special interest was materiality. I sat through the second summer school to observe how students and teachers interacted with material reality. This entailed approximately 80 hours of observations, during which I recorded notes electronically in Microsoft's OneNote. The flexibility of this tool allowed me to write down what I saw while also having the ability to record reflections on what I was and how I interpreted it alongside it. I could also upload pictures directly to the document from my phone. I sat at attention during lectures and followed groups or persons around, sometimes chosen randomly and other times out of interest, as they engaged in assignments. The direct outcome can be seen in Chapter 6, but the experiences from this second annual summer school partly informed my general understanding of EEd and my interest in phronetics.

My focus on phronetics has developed slowly, both on the basis of my experiences researching the PACE summer schools as well as by becoming part of a team of researchers and EEd teachers, which made EEd part of my everyday life. This has provided me with many hours of reflection on my work, not only professionally, but also personally. This too has contributed to the end product of the dissertation.

NEW VENTURE CREATION

In the fall of 2014, I contacted some people who were organizing a cross-disciplinary semester open for students as part of their master's program (the research setting is described in more detail in Chapter 6). The research on the second course was less in depth compared to PACE because the placement of the course over the duration of a semester made it impossible to ensure a more dedicated presence, mostly due to teaching obligations on my part to which I had already committed myself. Contacting the organizers was a rather spontaneous idea that arose as I was becoming nervous about the PACE data being insufficient. I therefore hoped to compare the two courses. Data was generated in a systematic but unstructured manner, whereby I would attend classes, place myself in the classroom, and take notes on my computer. I also conducted an informal interview with the course teachers, which I recorded on my phone. Unfortunately, I lost the audio files before they were transcribed when I my phone went missing during a stay in the United States. I conducted another, more formal interview with one of the students – the only one from the NVC course who would talk to me afterward. Her words mirrored many of the frustrations I experienced myself as a student in an EEd course. Ultimately, I only used the data for Chapter 6, but it did add to my overall sense of EEd culture by providing context and perspective from the students' level.

LIMITATIONS

Considering the limitations of what I was able to do empirically – having only the summer school course once a year for two years along with another course I briefly attempted to follow – I think I would be overestimating myself if I were to only speak about topics of which I could be certain; the dissertation would have been much shorter in that case. Most of the thoughts herein are expressed on the basis of my experience of two EEd courses and engagement with the people connected to those. I believe that many of the points I criticize are pretty general in EEd with its neoliberal focus and economic orientation. Yet, as Chapter 2 indicates, there are also alternative ways of engaging with entrepreneurialism. One of the dangers I face is making

statements that are too broad, over-simplified, and over-generalized. However, that main point of orienting education toward democracy still stands. I might have misunderstood aspects of entrepreneurship too, but the field is vast and the opinions within it are varied. In addition, it is difficult to keep track of what someone says he or she is doing and whether it is also what is actually being done. It is like in PACE, where our noble ambitions did not match with the outcome of our courses. Undoubtedly, the same points can be debated with regard to how I construe entrepreneurship in general. My stance is incredibly pessimistic and skeptical toward the assertions of researchers in entrepreneurship – those who are "entrepreneurship positive." I have tried to counter this pessimism by remaining constructive in the articles about EEd and how it can be transformed from a business project into a democratic project by providing economic value to democratic value instead.

THE LESSONS OF DEALING WITH HEFFALUMPS

In this chapter, I have conveyed to readers the daunting sense of engaging with a field that has no real subject. It was necessary to dedicate some time to '*the entrepreneur*' in order to reveal the point from which all the trouble emanates. It should be of primary concern to anyone who wants to educate entrepreneurs to first determine what they are really educating for. As I illustrate, there are multiple shapes into which an entrepreneur can fit. I was stumped for a long time in trying to decide which topic to study in PACE. My conclusion was that there was no real united vision inherent in PACE, but rather competing perspectives, goals, wishes and understandings. Therefore, instead of studying entrepreneurs, I studied how entrepreneurs are taught – or what is happening to and around students when they are taught to be entrepreneurial. I abandoned *the* entrepreneur as my unit of analysis based on the fact that I was convinced that *the* entrepreneur would be impossible to study in an educational setting. It would not just be the entrepreneur who would be difficult to study, but the becoming of an entrepreneur also, which is what I originally wanted to study. We cannot know who is an entrepreneur before someone actually becomes one, which is what makes it difficult to study from a qualitative and phenomenological point of view. I am not saying that there are no entrepreneurs, only that there is no *the*

entrepreneur, as established by science (Ernø, 2013) that we can possibly hope to study in any way that makes sense for educational purposes. What we can do, and what I have done, is to study what is being done to educate entrepreneurs, but without any interest in whether the educational effort succeeds or not. That is what puzzled me about PACE in the beginning. It is a summer school that wants to make students more entrepreneurial, but it does not care whether they end up as entrepreneurs. It is not the intention, one of the teachers told me, to ensure the students attending the summer school become more entrepreneurial. It is like a maths teacher saying that he teaches kids maths, but does not care whether they learn to solve mathematical problems. It. Is. Weird. It may stem from the fact that PACE was a research project that wanted to see what happened to the students during the summer school, and not how they were affected later in life (which would be really hard to do, since it would be nigh-impossible to select relevant correlations in relation to the effect PACE might have had). Anyway, this does not answer the remaining question: if we are not interested in whether students steer down an entrepreneurial path or not, then why would we be interested in teaching students entrepreneurial skills and helping them unleash their entrepreneurial potential in the first place? This precisely goes to show how PACE is controlled by an instrumental rationality and lacks a clearly defined value rationale (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 62). This is exactly why a phronetic research project like this one is needed when it comes to EEd. The body needs a head to know where it is going.

When I claim that the entrepreneur is a Heffalump, it might be more precise to say that this conclusion stems from my objection to the unit of analysis, namely entrepreneurship education. The point I am making by comparing the entrepreneur to the Heffalump is that we are dealing with an amalgamation of different things we have studied that will never be found to reside in a single person (Gartner, 2007). I have earlier mentioned my master's dissertation, wherein I deal more thoroughly (albeit in Danish) with how psychology has contributed to enforcing this type of idealized version of the entrepreneur. It is also a very good reason to be suspicious and to rebel against EEd as it stands. If it does not care about bringing more entrepreneurs to the

world, then what does it do? What is its purpose? Its function? Its value? It is reflections of this type that have formed this thesis and are what I attempt to study. This, rather than the entrepreneur, is what became my unit of analysis. It is because of these peculiar conditions regarding the ontology and epistemology of EEd that I have managed to steer toward phronesis. When not already enrolled in either the dominating or competing discourses present, it is apparent from the outside how motley a field EEd is. Just take a look Shane and Venkataraman's journal article about the promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research, which dedicates about a quarter of a page to the question of why entrepreneurship should be studied (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000, p. 219). Both are very influential within the field of entrepreneurship, and their argument basically boils down to them saying that entrepreneurship is important to study simply because it is important. There is no consideration of why, in the sense of whether it actually makes the world better. Entrepreneurship is change, but do we really want change just for the sake of change? While it would seem obvious from the outside to ask, as I did to begin with, what the Heffalumpian entrepreneur or the entrepreneurial process 'looks' like (sure, it would be nice to know), I find the more pressing question, especially concerning the educational aspects, to be 'what do we want it to look like?'.

As an aside to the above discussion about the entrepreneur and what was really my unit of analysis, it has been interesting for me to slowly come to the realization that I may have made this whole process unnecessarily complex by essentially objecting to EEd as a valid unit of analysis. A stringent, in-depth focus on PACE and the making of the summer school could have been the basis for another thesis entirely, with the aim of providing an account of the construction of the PACE summer schools in order to understand the process better. This could reveal really interesting aspects of EEd (and still be in line with the phronetic approach). Methodologically, it would have resembled what I was originally doing better than what I ended up doing. I touch a bit upon similar aspects in Chapter 7, but I do not think I have truly managed to penetrate and represent in full the diverse ideologies struggling against one another in PACE along with all the other factors that played their part in the formation of the summer

schools. I believe that I lacked both the initial overview and, dare I say, the courage to engage in this type of research from the beginning, because my unit of analysis would then, effectively, have been the people who employed me. Why? Because so much of what goes on is embodied or mediated through people, which is why it would be easy to feel that the research goes against the preference of specific individuals. There is something very intimidating about portraying people you work with, especially as a junior researcher still trying to find his feet. What went wrong for me was that I wanted to please and do what was expected despite being told I should focus on my own interests, but for various reasons I was not convinced that this was really what they wanted me to do. There is power at play, of course. And while the ideal, and what was always expressed in PACE meetings, is to create a research environment where we meet as equals and colleagues, it takes more than words to establish such an environment. It may in fact be impossible, since seniority, experiences and position would continue to influence power relations, but at the very least something that more closely resembles the ideal can be reached, wherein junior researchers also feel safer expressing frustrations, which I was not very good at. It certainly did not help that I worked from Aalborg, whereas most of the PACE team had their daily routines in Aarhus, making it even harder to really become part of the research group

With this and the above chapters in mind, it is time to proceed to the next few chapters. In the past three chapters, I have sketched out the overarching connections between the articles that comprise the next five chapters, despite how fractured they might initially read. Sorting out and pinpointing these connections has proven to be especially difficult since I was responsible for gathering the strands of this dispersed exploration into EEd into an overarching framework. While each chapter has been written independently from the others, I believe it was worth the effort of struggling to verbalize that which binds them together. The greatest struggle has definitely been the personal one of actually saying what I want to say in this thesis on the basis of my experiences in EEd without letting myself be too greatly affected by expectations that I felt others had of my project.

4.Democracy and cultural psychology

Steffen Ernø, Aalborg University

Abstract

This paper discusses a theme touched upon in Robert Innis's article on cultural psychology and philosophy, namely how we, within cultural psychology, seem to be undecided about how best to provide value on a societal level. It is discussed how psychology has provided us with several valuable tools for examining and understanding our own existence, despite the fact that it is also a field that has seemed to be in one crisis after another since its inception. It is argued that cultural psychology is an intellectual technology that allows us to peek under the hood of society, which I argue is of utmost importance in today's society, where democratic ideals seem to be failing. Corporations, industries, and privileged individuals exercise increased control over political processes, having created obscure systems by which they operate. It is concluded that cultural psychology needs to find its role as a scientific discipline that contributes to making transparent the political, social, and interpersonal relations that define how our lives are shaped, if we want a discipline the provides value beyond the scientific realm.

END NOTE

Before heading into the next chapter, I want to add a comment on where the above paper left off. Since it has already been published, I cannot make any changes to its present format, but I would like to expound in more detail the implications of a re-evaluation of psychology – cultural psychology, specifically, in this case. It should be noted that the '[label] psychology' is unimportant in the grand scheme of things here, as the points I arrive at in the paper, and the ones I will discuss here, are applicable, and relevant, to the general practice of psychology as an academic discipline. I have had one reader tell me that he thought the case I make in the paper to be a bit poor – in the sense that it is flirting too closely with banality. Well, it is obviously not unique, but 'preaching' political responsibility in regard to how social science research is conducted needs to be reiterated if the idea is to gain a foothold in society's (and academia's) collective consciousness (speaking metaphorically, of course). Additionally, the paper represents how I have come to understand my own field, and it is the foundation I have used to construct my approach to EEd as it has come to be: a consideration of its democratic potential and how it can be expressed more clearly. By changing how one approaches psychology, we also change how we engage with any other field through psychology (EEd, in this case). All of that is what the next four chapters are about. In this end note, I firstly want to home in on psychology and address in more concrete terms the steps that can be taken for it to become a (more) democratic discipline, and secondly to sum up what this means for the practice of EEd.

The question of what it takes for psychology to become a more democratic discipline is what has preoccupied me the most, academically, ever since I began to distance myself from the topic of EEd as this thesis neared completion. As I see it, there is a two-pronged approach to developing new directions for psychology to take it on a path where democratic values come to the forefront of the discipline. For now, I have dubbed them the internal and external approaches to the democratic development of psychology as a scientific discipline. Neither is exclusive of the other, but they represent different foci and are therefore easier to keep separate for explanatory

purposes. Both approaches can be considered to be 'suggestions for further research' in continuation of this dissertation, but contextually they fit here better as opposed to saving them for the conclusion, where such considerations would normally be placed.

The internal approach to democratizing psychology will have to rely on methodological innovation: a fundamental reconsideration of how we approach our objects of study, which, in most cases, are other human beings. I shall limit myself to discussing only the qualitative branch of psychological research. Even though qualitative psychology covers both wide and very radical approaches to the conduct of research (interviews, think-aloud protocol, observations, video observation, ethnography, auto-ethnography), they all have in common that none of them challenges the privileged position of the researcher – who remains a gatekeeper of sorts. It is the role of the researcher to *conduct* the interview, to steer, direct and control it. The researcher decides what is interesting to describe and analyze in observation studies, and becomes the central figure in ethnographic studies through whom everything is filtered. In the end, it is also the researcher who publishes the results, often directed to his peers in the scientific realm in pay-walled journals (although open-access is increasingly becoming an outlet for publications). The researcher is, undeniably, a crucial part of any research project. And, as should be acknowledged, a lot is done to communicate new ideas and discoveries to the public. The public, in turn, shows interest when new and interesting discoveries are made or when scientific concepts are demonstrated in ways that either entertain or explain without the need for spending hours reading about the complicated explanations that no one without an explicit interest in science has the time for in their otherwise busy lives. Yet, this often allows those not familiar with scientific practices to ignore the grueling and really very boring hours of work that go into scientific discovery. Which is too bad if we consider the disconnect it implies. What I suggest, then, is that psychology, through its methods, should look for new ways to connect with the public to garner interest and initiate dialogue. We can look for inspiration in other fields of research, where so-called 'citizen science' projects have already been conducted. Citizen science is characterized, as Jack Stilgoe (2016) writes in the Guardian, by its involvement of

citizens as active participants rather than passive consumers of science. Numerous projects have already been launched and concluded. Some examples mentioned by Stilgoe (2016) are the Galaxy Zoo [3] and Big Garden Birdwatch, [4] which employ citizens to help classify, observe and analyze data. In this way, the research is made relevant to the citizen and hopefully sparks an interest in following the project and learning more about the topic they are helping to investigate. The European Citizen Science Association (2015) has summarized ten key principles that they believe underlie good practice in citizen science, and both projects mentioned here seem like good examples. While there might be some projects out there that do this that I do not know about, it should be safe to say that psychology does not seem to be very prolific when one looks into citizen science projects. That is for example the impression one is left with when looking at the overview catalogue of citizen science projects hosted by the magazine Scientific American. [5] Now, it seems odd that psychology has not yet explored a similar approach, since our interest is in 'the psyche', which, at least when defined in a phenomenological manner as lived experience, is something we all have equal access to. Why have we not found a method to exploit this productively, research-wise? I do not know the answer, but one might suspect that an aspect of it has to do with psychology's preoccupation with becoming a 'real science', and citizen science is criticized for being a gateway to bad science (conducted by amateurs that provide less qualified data) (Stilgoe, 2016). Of course, citizen science will not solve all the problems present in psychology today, but it is one way of democratizing it. It is a new leg in the scientific repertoire that psychologists should learn to master.

Of course, citizen science has its own set of inherent pitfalls and biases to be aware of, but that does not mean it can be that easily dismissed, especially when the benefits of bringing science close to the public are taken into consideration. An enlightened

---

[3] Link to the project website https://www.galaxyzoo.org

[4] Link to the project website https://www.rspb.org.uk/get-involved/activities/birdwatch

[5] Link to website https://www.scientificamerican.com/citizen-science/?page=1

public is a prerequisite for a healthy, democratic society, and psychology should do its bit to help this along. Another benefit is that the general practice of citizen science can help restore institutional trustworthiness by combating the alienation of science from society that the often-used 'ivory tower' metaphor shows to be a recognizable image – trust in institutions is also called for by Bruno Latour in the opening chapter of his 2013 book *An Enquiry into Modes of Existence,* effectively a pre-emptive appeal to what many institutions clamor for in these times where 'fake news' has been given a lot of attention. Psychology, too, needs to reclaim legitimacy, as I pointed out in the above paper, not by becoming populist, but through transparency and access. We need people to understand what we do and why we do it. To many, science is a black box that prints results that we can either marvel at or be sceptical of, precisely because they lack an understanding of the methods that science-makers adhere to. Mutual engagement between science and civic communities can potentially increase this understanding and provide more people with the tools that allow them understand published findings and why they are legitimate (or why they are not).

One possible criticism is that citizen science projects are new way of representing science that in reality serves a neoliberal agenda. The citizens pay for universities and research time (at least, that is the case in Denmark) and therefore deserve to get something back. Science is a commodity invested in by society and, as with any investment, a return is expected, and that is what citizen science projects provide – effectively construing it as a sort of neoliberal pandering to the public. It is something that needs to be recognized. As I have argued, it is not about having researchers compromise on their research, but to the extent possible having them open the doors to the ivory tower.

What a psychological citizen science project would look like, I cannot say, but I do hope that this has clarified how I would like to see psychology develop in the future. The second prong – the external approach to democratizing psychology – is based not on methodological developments, but on choice of research projects. The field of psychology contains tremendous knowledge about communication, organization,

management, group interaction, cognitive biases and heuristics that can all be put to good use when it comes to experimenting with the political dimensions of life. Psychology, for example, has engaged a good deal with the parts of human life that relate to work. One can look at work by either Edgar H. Schein or Kurt Lewin to see how influential psychological ways of understanding work and organization have been, paving the way for I/O psychology as a major field with many trained psychologists also acting as consultants to small and large corporations. So, why not expand from work to politics, or vita activa, too? Projects where psychology can explore new ways to live and act together in a rapidly changing world. This happens to be my focus in Chapter 8, where I argue that EEd is in possession of educational tools that can be used for democratic education rather than business education, but of course the scope can be much wider, e.g. by engaging directly with new initiatives on democratic deliberation.[6]

So, to sum up, psychology needs to develop new ways of engaging democratically in its approach to research, with the two prongs outlined above being two examples of how this can be achieved. This is relevant to the study of EEd in the sense that it will also allow for psychology to approach EEd and entrepreneurship research according to new values (as this dissertation attempts to do). It was important for me to include a democratic perspective on psychology in the dissertation, because it is the basis for thinking diffractively (Haraway, 1997: p. 273) about EEd.

---

[6] Many previous and current projects can be found through www.participedia.net

5. FROM 'I' TO 'WE': COLLABORATION IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION AND LEARNING

Jan Warhuus, Aarhus University

Lene Tanggaard, Aalborg University

Sarah Robinson, Aarhus University

Steffen Ernø, Aalborg University

Abstract

Purpose*: The purpose of this paper is to ask: what effect does moving from individual to collective understandings of the entrepreneur in enterprising education have on the student's learning? And given this shift in understanding, is there a need for a new paradigm in entrepreneurship learning?*

Design/methodology/approach: *This paper draws on ethnographic data from entrepreneurship education (EEd) at a summer school in Denmark. The purpose of the summer school was to bring the students from an awareness of their own competences to a shared understanding of resources, relationships and opportunities for becoming enterprising.*

Findings*: Drawing on the recent developments in understanding creativity, the authors' explore the potential for similarities between becoming an entrepreneur in collaboration with others and being creative in collaboration with others. The authors' found that a focus on the collaborative and distributed character of entrepreneurship, as within the We-paradigm from creativity, does not exclude the importance of perceptions of individuals' self-images as part of a course in entrepreneurship. Yet, a reformulation of these could be an entry point for richer group work and articulation of diverse group potential.*

Research limitations/implications: *This study suggests that it is possible to take at least one step further in what can be achieved during an EEd course. Rather than remain a focus on individual learning and treating group work a didactics instrument, team formation processes can be used as a pedagogy/andragogy experiential tool in the classroom with its own learning outcomes, as presented and discussed above. For educators, this means that they have an additional tool to aid the complicated task of bringing EEd to students across campus. For students, this new approach means that the often dreaded and frustrating process of classroom team formation can become a positive experience of purposeful team assembly and collaboration. Two possible limitations regarding the findings of this paper can be identified: for students with extensive experience in forming teams and working in groups, taking them through this process may not have the desired effect as they may rely on habits and known mechanism without much reflection; it may be difficult to achieve the desired effect with students that know each other well before the course starts, as they may have too strong hidden agendas about who they want to work with and who they do not want to work with that this will over-power the idea/opportunity/subject-matter driven approach (Aldrich and Kim, 2007). Educators should consider if they may be subject to these limitations as this may have an effect on the use of active, opportunity-driven team formation in practise. To counter the second limitation, educators may want to consider how far into a course they want to facilitate the team formation; especially for courses running over significantly longer periods than two weeks. Future research may be able to assess the significance of these limitations.*

Practical implications: *This paper explores how students experience and handle a shift from an individual to a collaborative understanding of entrepreneurship imposed on them by the novel and unique design of a course that explicitly incorporates the team formation process into the curriculum. This is undertaken to gauge the extent to which students experience this shift as fitting the actual and perceived need for shared practices in developing enterprising behaviour, and to shed light on what action/process-based EEd courses may benefit from actively including a team formation process in the course design.*

Social implications: EEd may be offered for a number of reasons. New enterprises are seen as a potential source of economic wealth and for the student, this type of education offers the possibility of using their knowledge in new ways, becoming entrepreneurs or intrapreneurs. Also, from the perspective of both the higher education institution and the student, in the fast changing world in which we live, the digital mobility and multiplicity of work environments requires a workforce that possesses a range of individual competences. Such as being persistent, engaged and having good ideas, competences that are difficult to teach and hard to learn. Adding to our knowledge of how to handle these concerns, the paper points at a number of social implications of EEd.

Originality/value: The research conducted in this research paper contributes to the field of EEd by exemplifying how conceptual understandings of entrepreneurship as a collective enterprise, rather than an individual one, impact students' understanding and experience of entrepreneurship. Furthermore, it provides a foundation for expanding research aimed at providing students with a learning experience more in line with the everyday life of an entrepreneur.

6. THINGS THAT DO: EXPLORING THE MATERIAL AND SPATIAL DIMENSIONS OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

Steffen Ernø, Aalborg University

Steffen Korsgaard, Aarhus University

Wes Shumar, Drexel University

In this paper, we focus on a hitherto overlooked aspect of entrepreneurship education, namely the influence of materiality and spatial context on the process of teaching and learning. We present an empirical examination oriented toward the material and spatial dimensions of entrepreneurship education. Our theoretical and methodological approach builds on actor-network theory. Data was collected through participant observation and the analysis focuses on micro-level practices. Our findings demonstrate the agency of material artefacts and how they enable teachers to act at a distance by standing in as a scaffold that maintains the learning space as it interacts with the students. This acting at a distance, however, is highly uncertain and uncontrollable. Also, we recognize the importance of the infrastructure of the learning environment and argue that establishing a good, functional infrastructure reduces resistance to enabling positive learning experiences.

7.A CONFLICTED SPACE: THE ENTANGLEMENT OF INTEREST IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

Steffen Ernø, Aalborg University

Lene Tanggaard, Aalborg University

Abstract:

This paper presents an ethnographic approach to entrepreneurship education. We draw upon personal experience of working as researchers and participants on an international summer school in entrepreneurship. This allows for a look behind the scenes of the construction of an educational programme. The empirical material was collected through ethnographic explorations during the first few years of the programme. This paper shows how students undergo a twofold process of both objectification and subjectification. Students are told two stories simultaneously: one about emancipation and the possibility of doing good for society, and another about how to capitalise financially on their ideas. The objectification takes place through an implicit understanding that draws a line between the successful students and the unsuccessful ones. The consequence of these processes of subjectification and objectification could impact students negatively in the long term. Pragmatically, there is a strong argument for doubting that EEd, in its current form, would work as the primary focus for education in the future, as it is often construed to be.

8.EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY

Steffen Ernø, Aalborg University

9.CONCLUSIONS

There are a few things to note as an introduction to this final chapter There is no singular conclusion, but several, hence the use of the plural in the title. Nor is this an end. My thesis is a beginning – a phronetic exploration of EEd in a university context that requires further development if it is truly to flourish. What this really means is that, while empirically founded, this thesis also very much points towards future research on EEd practices and the need to establish a real alternative to EEd in its current form. Bringing a real alternative to life is its own project. What I have done here is to contemplate whether and why we should even consider alternative ways of practicing EEd. Of course, this chapter marks the end of my dissertation, so I will wrap up what has been accomplished so far in the process of developing a phronetic approach to EEd. I started the first chapter by introducing the reader to a research question that I had arrived at myself only very late in the process of working on my project. The question expresses the interest of the present dissertation, but it should be acknowledged that the original interest was to understand how one becomes an entrepreneur, at first by studying the educational environment addressing this potential becoming in a university context, which then later developed into the idea that I should use my participation in the PACE summer school as a stepping stone to becoming an entrepreneur myself. It is an invitation to explore alongside with me how I have come to regard EEd during the research process. The problem statement became central to my investigation, because it is the question I arrived at after a great deal of thinking about EEd and how to engage with the field in a meaningful way. It was not the original intention to explore this question, but all my empirical and theoretical work at the point where I began to organize my papers and thought into a thesis had led me to that exact question. In this context, it would be sensible to re-state that question so that we can consider how it has been answered in the seven chapters that followed it.

How can entrepreneurship education be re-oriented as a democratic discipline when considered phronetically?

It seemed central to focus the thesis around this question, because it asks how EEd can be done differently, and it is therefore able to encompass both the considerations that led up to asking the question, and the answers that will have to follow it. These can be given through two main points that also sum up the overall ideas presented in the dissertation. First, that there is a democratic potential in EEd not yet realized; second, for EEd to have a more widespread effect on everyday life, as opposed to only on business; and last, that our concept of learning needs to be expanded beyond what goes on as part of the constructed learning environment that both PACE and NVC represent. If what is taught is to become a part of the students' pattern of repeated performances, they need to become part of something (a group, club, network) that extends beyond either PACE or NVC and that will sustain the process of acquiring what we can call either a new habitus/identity/set of performative skills, depending on your theoretical preference.

We come closest to an answer to the research question in the last paper, where the question of the democratic potential of EEd is explicitly addressed. The preceding chapters help identify democratic aspects of EEd that allow for a final explicit consideration of it as a democratic discipline. Additionally, it is worthwhile to revisit the different perspectives of what we can label as my horizontal exploration of EEd – both methodologically, as they are presented in the papers, and as they ultimately relate to one another. By tying together the points from the various chapters, I hope to give the reader a clearer picture of how everything connects together. Hopefully, it will also increase the project's transparency when I recount the process of how the papers came into being.

A HORIZONTAL APPROACH

The dissertation reflects, as it stands, how my research was for a long while conducted without a clear research question in mind. This has resulted in a horizontal exploration of EEd rather than a vertical (top-down) approach, where an interest is defined and then explored fully and in depth. My initial interest in EEd was to shed light on the bridge, if any existed, between education for (about, through) entrepreneurship and its

practice. Achieving this understanding was important in order to hunt down the elusive entrepreneur. What I hoped for was to find out how one becomes an entrepreneur (figuratively saying that I wanted 'to get under the skin of the entrepreneur' might be a bit macabre in light of the hunting metaphor I have just used). This did not work out, which left me in a position where I had to re-orient what I wanted to pursue going forward in the PhD process. I could have stuck with the ethnographic approach to EEd by making a shift towards describing what attending an entrepreneurship course is like. I considered this, but ultimately felt that what I had access to, empirically, would make for an uninteresting contribution, since the PACE course was limited to two weeks per year, and plenty of my colleagues were already working on aspects that directly related to it. As a junior researcher without much prior experience in EEd as an academic field, I was in a difficult position to come up with a new and meaningful approach within that framework. Looking back, I see that I probably did undermine my own position. But I believe that the feelings I was experiencing at that time were quite natural. By working alongside more experienced researchers, it was easy to get the feeling that they had already 'been there and done that'. Knowing what I know today, I would probably have approached things differently and contributed where it made more sense to make a contribution, but, alas, things turned out differently. While the journey might have been more frustrating, I do believe I ended up in a place where I'm more confident about what my next step will be.

While I tried to find a new angle, things, as they have a habit of doing, continued happening: I got involved with the NVC course because I wanted to seek new inspiration and bolster my project empirically, since I felt it was a weak point that was holding me back, and then the second PACE summer school was completed. I had several ideas for potential ways that could help bring some structure to my thesis. It was around this time that we began working on the article about students' perception of entrepreneurship as either an I-activity or a We-activity, and whether the PACE course helped them move towards a collective understanding, which we were able to see a hint of through analysis of pre- and post-interviews with students. Another

method/theory I tested was ANT, which turned out to be a productive detour since it resulted in a chapter for the thesis. An in-depth ANT study of EEd would require much more planning, forethought and empirical freedom than circumstances allowed for. How I approached the second summer school methodologically distinguished itself vastly from the first year, where I had participated alongside the students. This time, I disengaged a bit more and sat back to observe, occasionally engaging with students to ask questions, but mostly I wanted to see how both teachers and students interacted with the things around them. Engaging with ANT even for a short period yielded really interesting and relevant insights that immensely affected my understanding of EEd. I came to see how closely learning is tied to performativity. To instigate change in subjects, which is what learning is - changes in how we think, perceive, act, move and do – we need them to engage in a sustained performance that can slowly be incorporated by the individual into their everyday life beyond the initial learning space where new, potential identities are introduced to the students for them to 'try on'. This is what I later describe from my own point of view in Chapter 8, where I write how I acquired an entrepreneurial gaze after my participation in the summer school. Something that I felt was affecting how I came to think about the world around me in a manner that was different from how I ordinarily would see it. I was not able to hold on to this gaze upon the world that I had developed over the course of a week; it slowly faded. This personal experience later informed my understanding of what I saw when I looked at EEd through the lens of ANT. I came to understand the importance of establishing environments in a socio-material sense that can aid in sustaining and maintaining these newfound ways of thinking about the world and oneself to ensure a sort of internalization takes place.

Something I did not realize at the time was that, by focusing on ANT, I continued in the vein of trying to understand and construe my field of research as conducive to collective thinking, although it should be noted that ANT is more radical in what can, and should, be included in the 'we' that is discussed in Chapter 5. Nonetheless, there was a common thread to connect the two, though I had not noticed it myself at this point. I think my breakthrough came when I got the chance to write something

completely different when I was invited to contribute to a special issue on the role of cultural psychology. This was a bit of an awakening. For the first time, I clearly put into words what I wanted regarding how research is conducted. While the paper that is Chapter 4 stands out, since it does not relate directly to EEd, it was a pivotal moment for my whole way of thinking about EEd, which is why I have chosen to include it in the dissertation. After writing that very article, I was able to see my previous work in a new light and finally begin the work of constructing a more coherent approach to EEd. Not coherent in the sense of a vertical, top-down way of considering EEd, but more in the sense that I now had an underlying framework based on certain values borrowed from democratic and anarchist value systems. In parallel to this, my supervisor and I were working a critical paper that aimed to consider the potential negative impact of entrepreneurial discourses on students. It is based both on our own experiences and on analysis of the ways of being encouraged by entrepreneurial discourse. We wanted to voice a concern about potential effects on students' psychological well-being in a culture increasingly permeated by entrepreneurialism as a necessary way of life if one wants to succeed. Entrepreneurialism fits perfectly into the individualized, competitive consumer society that has been so widely described in academic literature (examples being Giddens (1991), Beck & Beck-Gernsheim (2002) and Baudrillard (2017)). This, of course, runs directly counter to our attempts at seeing EEd in a collective light, which is why we saw it as necessary to bolster a critical narrative to help us think about the conflicting interests that are all present in EEd, as we had seen it. Now, this critical look at EEd and entrepreneurship discourse is deconstructing, and does not offer much about the future potential of EEd. It is always easier to be critical and point out problems; it is vastly more difficult to offer constructive criticism. This is what I wanted to achieve with the last of the papers, where I explicitly reflect upon the most promising aspects of EEd regarding how it might be used to influence society in a direction that builds towards a more democratic way of living. If we are able to recognize unwanted consequences brought about by a certain way of acting upon the world, we also enable ourselves to think about what it is that we want in place of current practices.

We should now be at a point where the reader, through my summarized process description, possesses key insights into the formation of the dissertation and its horizontal approach to studying EEd. That it ended up in this way was not because of careful planning, but rather out of necessity, and arose organically (although the author grew very frustrated with how long it took him to develop a semblance of coherence). The sudden lack of structure that I experienced as my original plan crumbled was what allowed me to develop the phronetic approach to EEd (viz. an exploration of the values that are guiding and the ones that ought to guide) that attempts to construe a set of democratically inspired values through which EEd can be practiced as something new and different. What I regret the most is that it was very late in the process of writing my thesis that I arrived at this point. While I cannot undo things now, I would have liked this idea about what EEd can be to have been formed earlier, so that this thesis could have gone into greater depth trying to establish concrete educational interventions that would follow the system of values I have sketched out so far. For now, this has mostly been a hypothetical reflection on what EEd can be, but that is not without worth, since it paves the way going forward, and serves, I believe, as a valuable counterpoint to the growing entrepreneurship discourse. Additionally, my eclectic use of various theoretical paradigms that I freely jump between will probably seem superficial, especially if one is well read in a certain theoretical area. Naturally, employing a broad and motley scope leaves things out, but my intention, at least at this point, is not to make a fully-fledged analysis from the point of view of one particular camp. My meaning was to apply different tools (theories) to my data and experiences to see how they might help us think about the field in new ways. Chapters are empirically or experientially founded, and while this might lead to a hypothetical consideration rather than a concrete change in practice in the here and now, it serves as inspiration and represents a significant and new contribution on how EEd, and maybe even entrepreneurialism in general, is approached and thought about.

VALIDITY AND THE PHRONETIC APPROACH

In light of the above, it is relevant to consider what this says about the validity of the thesis. An obvious objection could be made about relatively limited scope of the empirical material and whether it even represents EEd on a general level. Since it is a qualitative project, data volume and the ability to generalize are not the criteria that determine the validity of the research on their own. Yet, one aspect of relevance is how well my description of EEd resonates with practitioners and researchers from the field; however, this is something that we can cover only retroactively once the text gets an audience that reads it and relates to it. Besides, this speaks only to the validity of how I have represented EEd, and not to the points extracted from the descriptions and experiences. I do not expect everyone to nod in agreement with my perspective on EEd, but the merit of my argument lies in how my experiences are applied and reported – not as facts, but as a reason to think differently about EEd and to question established structures and the hegemonic discourse. The observations reported may not be representative of EEd as a whole, but many of the thoughts and reflections that these have led me, and in some cases my colleagues, to make extend the empirical reality into a greater frame wherein EEd is looked upon in an ethical context where its contribution to society is taken under consideration. In terms of phronesis, Flyvbjerg writes that:

> '[…] the primary purpose of phronetic social science is not to develop theory (though it may be done), but to contribute to society's practical rationality in elucidating where we are, where we want to go, and what is desirable according to diverse sets of values and interests. The goal of the phronetic approach is to add to society's capacity for value-rational deliberation and action' (Flyvbjerg, 2016).

Both on the ground of being a phronetic project, but also as a qualitative one, the validity of this project should be judged on its ability to raise questions and spark debates about the direction of our educational system, which is increasingly influenced by entrepreneurial discourses, which gives an indication of the integrity and authenticity of the research that some have suggested as criteria for validity that

a qualitative study should be judged on (Whittemore, Chase & Mandle, 2001). What this dissertation does, is to raise a flag to make us think about what the potential consequences of EEd could be. Something that is given very little attention in the literature. As I stated in the first chapter, this is a phronetic research project that has sought to uncover answers to four sub-questions in addition to the problem statement that bears repetition here at the end: 1) Where are we going? 2) Who gains and who loses? 3) Is this development desirable? 4) What, if anything, should we do about it? Now, the problem statement reveals that I had already arrived at part of the conclusion when I began writing this thesis, since it relies on certain answers to the above questions, but nonetheless we shall go through them to see what answers can be given. The impression given in the present dissertation of EEd is one that sees it as marked by different and conflicting discourses. Strongest is the underlying value rationale of neoliberalism and individualism. Despite the presence of the competing discourse of emancipation, very present among the teaching and research staff in PACE, it is clearly undermined by the ubiquitous economic rationality that exist not only in the course, but also in the collective imagination that stretches far beyond the course and academic departments around the world. While PACE does move students towards a collective mindset, it does not do away with the dreams of making it big and using entrepreneurship as the means though which money, power and freedom can be attained. Something many students bring with them from the beginning, and both PACE and NVC cannot help but speak to these discourses. As I have argued here, I think of this path as highly undesirable. The losers are those who have to live in a society where they cannot live up to the ideal – I am, in this respect, among those who can be found in this group. We are here talking about resourceful people with the means and capacity to attend university-level education who become embroiled in a discourse that makes them distrustful of their own abilities and worth, since they get to experience being a failure when it comes to entrepreneurialism, because so much is still focused on venture creation, and the neoliberal entrepreneurship discourse is spread out to more and more sectors making it unavoidable, meaning that these people will experience a sustained negative impression of themselves (if they do not succeed in turning it around or escape it in some other manner). The winners are of course

those who manage to thrive under the entrepreneurial paradigm. One can speculate about the political gains at state level, which would very much be in the spirit of the critical perspectives that I have introduced so far, but I have had nothing empirically to support any sort of conclusion in this regard. Regardless, as I have addressed in the papers, this development is not desirable, especially when considering alternative perspectives on education and how these can influence EEd and its value rationale. The alternative is to broaden EEd, as I have pointed out many times. The educational practices I witnessed are ones that could find very beneficial and general applications if removed from the hard-core business focus. Something that PACE actually tried to navigate through, but while I was told that venture creation was not a necessary prerequisite for being an entrepreneur, it was difficult to see the presence of this sentiment as the course was being taught. So, I do think alternatives should be pursued. In this thesis, I have argued for a more democratic approach to EEd and what it can accomplish. It is in the previous chapter that I offer my best analysis of what EEd possesses that makes it an attractive candidate able to help us develop the basis for a strong civic education system that can lead towards a more democratic way of life that can be developed, applied and sustained. Below, I will go through the three main points that I arrived at. What I hope to have accomplished in this section is to underline how this project is phronetic by answering the questions that are the foundation of any phronetic research project (all dimensions that have been explored in the present thesis) and the question of validity.

Next, I will go through the main findings that have come out of this research project. It is these findings that lead to an answer to the problem statement about how EEd can be re-oriented as a democratic discipline.

LEARNING NEEDS TO BE SUSTAINED

In an EEd setting, students are provided with a unique opportunity to play around with their identities. This happens both in terms of how they view themselves and how those who surround them view them. An entire learning space is created that is designed specifically to allow them to engage with the world in a new way. This is

sustained by a host of people, institutions and things. As was the case with PACE, it is no wonder that it was possible to see students engage with entrepreneurialism, as everything was affording them the opportunity to do so. The fault – not just in EEd, but in education in general – lies in assuming that learning that goes on in these highly specialized environments is internalized to such a degree that it can continue to thrive even when students are no longer part of it. If we want to provide students with the opportunity to become something different from what they are today, we should focus on expanding the infrastructure of learning environments beyond the classroom. The same is true for a re-oriented EEd that is construed more as a civic education setting. A democratic environment requires that people internalize the values that accompany it and necessitates structures that can make it even easier to get involved. For EEd in its current state, however, that would entail focusing on promoting student involvement in independent initiatives through which they can become part of communities that welcome them and sustain an ongoing process of becoming and development.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION HAS A DARK SIDE

The realization that EEd has a negative side was a necessary one to arrive at before the research question could be formulated, since it was what provided me with a reason to consider alternatives to EEd in its present form. Luckily, this dissertation seeks to provide only an illusion of linearity, though I fully acknowledge that it is impossible to provide a linear account of my research project. Thus, while it was necessary to realize this before I even began to write the thesis in its current state, it is also a necessary part of the answer to why we should even want to re-orient EEd in the first place. The ubiquity of entrepreneurship has become more and more obvious: we all have to be entrepreneurial at work, in our lives and for ourselves. We are told to disrupt and innovate. What is wrong with being here to participate? Surely, this is not a non-zero-sum game in which everybody can be winners? Innovation requires stability and an existing system that it can change. If everyone is disrupting

everything, we will soon run out of potential for disruptions. The main point is not that it is an unrealistic ambition, but rather that the presence of the entrepreneurial vortex sucks in people who, for many different reasons, are unfit to become entrepreneurs. Those people should not be made into losers for that reason, or into those who could not keep up or who were not strong enough or good enough. That is what we create with a society in which entrepreneurs are increasingly made into heroes and idols whom everyone else ought to emulate. This is a harmful consequence that could be expected to follow in the wake of the entrepreneurship wave currently in motion. Therefore, we need to re-calibrate. It is all well and good that we have entrepreneurs, but not every person needs to become one in order to contribute meaningfully to society. Here, our primary concern should be getting people involved as citizens in democratic societies, which requires all of us to assume part of the responsibility for the well-being of others – a sentiment we also find in entrepreneurialism, albeit warped by the many competing discourses, narratives and interests present within the field.

REDEEMING QUALITIES AND A DEMOCRATIC POTENTIAL

The experiences I have had with EEd have revealed not only aspects that we should be wary about, but also some that are inspiring. While not an exclusive trait, EEd does have a strong focus on enrolling students in practice. While the narratives present are muddled together, it is not all about increasing personal wealth and creating economic value. Values are discussed as having a much broader definition that also dictates that innovation should happen because it improves people's lives. In Chapter 5, we illustrated how students who had participated in the PACE course displayed an increasing tendency to think collectively in the sense of 'we' after completing the course. It was, however, a particularly explicit part of PACE's theoretical background to see the entrepreneurial way of being in the world in connection with living democratically. Yet, while the tendency toward democratic thinking is evident in PACE, it does not extend to the rest of the courses that provide EEd. For this reason, and also because PACE itself did emphasize venture creation as an essential part of EEd and entrepreneurialism despite attempting to diversify the notion of it, it is

necessary to state that EEd does need to be reformed in regard to its values if we are to avoid the negative consequences mentioned above and if it is to reach its democratic potential identified through the phronetic perspective applied in this dissertation. By focusing more on democratic involvement and how each of us can contribute, we also avoid separating students – and eventually people in general – into winners and losers. Democratic involvement does not mean everyone should be up for election. Through our everyday lives, there are many options, not all of which are apparent to us, but which we could choose in order to improve our local or global communities in one way or another. This is where the practical and intellectual tools in EEd are relevant.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

First and foremost, I regret that I did not manage to develop a conceptual prototype for a democratically oriented approach to EEd. In this project, I have managed to sketch the potential of what we already have and assess how it can be understood from a democratic (and anarchistic) perspective. However, I have not offered an alternative, but such an alternative could be developed. It would have to imagine how the tools and structure of EEd could be employed in an educational setting that does not involve enterprising. Rather, the focus is more general, or maybe it should be specialized to focus on democratic processes. The goal should be to encourage students to think about and experience different involvements in democratic practices (politically, in our everyday life and in the sciences). The greatest challenge, however, would be to address the question of how to create sustainable learning initiatives. It is not enough to plan a new kind of course; it needs to avoid making the same mistake as EEd whereby those who do not have a drive of their own are simply lost causes. In that sense, it needs to be inclusive through its general focus and must create paths that extend beyond the walls of the university.

LITERATURE

Achen, C. H. & Bartels, L. M. (2016) *Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Governments.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Adams, J. "From John Adams to John Taylor." Letter to John Taylor. 17 Dec. 1814. MS. N.p. Retrieved November 24, 2016, from http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Adams/99-02-02-6371.

Arendt, H. (1998) The Human Condition. (2. Ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Barfoed, C. K., & Mølholt, K. S. (2016, June 24th). Lykketoft revser Cameron: En fejl at lade folket bestemme. Retrieved November 25th, 2016, from http://nyheder.tv2.dk/politik/2016-06-24-lykketoft-revser-cameron-en-fejl-at-lade-folket-bestemme

Baudrillard, J. (2017) *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures* (Revised Edition). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Beck. U. & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002) *Individualization: Institutionalized Individualism and Its Social and Political Consequences,* Volume 13. London; Sage Publications

Biesta. G. J. J. (2010a) *Good Education in an Age of Measurement: Ethics, Politics, Democracy.* London & New York. Routledge.

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

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

Blenker, P., Elmholdt, S. T., Frederiksen, S. H., Korsgaard, S. & Wagner, K. (2014). Methods in entrepreneurship education research: a review and integrative framework. *Education + Training,* 56(8/9), 697 – 715.

Brand, M. Wakkee, I. & van der Veen, M. (2007). Teaching entrepreneurship to non-

business students: insights from two Dutch universities. In Fayolle, A. (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education, Volume 2*. UK; Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Brinkmann S. (2011) *Psychology as a moral science: Perspectives on normativity*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Brüderl, J., & Preisendörfer, P. (1998). Network Support and the Success of Newly Founded Business. *Small Business Economics*, *10*(3), 213–225.

Carson, K. (2017, June 12th) On Democracy as a Necessary Anarchist Value. *Center for a Stateless Society.* Retrieved from https://c4ss.org/content/49295.

Cartledge, P. (2016) *Democracy: A Life.* Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky. N. (2005) *Chomsky on Anarchism.* Pateman, B. (Ed) Edinburgh, Oakland, and Vest Viginia: AK Press.

Chomsky, N. (2014, January 7th) What Is the Common Good. Retrieved November 25th, 2016 from http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/21070-noam-chomsky-what-is-the-common-good#

Dahlstedt, M. & Fejes, A. (2017). Shaping entrepreneurial citizens: a genealogy of entrepreneurship education in Sweden. *Critical Studies in Education*, DOI: 10.1080/17508487.2017.1303525

Davies, W. (2014). *The Limits of Neoliberalism: Authority and the Logic of Competition.* Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: Sage Publishing Ltd.

Dewey, J. (1939) Theory of Valuation. *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*, 2(4), 1 – 67.

Dewey, J. (2011) *Democracy and Education.* Milton Keynes, UK: Simon & Brown.

Douven, I. (2016) Abduction. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Zalta, E. N. (Ed). Retrieved 20th of April from: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/abduction/#Aca

Ellis, C., Adams, T. E. & Bochner, A.P. (2011). Autoethnography: An Overview. *Historical Social Research /Historische Sozialforschung,* vol 36(4), 273 – 290.

Erickson, F. (2011) A History of Qualitative Inquiry in Social and Educational Research. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. USA; Sage Publications, Inc

Ernø, S. (2013) *Entrepreneurskab – en teoretisk refleksion over entrepreneurskab som forsknings- og undervisningsfelt*. Retrieved March 16th 2018 from http://projekter.aau.dk/projekter/files/76960128/Speciale_SE1.pdf

European Citizen Science Association (2015) Ten principles of citizen science. Retrieved February 5. 2018 from https://ecsa.citizen-science.net/sites/default/files/ecsa_ten_principles_of_citizen_science.pdf

Fayolle, A. & Kickul, J. (2007). New and emerging perspectives for future research in entrepreneurship education. In Fayolle, A. (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education, Volume 2*. UK; Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Fine, G. A. & Deegan, J. G. (1996) Three principles of Serendip: insight, chance, and discovery in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,* 9(4), 434-447.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) Making Social Science Matter – Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2016, May, 24th) What is Phronesis and Phronetic Social Science? Retrieved March 14th from https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/what-phronesis-phronetic-social-science-bent-flyvbjerg-傅以斌-

Foucault, M (1978) *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction.* (Robert Hurley, trans). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M (1983) On the genealogy of ethics. In Dreyfus, H. L. &Rabinow, P. (Eds.), *Michel Foucault (pp. 229 – 253).* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics; Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978 – 1979*, translated by Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gaglio, C. M. & Winter, S. (2009). Entrepreneurial Alertness and Opportunity Identification: Where Are We Now? In: Carsrud, A. L. & Brännback, M. (eds) Understanding the Entrepreneurial Mind – Opening the Black Box. New York. Springer, pp. 305 - 325

Gartner, W. B. (1989). "Who is an entrepreneur" Is the Wrong Question. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*,12(2), 47-68.

Gartner, W. B. (2007). Psychology, Entrepreneurship, and the 'Critical Mess'. IN Baum, J. R., Frese, M. & Baron, R. (eds) The Psychology of Entrepreneurship. Mahwah, New Jersey. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 325 – 335.

Gautney, H. (2011, October 10) What is Occupy Wall Street? The History of Leaderless Movements. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/on-leadership/what-is-occupy-wall-street-the-history-of-leaderless-movements/2011/10/10/gIQAwkFjaL_story.html?utm_term=.47c0ce9f44b4

Gibb, A. A. (1993) The Enterprise Culture and Education: Understanding Enterprise Education and Its Links with Small Business, Entrepreneurship and Wider Educational Goals. *International Small Business Journal,* 11(3), 11 – 34.

Gibb, A. A. (2002) In pursuit of a new 'enterprise' and 'entrepreneurship' paradigm of learning: creative destruction, new values, new ways of doing things and new combinations of knowledge. *International Journal of Management Review,* 4(3), 233 – 269.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity – Self and Society in Late Modern Age.* Stanford, California; Stanford University Press.

Gilbert, N. (2002) *Transformation of the Welfare State. The silent surrender of the public responsibility.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Graham, R. *The General Idea of Proudhon's Revolution.* Retrieved June 19th 2017 from https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/robert-graham-the-general-idea-of-proudhon-s-revolution

Graeber, D. (2009) *Direct Action: An Ethnography.* Canada: AK Press.

Hannon, P. D. (2005) Philosophies of enterprise and entrepreneurship education and challenges for higher education in the UK. *Entrepreneurship and innovation,* 6(2), 105 – 114.

Haraway, D. (1997) *Modest_Witness@Second_Millenium.Femaleman_-Meets_OncoMouse*: Feminism and Technoscience. New York: Routledge.

Hayek, F. A. (2007). *The road to serfdom: Text and documents. The definitive edition.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published in 1944).

Hulgård, L. (2010) Discourses of Social Entrepreneurship – Variations of the Same Theme? *EMES European Research Network.* Retrieved April 12th 2017 from http://www.emes.net/site/wp-content/uploads/WP_10-01_Hulgaard__web_.pdf

Hull, D., J. Bosley & G. Udell (1980). Reviewing the heffalump: Identifying potential entrepreneurs by personality characteristics. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 18(1), 11-18.

Jay, M. (1996) *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923 – 1950.* USA: University of California Press.

Jones, S. H. (2000). Autoethnography: Making the Personal Political. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3. Ed).USA: Sage Publications, Inc

Katz, J. A. (2003) A chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education: 1876 – 1999. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 282-300

Katz, J. A. (2007) Education and Training in Entrepreneurship. In Baum, J. R., Frese, M. & Baron, R. (eds) *The Psychology of Entrepreneurship*. Mahwah, New Jersey. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 209 – 235

Kelly, P. (2006) The Entrepreneurial Self and 'Youth at-risk': Exploring the Horizons of Identity in the Twenty-first Century, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 9(1), 17-32

Kilby, P. (1971) Hunting the Heffalump. In P. Kilby (Ed.), *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development* (pp. 1-40). New York: Free Press.

Klyver, K., & Schøtt, T. (2011). How Social Network Structure Shapes Entrepreneurial Intentions? *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 1(1), 3–19

Korhonen, M., Komulainen, K. & Räty, H. (2011) Bringing up Global or Local Citizens? Pupils' Narratives of Spatial Selves in Finnish Entrepreneurship Education, *Young*, 19(1), 45-67.

Kropotkin, P. (1972). *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*. NY: New York University Press.

Lave, J. & Kvale, S. (1995) What is anthropological research? An interview with Jean Lave by Steinar Kvale. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8, 219 – 228.

Latour, B. (2013). *An Enquiry into Modes of Existence – An Anthropology of the Moderns*. Harvard, MA; USA: Harvard University Press.

Levie, J. (1999) Entrepreneurship Education in Higher Education in England: A Survey. *UK, the Department for Employment and Education.*

MacMillan, I. C. & J. A. Katz (1992). Idiosyncratic milieus of entrpreneurial research: the need for comprehensive theories. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 7(1), 1-8.

McNay, L. (2009) Self as enterprise: Dilemmas of control and resistance in Foucaults's *the Birth of Biopolitics. Theory, Culture & Society,* 26(6), 55-77

Madison, J. (1787) The Federalist No. 10: The Utility of the Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection (continued). Retrieved November 24, 2016, from http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa10.htm

Marx, K. (1982). *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (J. O'Malley, Ed.; A. Jolin, Trans.). Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

May, T. (1994) *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism.* The Pennsylvania State University Press. University Park, PA.

McClelland, D. C. (1961) *The Achieving Society.* New York: Irvington Publishers, INC.

McClelland, D. C. (1963) N Achievement and Entrepreneurship – A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 1(4), pp. 392 – 396

Middleton, K. W. & Donnellon, A. (2014) Personalizing Entrepreneurial Learning: A Pedagogy for Facilitating the Know Why. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal,* 4(2), 167 – 204

Milstein, C. (2010). *Anarchism and Its Aspirations.* Canada: AK Press.

Moscovici, S. (1981). On social representations. In: J.P. Forgas (ed.) *Social Cognition: Perspectives in Everyday Understanding*, London: Academic Press.

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

Neck, H. M., & Greene, P. G. (2011). Entrepreneurship Education: Known Worlds and New Frontiers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1), 55–70.

Neergaard, H. (2005). Networking Activities in Technology-based Entrepreneurial Teams. *International Small Business Journal*, *23*(3), 257–278.

Nicolaou, N. & Shane, S. (2009). Can genetic factors influence the likelihood of engaging in entrepreneurial activity? Journal of Business Venturing, 24(1), 1–22.

Ogbor, J. (2000) Mythicizing and reification in entrepreneurial discourse: ideology-critique of entrepreneurial studies. *Journal of Management Studies,* 37(5), 605 - 635

Ollila, S. & Middleton, K. W. (2013) Exploring entrepreneurial identity construction: the case of an action-based entrepreneurship education. Retrieved December 8th, 2016 from http://publications.lib.chalmers.se/publication/179509-exploring-entrepreneurial-identity-construction-the-case-of-an-action-based-entrepreneurship-educati

PACE – Research objectives. Retrivied on March 28th 2017 from http://mgmt.au.dk/research/innovation-entrepreneurship-and-information-systems/research/icare/pace/research-objectives/

Pittaway, L., & Edwards, C. (2012). Assessment: examining practice in entrepreneurship education. *Education + Training*, 54(8), 778–800

Rancière, J. (2013) *Hadet til demokratiet. (original title*: La haine de la démocratie).* Denmark. Møller.

Rauch, A. & Frese, M. (2007) Born to Be an Entrepreneur? Revisiting the Personality Approach to Entrepreneurship. IN Baum, J. R., Frese, M. & Baron, R. (eds) *The Psychology of Entrepreneurship*. Mahwah, New Jersey. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 41 – 67

Ricketts, M. (2006). Theories of Entrepreneurship: Historical Development and Critical Assessment. In Casson, M., Yeung, B., Basu, A., & Wadeson, N. (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, S. Neergaard, H., Tanggaard, L. & Krueger, N. (2016). New horizons in entrepreneurship education: from teacher-led to student-centered learning. *Education + Training,* 58(7/8), 661 – 683.

Rose, N. (1998) *Inventing Our Selves – Psychology, Power, and Personhood*. UK; Cambridge University Press.

Rosseau, J. J. (1762) *The Social Contract*. USA; Hafner Press.

Scharff, C. (2015). The Psychic Life of Neoliberalism: Mapping the Contours of Entrepreneurial Subjectivity. *Theory, Culture & Society,* 33(6), 107-122

Schoon, I. & Duckworth, K. (2012) Who Becomes an Entrepreneur? - Early Life Experiences as Predictors of Entrepreneurship. *Developmental Psychology*, 48(6), pp. 1719 - 1726

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry Into Profits, Capital Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle.* Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press

Shane, S. & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research. The Academy of Management Review, vol. 25(1), pp. 217 - 226)

Spinosa, C., Flores, F., & Dreyfus, H. L. (1997). *Disclosing New Worlds: Entrepreneurship, Democratic Action and the Cultivation of Solidarity*. Cambridge, Mass. & London, England: The MIT Press.

Stilgoe, J. (2016, November 8th) *Is citizen science the future of research or a recipe for bad science*? Retrieved February 5th 2018 from https://www.theguardian.com/science/political-science/2016/nov/08/is-citizen-science-the-future-of-research-or-a-recipe-for-bad-science

Taatila, V. P. (2010). Learning Entrepreneurship in Higher Education. *Education + Training,* 52(1)*,* 48 – 61.

Urry, J. (2003) *Global Complexity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Van Reybrouck, D. (2016) *Against Election: The Case for Democracy.* Penguin Random House. United Kingdom.

Wilson, M. S. & Chomsky, N. (2013, May 28th) Noam Chomsky: The Kind of Anarchism I Believe in, and What's Wrong with Libertarians. Retrieved November 23, 2016, from http://www.alternet.org/civil-liberties/noam-chomsky-kind-anarchism-i-believe-and-whats-wrong-libertarians

Whittemore, R., Chase, S. K., & Mandle, C. L. (2001) Validity in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research,* 11(4), pp. 522 – 537.

World Value Survey. Retrieved May 22nd 2017 from http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSOnline.jsp

SUMMARY

Entrepreneurship is a ubiquitous part of daily discourse and politics in many modern societies. We are increasingly becoming aware of how we are expected to be the creators of our own future jobs. Entrepreneurship promises more jobs for more people, and it incites us to innovate and to disrupt us away from the status quo. Entrepreneurship is a key component for steady economic growth. As a consequence, a growing interest in entrepreneurship education has followed; one that promises to provide the means that will sustain the future demand for entrepreneurial souls. This dissertation is a phronetic exploration of entrepreneurship education. Phronesis, as identified by Aristotle, is a scientific virtue addressing ethical and practical matters related to fields of public interest. Given the context of the study, and based on qualitative data, it is argued how an alternative way of thinking about entrepreneurship education might be more desirable.