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ABSTRACT
On the basis of our co-operative inquiry, we suggest that the concepts of bricolage and reflexivity are very useful in framing the contemporary entrepreneurship curriculum. In this paper we explore how that could influence teaching and learning practice. We also highlight the importance of connecting the efforts, energies and activities of individual entrepreneurs with the social, economic and political impacts of entrepreneurship. For this reason, we suggest that it is important that entrepreneurship education does not simply replicate management education, but be positioned in such a way that it impacts a broader range of ways in which to influence and change broader social and economic conditions.

INTRODUCTION
This paper reports on the second stage of a research project which investigated the implications for theory, policy and practice that arise from asking the question ‘is entrepreneurship most usefully framed as a discipline or as a domain of practice?’ (O’Connor, Cherry and Buckley, 2007). The focus of this second stage is on the implications for educational practice in particular.

Adopting a social constructivist perspective, we noted that entrepreneurship is a multi-layered and multi-dimensional phenomenon that, in common with business strategy and leadership, has attracted multiple disciplinary frames in efforts to describe and explain it. Its archetypical nature and global occurrence have meant that it has also attracted multicultural study. The resulting diversity of theory and research methodologies used to engage with it is a testament to its complexity. So disparate and diverse is the thinking about entrepreneurship that there is still substantial disagreement as to what it is (Gartner 2001; Hansemark 1998, Lindsay & Hindle 2002; Low & MacMillan 1988; Hill & McGowan 1999).

This has led some to label the study and understanding of entrepreneurship as still being in its adolescence (see for example, Low 2001) and the practice of entrepreneurship as admitting of very few or even no enduring rules or solutions. However, we contend that acknowledgment of the fundamental
complexity of entrepreneurship is essential in avoiding unhelpfully reductionist and limiting approaches to entrepreneurial research, policy and educational practice. We further contend that entrepreneurs themselves need the capability to engage with high levels of complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty, and that the education offered to them by universities needs to cultivate that capability.

Typically, entrepreneurship education in higher education seems to have focussed upon business and new venture start-up, self employment and the competitiveness of small and large organisations (see for instance Fletcher and Rosa 1998; Keogh and Galloway 2004; Edwards and Muir 2005; Johnson, Craig and Hildebrand 2006). Laukkanen (2000) has gone so far as referring to universities as becoming “business generating model[s]” (p. 25). However, by adopting an approach to entrepreneurship education that accepts it as a multi-layered and multi-dimensional phenomenon we find alignment with the argument outlined by Taylor and Plummer (2003) who suggested that education and enterprise are relevant to issues of human capital and of community growth and development. They have argued that education in this field “is about equipping people to work within a global sphere of economic activity” and “providing individuals with an understanding of facets of the economy and society they live in, and the processes of change that run through them” (p. 559).

At the outset of this research project we had intended to explore the implications of a ‘domain of practice’ approach to entrepreneurship on policy, education and entrepreneurship research. We wanted our inquiry to be both critical and appreciative and, through reflexive iteration of both texts and direct conversation, to avoid an unhelpful fracturing and splintering of the study of entrepreneurship. To help us hold and explore our research question, we chose the cooperative inquiry method. Methods of collaborative and cooperative inquiry have been eloquently described by Heron (1981, 1988) and Bray et al (2000). They sit within a paradigm of action research and participatory human inquiry - a paradigm which has several defining features. These include a focus on the dilemmas and problems that characterise human practice and experience; a preference for de-mystifying research and treating it “as a form of learning that should be accessible by everyone interested in gaining a better understanding of his or her world” (Bray et al, 2000, p 3); a concern to work arm-in-arm with others who share the curiosity or need for the inquiry; and an interest in initiating change in thinking and behaviour.

The co-operative inquiry method forced us to focus our effort in disciplined cycles of co-operative inquiry, which include both action and insightful reflection. The concepts of 'bricolage' (working with whatever comes to hand, resourcefulness and improvisation) and reflexivity (thinking both appreciatively and critically in a disciplined way about one's practice and its context) emerged for us as key dynamics of the process.

On the basis of our co-operative inquiry, we have suggested previously (O’Connor, Cherry and Buckley, 2007) that a contemporary university curriculum for entrepreneurs should be designed with the following principles in mind:

- that it is helpful to use and hold both ways of ‘locating’ entrepreneurship (as discipline and as domain of practice) in creative tension to understand the phenomenon and to inform educational curricula;
- that focus on entrepreneur as individual (and therefore attempts to understand the dynamics of the individual) and entrepreneurship (a situated activity which occurs and can only be understood in social, economic and political contexts) must also be held simultaneously in the development of curricula;
- that entrepreneurship itself contains cycles both bricolage (resourcefulness and the capacity to work with whatever is at hand) and disciplined reflexive thought and inquiry;
• that the role of scholarship in this context includes not only the resourceful and timely application of the knowledge of experts but the disciplined development of theories of practice from practice itself.

Cumulatively, this line of thinking implies a view of the curriculum that is ‘generous’ and open to regular and robust debate. If the dominant frameworks informing curricula are protected from challenge, we contend that entrepreneurship education itself is impoverished. Consistent with this view is the desire to encourage students to be educationally tolerant themselves; that is, to value a robust curriculum which includes relevance to the wider world, an understanding of the economic and social principles in which their ambitions are located, developing the skills of bricolage and disciplined reflexivity and the capacity to both use and build robust theories of practice. This research therefore extends our original work to consider deeply through the co-operative inquiry method the implications of this line of thinking for the practice of entrepreneurship education.

METHOD

This second stage of the research project continues the cooperative inquiry employed in the initial study (O’Connor, Cherry and Buckley, 2007). As developed by Heron (1981, 1988) and Bray et al (2000) methods of collaborative and cooperative inquiry are positioned within a paradigm of action research and participatory human inquiry – approaches, which engage with the dilemmas, and complexities that characterise human practice and experience.

It requires sustained efforts at working together, the valuing of inquiry as much as advocacy; transparency; open-mindedness; a preparedness to challenge our own fundamental assumptions; and a commitment to regular de-briefing of what is being done, learned and developed. This is an approach which, above all, deliberately ‘problematises’ things, which might otherwise be taken for, granted.

For a complete description of the methodology, the reader is referred to our previous paper (O’Connor, Cherry and Buckley, 2007). In summary, it consisted of three cycles of activity, the first of which involved the formation of a co-operative inquiry group by the three authors, who committed to a rigorously recorded process of reflexive dialogue. Its second cycle invited another group, known as a reference group, to join with the co-researchers to explore the differences incited by considering entrepreneurship as a discipline and a domain of practice. The participants in the reference group were researchers and educators from across Swinburne University of Technology and particularly from the Faculty of Business and Enterprise. A software package called GrouputerNet was used to help generate and capture the collaborative real-time thinking of this group. In the third cycle, the co-researchers conducted further discussion sessions which were both stimulated by the data of the reference group and by our own continuing struggle with the paradoxes already described.

As noted in our earlier paper, co-operative inquiry calls for transparency; a ‘meta-awareness’ of what the participants are doing, thinking and assuming, individually and collectively; and calls for courtesy and respect for one another’s perspectives and needs. It also demands a willingness to not simply ‘reflect’ on things but to bump into things and as a result, be forced to ‘look again’.

CRITICAL THEMES

As already indicated, this paper is the second generated by our co-operative inquiry. In the first one, we both developed and explored the proposition that it is helpful to use and hold two ways of ‘locating’ entrepreneurship (as discipline and as domain of practice) in creative tension to understand the phenomenon and to inform educational curricula.
We also offered several other propositions, which we did not have the opportunity to develop in any depth. These were:

- that entrepreneurship contains cycles of both bricolage (resourcefulness and the capacity to work with whatever is at hand) and disciplined reflexive thought and inquiry;
- that focus on entrepreneur as individual (and therefore attempts to understand the dynamics of the individual) and entrepreneurship (a situated activity which occurs and can only be understood in social, economic and political contexts) must also be held simultaneously in the development of curricula;
- that the role of scholarship in this context includes not only the resourceful and timely application of the knowledge of experts but the disciplined development of theories of practice from practice itself.

Taken together, they form a view of the curriculum as needing to be ‘generous’ and open to robust debate, and as encouraging students to be educationally tolerant themselves: that is, going beyond an exclusive preoccupation with their own business and ideas to embrace an understanding of the economic and social principles in which their ambitions are located; developing the skills of bricolage and disciplined reflexivity; and the capacity to both use and build robust theories of practice.

It is to the more detailed exploration of some of these propositions that we now turn. It is our intention to explore the development of theories of practice from practice itself in a further paper.

**BRICOLAGE**

As noted in our previous paper, we observed a relative difficulty experienced by our participant group in making an immediate, strong, shared or consistently helpful connection between ‘discipline’ and ‘entrepreneurship’, in the context of our admittedly small and contained brainstorm. We could have been forgiven for thinking that this was a group of individuals wrestling with the issue for the first time. That is unlikely to be the case, given their status as researchers, educators and doctoral candidates. We then concluded that, at the very least, there was no set of common understandings of entrepreneurship as a discipline (expressed either in terms of superficial language or deeply shared paradigms) that this group was drawing upon.

We wondered whether this group of entrepreneurs, scholars and educators was more likely to be operating from a stance of what Fabian (2000) has called ‘segregation’: a range of very different paradigms. This would be consistent with the group’s general preference for the idea of entrepreneurship as ‘domain of practice’ and the attractive freedom to choose one’s own approach that they generally associated with that.

It occurred to us that this position is consistent with the stance of ‘bricolage’: the activity of improvisation or ‘making do’ with whatever is to hand (Levi-Strauss, 1966) that has been taken up by some researchers (for example, Denzen and Lincoln, 1994).

Located by Baker and Aldrich (2000) within the larger context of improvisation theory, this is a stance that values resourcefulness, inventiveness, alertness to opportunity and what is available, persistence and the capacity to link means with end in unusual ways. These are all qualities or behaviours that could be reasonably associated with entrepreneurship and it intrigued us to consider whether they would carry into practice, into research and the linkages between them.

Bricolage derives from the French verb bricoler, with its connotations of resourcefulness, making do, and improvising with whatever is to hand. In essence, it involves inventing through mucking about in
original and creative ways. A bricoleur is one who works in this way, designing, crafting and building things through trial and error, developing their own strategies and techniques and ways or working with existing ideas and materials. Like magpies, they collect a diverse range of intellectual or material resources, combining them in ways that are unusual and new.

This approach to design contrasts with the kind of planned construction that is guided by theory and the systematic application of logic, or with working from first principles, such as engineering.

Bricolage has been taken up in several disciplines, with additional connotations, ranging from eclectic approaches to practice to styles of practice that are subversive and anti-establishment. The punk movement has been characterised as stylistic bricolage by Shuker (1998), with its creation of subcultures which borrow symbols and objects from ‘mainstream’ or dominant cultures and put them to very different uses, sometimes with grotesque and deliberately challenging results.

These are all associations, which resonate with our common ‘sense’ of entrepreneurship, as well as with Schumpeter’s (1976) framing of entrepreneurship as a process of creative disruption. For example, they easily accommodate a sense of the entrepreneur as one operating at the edge of mainstream or conventional thinking and practice, a person who rejects tradition, trusts their own judgement and ideas and trades the accuracy of classical training for the creativity of improvisation. At the edge, an initial lack of resources is not an obstacle to creative and ambitious thinking and practice, but rather the trigger for resourceful use of the networks, techniques and tools that are available. This iconoclastic and marginal space makes possible the making of remote connections, of putting familiar things to unfamiliar uses, in familiar and unfamiliar places.

These associations also accommodate a potential for messiness, creation by accident, by playing around, experimenting, learning from creative ‘errors’ and above all, learning from failure.

Papert (1991) has suggested that, seen as a problem solving style, bricolage stands in strong contrast to the analytical style. This is reflective of the formulation of bricolage by French anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss (1966), who saw it as a form of thought characteristic of primitive people. Mythological thinking is one of the prime examples he offered of such primitive thinking. He argued that while able to offer a ‘good enough’ explanation of the world as ‘primitive’ people experienced it, mythological thinking – built from the ground up and creative in its imaginative scope – was fundamentally flawed because it was not open to the kind of challenge that comes from scientific analysis. For Levi-Strauss, primitive thinking was always trapped in its own limited paradigm. By contrast, scientific analysis combines the construction of theory from logic with the testing and modification of theory through rigorous experimentation. It should be able to self-correct when hard data challenges theory.

Post-modernists have challenged this grand, but now somewhat dated, scientific narrative, suggesting that dominant paradigms are seldom challenged from the centre. Rather, new paradigms emerge by iconoclastic challenge or accidental tinkering at the edge. Indeed, Jacques Derrida (1978) suggests that "if one calls bricolage the necessity of borrowing one's concept from the text of a heritage which is more or less coherent or ruined, it must be said that every discourse (emphasis added) is bricoleur." And Arnold (1994) includes bricolage when nominating the three important areas of postmodernist feminism: jouissance (pleasure and playfulness as in feminist poetics); bricolage (making the text work as a one off); and deconstruction (an acknowledgement that the text or narrative is neither seamless nor authoritative).
From a post-modern perspective, the creative disruption that defines and characterises entrepreneurship can cause significant interruption to the larger narratives of traditional disciplinary thinking, research and theory building, just as it does to more day-to-day practices and ideas, and to concrete products.

What does all this imply for the curriculum? The notion of bricolage not only offers a helpful description of the way entrepreneurs problem-solve and create, but also suggests that a curriculum must create a site for this inventive, disruptive, resourceful and ‘disrespectful’ way of thinking and practising. The discomfort with theory noted in the reference group of this project - and present in our own experience of entrepreneurs in the classroom – sits side-by-side with an urgent demand for ‘things that work’, ideas and techniques that can be put to use immediately in helping to bring a great idea to market. In this context, ideas and tools are judged not by their elegance or provenance but by their utility.

We suggest that those who teach in this environment must be prepared to not only cope with this dynamic but operate as bricoleurs themselves, turning this dynamic to advantage in resourceful ways. The framing of theory (or techniques validated through scholarship) must in the first instance be presented as ‘fit and relevant for practice’: fit for the demands which entrepreneurs will make. Teachers must be resourceful ‘in the moment’, using whatever comes up in the room as the source of teachable moments. They must be able to use conventional ideas and tools in unconventional ways and set learning tasks that call for inventiveness and experimentation. They cannot afford to be confronted or offended when their own or others' longstanding academic wisdom is challenged or ignored.

Layton’s (2004) research suggests that students can respond creatively to the risks and challenges of learning tasks that reflect their work environment, that are real and immediate for them, even to the point of being important for professional survival. In the process of improvising or experimenting with responses to these opportunities and threats, they create new situations that also demand action, in what Layton describes as an ongoing process of bricolage.

In so doing, Layton noted that students drew on resources in their private lives as much as they did those at work. However, this process did not always change a student's self-positioning or self-awareness and so did not necessarily lead to learning (in terms of changed capability) or to a changed perception of the future. Layton concluded that other forms of learning are needed to encourage an exploration of sociological understandings of selves (of self in the context of society) as well as serious consideration of self-in-the- future (as compared with self-in- the-present moment).

This conclusion is consistent with Hatton’s (1988) earlier study of teachers. Hatton noted that while bricolage provides a useful description of what many teachers in classrooms do, it also highlights the ultimate limitations of their teaching practice: ad hocism, limited use of theory and a repertoire which is fit for immediate purpose but ill-equipped for developing the underlying capabilities which students need in a diverse, evolving and challenging world.

As Sull (2004) has observed, a commitment to disciplined entrepreneurship involves protocols for rigour in practice, and we would argue that these protocols can be formed and informed by the lessons of experience, combined with a commitment to reflexivity in thinking on practice, and the guidance of theory. As a particular example of this, we draw attention to the importance of exploring both the dynamics of the individual and of entrepreneurship, situated in social, economic and political context in the development of curricula.

These issues are addressed in the next sections of this paper.
REFLEXIVITY

In the preceding section we introduced the concept of bricolage and suggested that a robust curriculum that recognises bricolage as a key in informing entrepreneurship education, together with the application of disciplined reflexivity, makes for an inventive teaching and learning space — one which potentially reflects the essence of entrepreneurship. In this section we explore two dimensions which ground disciplined reflexivity in entrepreneurship education. They are: interruption and intervention, and artfulness and responsiveness.

Schon’s work on reflective practice and the reflective practitioner (1987) crystallised the value for educators of engaging students in the process of critically reflecting on their action in practice. This is especially relevant for disciplines with a strong professional practice orientation. Action-reflection learning, in which practitioners engage at looking at their own action or practice in a reflective manner and coming to understand how this action or practice has influenced the course of events is an example of reflective practice. The concept of reflexiveness adds to this the notion of disciplined thought and action connected with a concept of the self. Bleakley’s (1999) description of holistic reflexivity goes even further and includes both the aesthetic and the ethical as a practice of sensitivity to, and a caring for, the world. Holistic reflexivity asks the entrepreneur to consider their thinking and actions in the wider economic, ecological, political and social context which supports their ambitions.

We suggest that acts of interruption and intervention by the lecturer are useful dimensions of disciplined reflexivity in the entrepreneurship classroom. This means that the lecturer makes use of the teaching-learning environment in such a way that interruption and intervention become the ordinary and expected practice of the lecturer in the self questioning environment of the entrepreneurship student. This involves capitalising on opportunities often unforeseen and challenging for the educator which may however provide very effective ways of engaging students in greater self understanding of their actions in practice. The lecturer acts as container for the reflexive processes of students, while also acting as the interrupter and intervener, promoting discomfort in the thinking and awareness of students and pushing toward the unfamiliar (and possibly unknown). An example would be questioning the seemingly innocent practice by students of sharing lists of names and contacts for purposes of networking. Here the lecturer might introduce the ethical dimensions involved in this practice for consideration by the students.

Often the curricula for entrepreneurship education are based on the literature from management and leadership. While an entrepreneur might benefit from these studies because they will find themselves at some stage or other as inexperienced leaders confounded by the demands of management practice in enterprise development, the questions around effective and engaging entrepreneurship education might lie more in how the selected instructional materials (readings, case studies and exercises) are used with the student group reflexively. However, in order to do as Bleakley (1999) suggest and ‘think against oneself’ the student must grapple with difference and uniqueness. Here the practice of disciplined reflexivity provides the student with the means to make use of their own data about their own beliefs, experiences, and understanding in a new and very different way.

Popular use of case studies as instructional material exists in both entrepreneurship and business education programs. While case studies are very useful for introducing students to the experience of others in new business formation, in effect it introduces students to the experiences of others, rather than their own. They may be even more effective if used to engage students in ‘self-reflection-by-proxy’. Here the role of the educator as facilitator of reflexivity is paramount to the development of individual’s understanding. An example is to get students to more richly describe their own experience...
by using another character, even a fictitious one. While articles about narcissism and entrepreneurship may be of great interest, their content might be even more effective if mediated through the invention of experiences that happened to ‘my brother’, ‘my boss’ or another. In this example, skilful use of interruption and intervention exist where self-reflection-by-proxy is at play in the classroom.

The other dimensions of facilitating reflexivity that we would like to draw attention to are artfulness and responsiveness. The diversity in the classroom where entrepreneurship students are often from varied backgrounds, is an exciting and challenging setting for lecturers. Exciting because the richness can be utilised for deep engagement by students; challenging because approaching entrepreneurship education requires a lecturer to be entrepreneurial in their approach. Students of entrepreneurship may present with a high tolerance for ambiguity and behave as non-linear learners in the classroom – a potent combination where artfulness on the part of the lecturer makes use of learning opportunities.

Artfulness involves recognising opportunities for the individual students and the student group as a whole, capitalising on whatever comes to hand, in the manner of the bricoleur. It seems entrepreneurship students are less concerned with identifying with communities of shared meaning (possibly unlike their business education counterparts) and more with developing their agility to ‘see’ and ‘know’ in previously unexplored ways. Self-reflexivity is critical in pushing this boundary, particularly aiming at having students locate themselves in the political, ecological, economic and social realities of their world. Disciplined reflexivity seeks to take them to this point.

Taken together, we believe that interruption and intervention, and artfulness and responsiveness, are dimensions of practice which the lecturer can make use of in the learning-teaching space in a disciplined reflexiveness.

**Entrepreneurship as both an individual and socio-economic phenomenon**

In this section we explore the proposition that in the positioning and development of an entrepreneurship curriculum, it is useful to focus simultaneously on the entrepreneur as individual (and the dynamics of the individual) and entrepreneurship as a situated activity understood in social, economic, ecological and political contexts.

Elsewhere, O’Connor (2007) has argued that entrepreneurship is “a social process involving the efforts of individuals in enterprise activities that has economic development implications at a regional and/or national level” (p. 57).

This dual focus was evident in the early data set generated in this study by the reference group. Their comments clearly located entrepreneurship as a micro activity with the potential, when taken up by significant numbers of people, to influence macro dimensions of poverty, national wealth and even global activity.

Although the concept of bricolage was not introduced by the reference group, we suggested earlier that this idea can be usefully employed to assist our understanding of how limited resources can be artfully deployed in ways that ultimately help to have great impact. Hjorth and Johannisson (2007) capture this nicely when they suggest that the entrepreneurial learning process is “the invention of new practices, the making of new worlds” (p. 64).

This has some interesting implications for the entrepreneurship curriculum. Hjorth and Johannisson (2007) argue that knowledge is as much discursive as it is experiential and that “learning … is the process of becoming a user of concepts and their related (socially contextualized) language and practice, resulting in enhanced possibilities for living” (p. 48).
Interestingly, our reference group data also highlighted the importance of making connections between the practice and the world within which it resides. Keogh and Galloway (2004) claimed that “one of the main purposes of tertiary education is to prepare students for the economy in which they will operate and to which they will contribute…” (p. 531). Taylor and Plummer (2003) are others who argue that enterprise is concerned with the human capital that contributes to community growth and development. They suggest that education in this field “is about equipping people to work within a global sphere of economic activity” and “providing individuals with an understanding of facets of the economy and society they live in, and the processes of change that run through them” (p. 559). These are definite calls for entrepreneurship education that makes very clear connections between human activity at the micro level and the macro level outcomes for which entrepreneurship is so often claimed to be responsible (Cassis & Minoglou 2005; Chell, Haworth and Brearley 1991; Baumol 1995; Kilby 1971).

These viewpoints also suggest that education aimed purely at business creation and management is insufficient in its breadth and scope. Some have been very definite in calls for a paradigm shift in entrepreneurship education away from the narrow perspective of mere business creation to a broader perspective of individuals who create more pervasive change (Kirby 2007; Gibb 2002). So, for example, in their discussion of entrepreneurship education at the University of Glamorgan, Edwards and Muir (2005) argue that the “focus of enterprise education here [at the University of Glamorgan] is not actually about business but about developing the individual, who will create, own and lead new enterprises” (p. 617).

Others, for example, Craig and Hildebrand (2006) have explored what they see as the next challenge for entrepreneurship education, that is, to move into non-business school arenas. They argue that individuals trained in technical disciplines like engineering and science have the opportunity to become an entrepreneur or at least entrepreneurial.

Similarly, Keogh and Galloway (2004) addressed the convergence of entrepreneurship on the science, engineering and technology disciplines at Heriot-Watt University in Scotland. They suggested that engineers should gain “[k]nowledge and understanding of concepts such as enterprise, innovation, and business sustainability” (p. 537). They conceived entrepreneurship education as a way of “combining specialisms, [whereby] students are given a realistic overview and some hands-on experience of what will be expected of them when they become contributors to their industry and the economy generally” (sic., Keogh & Galloway 2004, p. 540, emphasis added). This approach seems to emphasise the ‘enterprising’ or ‘entrepreneurial’ person model of entrepreneurship education by portraying students as contributors to an economy although the creation of economy would appear not to be given sufficient focus.

At the same time, however, it has been argued that universities may be intent on becoming what Laukkanan (2000) referred to as “business generating model[s]” (p. 25) and that universities seem to struggle to differentiate entrepreneurship from more traditional business education.

Adcroft, Willis and Dhaliwal (2004) believe that “management education reflects an increasingly accepted assumption of the universality of management; under whatever conditions, global or national, public or private, the key determinant of organizational success is [assumed to be] management” (p.528).

The broader point being made here is that entrepreneurship, like management, should not be considered alone and without deference to the contributions of other segments of the community that
create industry structures, market conditions, labour cost factors and general resource conditions. They are suggesting that a population that has an over-representation of those educated to be new business creators and owners may confront environmental and market conditions that are unable to accommodate this breed of educated labour force.

Entrepreneurship education, if considered in this way, has a role to play in a range of professions engaged in the transformation of socio-economic environments.

CONCLUSIONS

In this article we have drawn upon the concepts of bricolage and reflexivity, and suggested that these can be of great practical help in framing the contemporary entrepreneurship curriculum. We have also argued the importance of connecting the efforts, energies and activities of individual entrepreneurs with the social, economic and political impacts of entrepreneurship.

We agree with Fletcher's (2007) suggestion that entrepreneurship needs to be considered an integrative discipline “by taking into account of how entrepreneurial practices are constructed through interaction between individual agency, industry/sector/firm structures and the wider economic, social or cultural economy” (p. 162, emphasis in original).

We conclude by suggesting that it is important for entrepreneurship education to not simply replicate management education but to be positioned in such a way that it impacts a broader range of ways to influence and change broader social and economic conditions.
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