

Enterprise Education: Towards the Development of the Heutagogical Learner*

Colin Jones[†]

[†]Queensland University of Technology

Abstract

In recent times we have witnessed attempts to demarcate entrepreneurship education from enterprise education. While there is useful value in further establishing the distinction and similarities between these two forms of education, such work merely scratches the surface of what is required to fully embed entrepreneurship and enterprise education in higher education. What is needed is a deeper repositioning of entrepreneurship and enterprise education. The distinctive university-wide contribution that entrepreneurship and enterprise education is increasingly asked to make globally needs unpacking. No other domain of education is poised to help develop the specific attributes students need to navigate and succeed in the 21st century. However, significant resistance to the embedding of entrepreneurship and enterprise education in higher education remains.

This paper, builds upon a new and innovative approach, to plot a pathway towards full integration within higher education for entrepreneurship and enterprise education. The key development to be offered for consideration is a new language from which to reposition and explain the role and nature of entrepreneurship and enterprise education. Building on recent work that have promoted the value of heutagogical learning for entrepreneurship and enterprise education, the components of a new student-oriented language are presented. This repositioning of entrepreneurship and enterprise education highlights the unique potential of heutagogical learning. This is illustrated by the manner in which this paper seeks to communicate with *all* educators, *all* students, and *all* education managers/policy makers.

The ideas developed in this paper do not represent a simple pathway through which to move entrepreneurship and enterprise education forward. They do however offer an opportunity to contemplate several pedagogical factors that continue to hold the development of our domain back. This paper is deliberately provocative, seeking to inspire the enquiring minds that consider the ideas developed within, to act upon them; to act as an individual in the best interests of their students; to engage in deeper conversations around the ideas of heutagogy and academagogy; and, to act in ways that promotes the individual needs of every student we can assist to prepare for the new world of work that awaits them.

Keywords: Enterprise Education, Heutagogy, Academagogy, Pedagogy

* URL: <http://ojs.aishe.org/index.php/aishe-j/article/view/254>

1. Introduction

There can be little doubt that the world of education in general is awash with paradigm changing disruptions that threaten to liberate learners (Christensen, Horn & Johnson, 2008; Moe & Chubb, 2009), and ultimately, redefine the purpose of enterprise education in higher education. In recent times we have also witnessed attempts to demarcate entrepreneurship education from enterprise education. Most specifically, the QAA (2012) guide provides clear and logical separation of both forms of education. While there is useful value in further establishing the distinction and similarities between these two forms of education, such work merely scratches the surface of what is required to fully embed entrepreneurship and enterprise (hereinafter referred to as E & E education) in higher education. What is needed is a repositioning of E & E education. The distinctive university-wide contribution that E & E education is increasingly asked to make globally needs unpacking. No other domain of education is poised to help develop the specific attributes students need to navigate and succeed in the 21st century. However, much resistance to the embedding of E & E education in higher education remains.

This paper seeks to make a novel contribution aimed at assisting the full integration within higher education of E & E education. First, this paper highlights the need to develop a new language from which to reposition and explain the role and nature of E & E education. Building on recent works that have promoted the virtues of heutagogical learning for E & E education (Author, Matlay, Penaluna & Penaluna, 2014), the components of a new student-oriented language are presented. In a sense, a promotion of a philosophy of *learning* for E & E education. Rather than settling upon an acceptance that our educators should be supported by an appropriate philosophy of *teaching*, a deeper orientation to students is developed.

Second, the repositioning of E & E education developed here highlights the unique potential of heutagogical learning. It forces us to view educators as facilitators, students as instigators, and managers/policy makers as informed supporters. Viewed

from this perspective, E & E education is freed from the shackles of pedagogical indifference. E & E education becomes the author of its own rules and purpose. This optimistic view of E & E education is premised upon a new language being developed through which the roles and purpose associated with E & E education are both redefined and reimagined. But first, some semantical housekeeping.

2. EE And EE And E & E

It is important to clarify precisely what is being referred to when discussing entrepreneurship and/or enterprise education. This is because we clearly observe different emphasis placed on entrepreneurship education and enterprise education in the literature. Consistent with Author et al., (2014), in this paper, enterprise education is defined “as the process of equipping students (or graduates) with an enhanced capacity to generate ideas and the skills to make them happen”, (QAA, 2012, p. 2). A process argued to precede the related process of equipping “students with the additional knowledge, attributes and capabilities required to apply ... [such enterprising] ... abilities in the context of setting up a new venture or business”, or the process of entrepreneurship education. Entrepreneurship education is frequently held hostage to many fads, such as the process effectuation, the lean startup approach and long running villains such as the business plan. Time will ultimately determine which aspects of these fads stick and aid in the development of the specific knowledge associated with the process of business creation. Alternatively, in enterprise education, we are beginning to see the students’ development as the most dominant feature of this literature. Indeed, there is a large body of character development literature (Dewey, 1922; Perry, 1970; Parker, 1978, Baxter-Magolda, 1998) easily relatable to enterprise education. From this perspective, it can be seen that enterprise education has a good, close friend in entrepreneurship education, but an even better first cousin in the educational literature; and blood ties matter most.

In this paper entrepreneurship education and enterprise education (hereinafter referred to as E & E education) are discussed as one, with the caveat that they are seen to address different purposes, purposes that are nevertheless, commonly

interrelated. They are commonly related because they are both related to the development of the entrepreneurial graduate, but as explained, they are focused on different stages of the graduates' development. Unavoidably this relationship is rarely linear, more often, it is typically quite iterative. It is difficult to advance our discussion of E & E education without treating them as a whole in this regard, as it just serves to further preserve confusion already present within our growing literature. What is important is that the dialogic relationship between both forms of education is understood (i.e. one cannot be understood without reference to the other). With this addressed, we can now safely proceed confident that at least the foundational assumptions upon which this paper is premised upon have been sufficiently explained.

3. Getting Our Priorities Sorted

It is the provocative contention of this paper that E & E education should be discussed from the viewpoint of the student first, the community second, the institution third and the educator last. Too often it seems to be discussed from the other way around, with the educators' needs being elevated above that of the student. We increasingly know a few things about our current and future students. First, they will not inherit an employment landscape similar to the one we older folk uncounted. The world of the freelancer is now well established in our collective vocabularies. The work of Price (2013) illustrates how our students increasingly must be capable of developing an enterprising career regardless of any startup aspirations. Students in all education settings are being encouraged to develop survival skills. Wagner (2008) identifies seven survival skills required by graduates in the 21st century; 1) critical thinking and problem solving; 2) collaboration across networks and leading by influence; 3) agility and adaptability; 4) initiative and entrepreneurialism; 5) effective oral and written communication; 6) accessing and analyzing information; and 7) curiosity and imagination. There is a great symmetry between the focus of Wagner and that naturally occurring in the E & E education literature vis-à-vis the role E & E education is increasingly expected to contribute to the development of employability skills.

Actually, this emphasis upon the development of the student has always existed; it just has remained dormant for many years. We can go back in time to 1869 when Eliot (1869, p. 218) stated that “to make a good engineer, chemist, or architect, the only sure way is to make first, or at least simultaneously, an observant, reflecting, and sensible man, whose mind is not only well stored, but well trained also to see, compare, reason, and decide”. As president of Harvard University, Eliot clearly influenced the organization of higher education in America (Carney, 2015). This focus ensured that American universities would place an emphasis upon research, liberal arts education and *practical training*. As a consequence, universities globally have remained ever-since conflicted how to balance priorities between these three important purposes.

Along the way others have tried to reduce the central focus of education to very specific outcomes. For example, Ruskin (1917, p. 194) stated that “the question as to what should be the material of education, becomes singularly simplified. It might be matter of dispute what processes have the greatest effect in developing intellect; but it can hardly be disputed what facts it is most advisable that a man entering into life should accurately know. I believe, in brief, that he ought to know three things: First. Where he is. Secondly. Where he is going. Thirdly. What he had best do, under those circumstances”. Ruskin felt that when an individual could navigate his (or her) way in life, they were educated, if they couldn’t, they were uneducated. Such simplistic ideas appear to be gaining currency in our educational landscapes as secure long-term jobs disappear and students are expected to graduate capable of navigating a global landscape.

Previously, Author (2011; 2013) reintroduced the ideas of Heath (1964), connecting his past ideas about personal development to the extant E & E education literature, championing the notion of a graduate student capable of creating his or her own opportunities for satisfaction. An important outcome of this work is the visible connection between the E & E education literature and the extant character development literature (Dewey, 1922; Perry, 1970; Parker, 1978, Baxter-Magolda,

1998). Heath's (1964) ideal graduate, the reasonable adventurer, comprises six specific attributes: 1) intellectuality; 2) close friendships; 3) independence in value judgments; 4) a tolerance of ambiguity; 5) a breadth of interest; and 6) a sense of humor. Developed over time these attributes are argued to make it possible for graduates to create opportunities for satisfaction in their lives.

This single focus upon the needs of the individual student relative to the demands of their world is where E & E education must ensure it retains its primary focus. But this is no easy task. E & E education is constantly at risk of being hijacked by numerous external agendas that seek to make E & E education their servant. To break free from any such potential shackles and to position itself as something of great importance on the educational landscape, E & E education needs to reposition itself through the development of a distinctive and easily digestible language. A language that differentiates it from other fads and content-driven subject matter, whilst also strengthening the ties between E& E education and the broader educational literature.

4. A New Language For E & E Education

A challenge faced by many E & E education educators is being forced to justify their experiential education approaches on pedagogical grounds. Educators in the E & E education domain increasingly favor experiential education methods to allow their students to learn *for* and *through* enterprise learning, rather than merely *about* enterprise. That is, they seek to make many aspects of their historically traditional role redundant. However, they quite often are required to justify their privileging of experience, reflection and self-development ahead of the methodical digestion of organized subject matter. The challenge ultimately is one of being forced to reconcile our non-pedagogical practices to the traditional pedagogical logic of others.

Let me explain. In simple terms, pedagogy relates to the full range of decisions taken by an educator on behalf of his or her students. For example, the subject matter the students will encounter, the learning activities they will engage with, the type of assessment they will experience, the scheduling of materials, activities and assessments. Herein lies the problem. Frequently, E & E educators will invite students to co-create the learning experience. In the pursuit of self-directed learners and individual learning pathways, they will actively support a greater degree of student-driven decision making about required content, appropriate learning activities and even forms of required assessment. When this trust and customization is present, such an approach is not a *pure* form of pedagogy. Therefore, it should not be assessed from a strict pedagogical stance. Yet that is what frequently happens, and this works against the required appreciation of teaching methods used in E & E education, preventing institutional wide adoption of E & E education. The underlying problem being that we tend (as an academy) to naturally default to capturing all manner of teaching and learning practices from within pedagogical logic.

What is missing is the presence of an alternative form of language through which to account for non-pedagogical practices. At present, we are stuck at pretending apples and oranges can both be peeled with an apple peeler. The recent promotion of heutagogy (Hase & Kenyon, 2000; 2013) and more importantly, academagogy (McAuliffe & Winter, 2013) to the domain of E & E education by Author et al., (2014, p. 765) goes some way to addressing this issue. In drawing attention to heutagogical learning, the components of a potentially new type of conversation have developed. They also foresaw the need to connect such conversations around the scholarship of teaching (Boyer, 1990). Indeed, they noted, “we must be capable of explaining how we influence the transmission, transformation and extension of knowledge within the lives of our students”. This is the primary task of the day, to produce a distinctive dialogue that elevates our voice above the maddening crowds that also compete for attention in the education landscape.

In addition, we have been gifted the concepts from which to contemplate and ultimately assemble a distinctive dialogue. The pedagogy-andragogy-heutagogy (PAH) continuum outlined by Garnett and O'Beirne (2013) provides the starting blocks for us to proceed. It enables us to separate the apples from the oranges. Importantly, this starting point relocates pedagogical practice to the realm of the educator. It also introduces a place of equal importance for the student, that being heutagogical practice. In between these two positions is andragogical practice, the space for student-educator negotiations. Along this continuum we can place apples, oranges and the fusion of the various agreed combinations. When we deliberately choose to separate the roles, we can better ascribe roles and therefore appreciate in terms of the interaction, what the student and educator do together, and separately, to produce enterprise-learning outcomes.

To explain the nature of this process with an academic context, the idea of academagogy (McAuliffe & Winter, 2013) can be drawn upon. Here we are not concerned with pedagogy, andragogy or heutagogy taking a higher place of importance; their respective contributions are determined by the student's individual starting place, and ordered iteratively through a process of scholarly leading, or academagogy. The educator has an identifiable role that is more advanced than merely being described as a facilitator of experiential learning. They are engaged in a process of scholarly leading for the betterment of each individual student's learning outcomes. Having hopefully convinced you that pedagogy need not be placed on the highest available pedestal, we can now contemplate the need to construct a new language around academagogy so that each actor's roles can be fully understood.

5. Identifying New Roles

The introduction of heutagogy into our domain is an important moment of emancipation for enterprise educators struggling to justify their teaching practices. It provides the means to reorient the conversation into a neutral space where the *gogies* are equal. A space where the nature of the interaction required supporting the process of academagogy can be explained and understood. Not just by colleagues,

but also most importantly, by the students we desire to see take greater responsibility for their own learning. For without such clarity of communication, how will all the stakeholders understand the underlying logic, or the actual purpose of E & E education?

From a heutagogical perspective, there are many different stakeholders whose combined efforts support enterprise-learning outcomes. There is much excellent work being done in other educational fields where heutagogical approaches have become entrenched. Andrews (2014) outlines four design elements of a heutagogical approach. First, there is a flexible approach to the curriculum that is guided by learner-generated pathways. We accept learning can occur anywhere/anytime. Second, we need agile approaches to assessment where the learner and educator co-construct assessment processes. For example, success criteria can be negotiated and also include self-reflection alongside goal-setting behaviours. Third, the nature of enquiry must be authentic and learners should seek creative solutions to real problems and opportunities that are found in their lives. Fourth, Heutagogy implies contracts, through which accountability and awareness exist side-by-side.

So, the educator is not always the leader in the first instance. Their role will vary from student situation to student situation. Thus, the educator is able to focus time and energy in ways that can help those students who most require assistance and guidance and work closely with other more self-directed students. What is of great importance is the recognition that we don't simply assume students just become self-directed. In this approach, where students have a self-determined orientation, their learning trajectories are mapped out with the educator so that agreement is formed around content focus, learning activities and assessment processes. The by-product of such agreement is a self-directed student who understands how their learning relates to their motivations and personal development.

If we can conceive an educational landscape where there is quite a degree of fluidity and interchange between educator, student and their communities, we can better embrace these ideas. For example, an educator might require students take action on something they feel a (heartfelt) connection to. So while the educator has introduced a framework for action, it is the student who determines how and where this activity will unfold. Once the student has identified a context there is a need to negotiate the manner in which the activity will proceed, the goals sought, and the means of formative and summative processes to be used to guide the learning process. In this example, the activity is pedagogically *seeded*, and heutagogically *imagined*, and then andragogically *performed*. Again, we have new components for our new language. We have educators *seeding* opportunities for students to *imagine*, *negotiate* and then *perform*. We have students proposing forms of *community interaction* and *resource acquisition*. We have *accountability* attached directly to *performance* not memorization. Most importantly, we have enrolled the students' hearts and their minds. We have energy focused outwardly, not inwardly. We have learning outcomes (in a traditional sense) across each cohort related to *divergent learning processes*, not a singular learning processes. We have broad *student choice* rather than merely narrow educator choice.

Most importantly, we have an educational process built on authentic learning processes. We have passionate educators helping self-motivated passionate students, who together interact passionately with their respective local communities. We must go beyond simple notions of flipping classrooms (Bergmann & Sams, 2012) if we are to make headway on these matters. We must be prepared to recast the roles of all actors and assist and support all actors to understand the nature of their required behaviours. Essentially, I am talking about breaking the rules of one of the oldest games in town. I am arguing for the recognition that such change will not occur without significant change within educational institutions.

I suspect that to achieve this change we may need to demonstrate the value and practicality of heutagogy outside the curriculum first before we can then fully develop this approach for E & E education within the curriculum. I would propose, a competency-based approach where our students, in advance of their enterprising actions, know the skills and knowledge bases against which they will be assessed. So we would have students, following their hearts, engaging in authentic learning actions that can be reconciled to known and agreed learning outcomes. This approach would lessen the coordination and resources concerns that could be expected from supporting students pedagogically. It's the students' learning, their projects and thus, they need to become responsible for make it happen, and most importantly, demonstrating to the educators' satisfaction that the project and the learning have occurred.

6. Recruiting From Within

To paraphrase Clark Kerr (1963), E & E education is at a hinge of history: while connected to its past, it is capable of swinging in another direction. As custodians of this domain, we must do better than merely cataloguing the teaching methods of our educators. We must elevate and never lose sight of the overarching purpose of E & E education. It has been argued that the changing structure of employment markets globally is forcing our hand. Every student must graduate as an enterprising individual capable of creating opportunities for satisfaction. Stated another way, the purpose of E & E education is to transform students into individuals with a capacity for self-negotiated action. In an educational context the word transform should not be used lightly. Within in this paper it describes those moments experienced in great depth that awaken new perceptions, develop new abilities, and ultimately render the world different to our students' eyes (Hart, 2001).

We must be mindful of our desire for our students to be highly reflexive (Pepin, 2012), to be creative thinkers (Penaluna & Penaluna, 2009; 2011), and capable to of managing their enterprising ideas (Bridge, 2013). While these may be logical, indeed noble outcomes, we need to stay focused on what lays at the heart of such

aspirations. In its simplest form, E & E education should start with and remain focused on the growth that emerges in an individual as they interact with their world in new ways, having been supported to do so. From this perspective E & E education cannot be captured in neat ways; it is the magic dust that brings the mundane to life. It is a student's uncommon interest in the commonplace (Author, 2011); it is the inner belief that emerges in educators and students who develop greater empathy and appreciation of each other's roles.

It has been argued that the ideas of heutagogy, academagogy and andragogy offer a pragmatic way for enterprise educators to reengineer their teaching practices. To bring new excitement and hope into their students' learning. To personalize this learning (Bray & McClaskey, 2015) in ways that develops learning expertise in students. To encourage the learner to not merely take responsibility for set tasks, but to actually co-design the tasks, and to negotiate assessment processes. In a sense we are referring to meaning-centred education (Kovbasyuk & Blessinger, 2013, p. 3) "where educational practices are not limited to preset curricular endpoints and standards". A place where students should be given the opportunity to transcend ideas and concepts (Hart, 2001) that matter most to the reality they are experiencing. It is not about trying to teach the unteachable, but rather, allowing students to learn the learnable.

Nothing that has been stated here is dependent upon knowledge of and appreciation of business contexts. Provocatively, we stand to gain more from checking the business context in the corridor before we seek to expand the reach of E & E education across our institutions. The starting space for E & E education does not assume a business context; it starts with the passions and interests that lay within each student's heart. We can enroll various business contexts as and when we need them, but to position the business context in the foreground initially is to put the cart before the horse. If develop a student-centric focus we can recruit support for E & E education across every faculty and school. We can become increasingly relevant to all when we start with the aspirations of individual students, and respond via a

process of academagogy. In this way, we can recruit fellow educators in all disciplines to work alongside us, recruiting from within. Recruiting support for E & E education as we demonstrate its relevance and importance to students scattered throughout learning institutions the world over.

7. Conclusion

Alfred Whitehead (1929, pp. 1-2) once said that, “in training a child to activity of thought, above all things we must be beware of what I will call ‘inert ideas’—that is to say, ideas that are merely received into the mind without being utilized, or tested, or thrown into fresh combinations”. Further stating that, “every intellectual revolution which has ever stirred humanity into greatness has been a passionate protest against inert ideas”. E & E education is by its very nature a protest against inert ideas. As a domain we continue to drift away from textbooks, preferring authentic forms experiential education. This paper has been deliberately provocative. Building on the ideas of Author et al., (2014), a call is being made for an intellectual revolution around what is seem as normal behaviour for both students and educators alike. At a time when higher education stands accused of failing graduates (Arum & Roksa, 2014) we increasingly are offering authentic educational experiences to all types of students. There is an imperative to such wishful thinking, and this is greatly influenced by the relentless shadow of technology that increasingly falls darkly across our educational landscapes. The predictions of Carney (2015) and Christensen et al., (2008) are gloomy. Yet the fresh ideas of Price (2013) offer much food for thought.

On one hand, the concept of the university of everywhere (Carney, 2015) threatens the very survival of many universities globally. The premise being that once a well-know university brand makes core course offerings universally available to all; the underlying business model of most universities will dissolve. Alternatively, Price (2013) draws attention to a new type of learner, the authentic digital native, to whom universities must adapt their practices towards to ensure they are engaged and satisfied. I am neither a pessimist nor optimist, but rather a possibilist, preferring to imagine a world were students, educators, communities and universities exchange

new forms of value from each other. I see E & E education being at the epicenter of this evolving landscape.

We may not easily be able to unite globally to hold hands and project a visible face for what E & E education might become. However, we can examine our own practices and the needs of our students and create change from within. We can start conversations with colleagues in other disciplines and invite ourselves into the lives of their students. We can bring about change in this way. To do so effectively, we need to unite around the development of a common language for E & E education. We need to develop legitimacy for heutagogy and academagogy. We need to help other stakeholders understand their potential roles. This work has started, it is exciting and the feedback so far has been overwhelmingly positive. The future of E & E education is in our hands, we have the opportunity to create opportunities for all.

8. References

- Andrews, J. (2014) "From obstacle to opportunity: Using government-mandated curriculum change as a springboard for changes in learning and teaching", in Blaschke, L., Kenyon, C. & Hase, S. (Eds.), *Experiences in Self-Determined Learning*, CreateSpace Independent Publishing: New York.
- Arum, R. & Roksa, J. (2014) *Aspiring Adults Adrift: Tentative Transitions of College Graduates*, University of Chicago Press: London.
- Author, C. (2011) *Teaching Entrepreneurship to Postgraduates*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham.
- Author, C. (2013) *Teaching Entrepreneurship to Undergraduates*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham.
- Author, C., Matlay, H., Penaluna, K. & Penaluna, A. (2014) "Claiming the future of enterprise education", *Education + Training*, 56(8/9): pp. 764-775.
- Baxter-Magolda, M. (1998) "Developing self-authorship in young adult life", *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(2): pp. 143-156.
- Bergmann, J. & Sams, A. (2012) *Flip Your Classroom*, International Society for Technology in Education: Oregon.
- Boyer, E. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, Carnegie Foundation: New Jersey.
- Bray, B. & McClaskey, K. (2015) *Making Learning Personal*, Corwin: Singapore.
- Bridge, S. (2013) "Reflections on the omission of social capital from enterprise education and business start training", *Education + Training*, 55(8/9): pp. 899-910.
- Carney, K. (2015) *The End of College*, Riverhead Books: New York.
- Christensen, C., Horn, M. & Johnson, C. (2008) *Disrupting Class: How Disruptive Innovation will Change the Way the World Learns*, McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Dewey, J. (1922) *Human Nature and Conduct*, Henry Holt and Company, New York.

Eliot, C. (1869) "The new education", *The Atlantic*, 23(136): pp. 203-221.

Garnett, F. & O'Beirne, R. (2013) "Putting heutagogy into learning" in Hase, S. & Kenyon, C. (Eds.), *Self-Determined Learning*, Bloomsbury: London.

Hart, T. (2001) *From Information to Transformation*, Peter Lang: New York.

Hase, S. & Kenyon, C. (2000) *From Andragogy to Heutagogy*, Ultibase: Melbourne.

Hase, S. & Kenyon, C. (2013) *Self-Determined Learning*, Bloomsbury: London.

Heath, R. (1964) *The Reasonable Adventurer*, Pittsburgh University Press: Pittsburgh.

Kerr, C. (1963) *The Uses of the University*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge: MA.

Kovbasyuk, O. & Blessinger, P. (2013) "The nature and origins of meaning-centred education", in Kovbasyuk, O. & Blessinger, P. (Eds.), *Meaning-Centred Education*, Routledge: London.

McAuliffe, M. & Winter, A. (2013) "Distance education and the application of academagogy: a case study", *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 1(2): pp. 1-15.

Moe, T. and Chubb, J. (2009) *Liberating Learning*, Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Parker, C. A. (1978) *Encouraging Development in College Students*, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis.

Penaluna, A. and Penaluna, K. (2009) "Business paradigms in Einstellung: Harnessing creative mindsets, A Creative Industries Perspective", *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 21(2): pp. 231-250.

Penaluna, A. and Penaluna, K. (2011) "The evidence so far: Calling for creative industries engagement with entrepreneurship education policy and development", in Henry, C. and de Bruin A (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship and the Creative Economy: Process, Practice and Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 50-78.

Pepin, M. (2012) "Enterprise education: a Deweyan perspective", *Education + Training*, 54(8/9): pp. 801-812.

Perry, W. (1970) *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme*, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston: New York.

Price, D. (2013) *Open: How we'll Work, Live and Learn in the Future*, Crux Publishing: London.

QAA (2012) Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education - Enterprise and entrepreneurship: a new approach to learning. available at: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Newsroom/PressReleases/Pages/Enterprise-and-entrepreneurship-a-new-approach-to-learning.aspx>, (accessed 6 April 2012).

Ruskin, J. (1917) *The Stones of Venice*, J. M. Dent: London.

Wagner, T. (2008) *The Global Achievement Gap*, Basic Books: New York.

Whitehead, A. (1929) *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*, Free Press: New York.