AARHUS UNIVERSITY

Coversheet

This is the accepted manuscript (post-print version) of the article.

Contentwise, the post-print version is identical to the final published version, but there may be differences in typography and layout.

How to cite this publication

Please cite the final published version:

Neergaard, H., & Christensen, D. R. (2017). Breaking the Waves: Routines and Rituals in Entrepreneurship Education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 31(2), 90-100. DOI: 10.1177/0950422217692479

Publication metadata

Title:	Breaking the Waves: Routines and Rituals in Entrepreneurship Education
Author(s):	Neergaard, H., & Christensen, D. R.
Journal:	<i>Industry and Higher Education</i>
DOI/Link:	10.1177/0950422217692479
Document version:	Accepted manuscript (post-print)

General Rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Breaking the Waves: Routines and Rituals in Entrepreneurship Education

Helle Neergaard, PhD

Professor in Entrepreneurship
Aarhus University
Bartholinsallé 10
8000 Aarhus C
Denmark

Dorthe Refslund Christensen, PhD

Associate Professor
Jens Chr. Skousvej 2, 1485/539
Aarhus University
8000 Aarhus C
Denmark

Objectives

Learning is related to the environment created for the learning experience. This learning environment is often highly routinized and involves a certain social structure but in entrepreneurship education such routinization and structure may actually counteract the learning goals. The purpose of this paper is therefore to investigate how classroom routines and rituals impact on entrepreneurship education in order to problematize how existing classroom environments may hinder critical learning experiences from taking place.

Prior work

Previously, rituals have predominantly been examined with an emphasis on religious aspects, structures and values of society. Rituals are actions that we undertake with a particular observance, which makes them special and creates structures of order, providing a feeling of security through familiarity. Rituals further help create social relationships and they may even have an *'identity shaping dimension in that they establish order by creating social feelings ensuring unity through emotional and symbolic dimensions'*. Many rituals used in the classroom originate from behaviourism but in entrepreneurship education we often replace these with new ones.

Approach

The paper builds on extensive insight from six cohorts of students at two Scandinavian universities over a four-year period (2012-2015). The data was procured using an experiential-explorative research approach in which the researchers were personally involved in reflective processes as co-learners.

Findings

The findings illustrate how educators can use rituals actively to change how students learn. However, students are very wary of embracing new structures and rituals, indeed, some feel so comfortable with the old rituals that they would prefer not to change from the old way of just being receivers of knowledge to becoming co-creators of the learning situation. It is therefore important to exchange existing rituals with new ones that enhance the feeling of safety and involve the students in creating the change. This is achieved through scaffolding and setting up ritual markers, which are continuously repeated.

Value and implications

We describe rituals as both a scaffold and a marker. The scaffold approach results in less unease with the introduction of new ways of doing things. Ritualization markers used to emphasize how the learning environment functions, decouple existing routines and create new rituals, further help students feel safe. If the ritual room is installed properly then it can provide a safe space for experimentation.

Key words: Enterprise Education; Routines; Rituals; Scaffolds; Markers

Breaking the Waves: Routines and Rituals in Entrepreneurship Education

Helle Neergaard, PhD

Professor in Entrepreneurship
Aarhus University
Bartholinsallé 10
8000 Aarhus C
Denmark

Dorthe Refslund Christensen, PhD

Associate Professor
Jens Chr. Skousvej 2, 1485/539
Aarhus University
8000 Aarhus C
Denmark

Introduction

Universities are institutions, which as a key part of their activities provide rooms for the purpose of teaching and learning. However, according to Blunden and Arnold (2006) most university management have a conception of teaching and learning, which reflects a centuries old, unchanging conception of how university education should be undertaken. These traditional ways of teaching do not stimulate entrepreneurship or entrepreneurial learning (Gibb 2002; Sogunro 2004). The norm is the lecture, which takes place in a theatre style room with fixed tables around a 'scene'. Indeed, Thielens (1987) found that generally, independent of subject, size of class, level of education, faculty (college and university professors) tend to lecture.

Learning is, however, not only related to the form of presentation but to the whole environment created for the learning experience. When we are developing new forms of enterprise education, focus is often on didactics in terms of target groups, learning goals and content or on changing the pedagogy in terms of the learning process, student involvement or teacher-student interaction, but rarely on changing the learning environment in terms of physical environment, technical support systems or institutional setting. There is an abundant literature on entrepreneurship/ enterprise¹ education and there seems to be a broad consensus that the learning 'through' model provides the 'best' learning opportunities for students in higher education (Rae 2004; Cooper et al 2004; Cope 2005). Despite the broad consensus on the advantages of learning through, the context in which this type of learning takes place has been overlooked, even though learning through involves present-oriented, real-world learning – which is a model for teaching, which breaks radically from the 'received' model of lecturing which involves past-oriented, classroom-fixed lecturing (Gibb 1987).

Moreover, students learn both passively and actively. Passive learning takes place when students do not directly participate in the learning process, but are passive recipients of instruction (Cross 1987), which is mostly the case in the classical classroom-fixed lecturing. They become what could be termed *receptacles of knowledge* and according to Brown (1992) educators are mere classroom managers. Active learning, on the other hand, will more likely take place when students are doing things (Ryan and Martens 1989:20), a central characteristic of learning through. Though the term "active learning" has never been precisely defined in educational literature, some general characteristics are commonly associated with this term: (i) students are involved in more than listening, (ii) there is less emphasis placed on the transmission of information and more on developing students' skills, (iii) students are involved in "higher-order thinking" (analysis, synthesis, evaluation), (iv) students are engaged in activities other than listening, and (v) emphasis is placed on student attitudes and values. These characteristics rhyme very nicely with what enterprise education attempts to achieve – and there is an abundant literature on entrepreneurship/ enterprise education and the advantages of learning 'through' (Rae 2000; Gibb, 1987; Cope 2005; Blenker et

¹ We are deliberately using these two terms interchangeably although we are aware that there is a discussion in the literature on the potential differences (see e.g. Gibb 1993 for a more extensive explanation).

al 2012). Indeed, ‘learning through’ tends to break radically with the ‘received’ model of lecturing as being more learner-centred. As Chickering and Gamson (1987:4) state:

Learning is not spectator sport. Students do not learn much just by sitting in class listening to teachers, memorizing pre-packaged assignments, and spitting out answers. They must talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences, apply it to their daily lives. They must make what they learn part of themselves.

Heinonen and Poikkijoki (2006:84) stress that, “the special challenge of entrepreneurship education is the facilitation of learning to support the entrepreneurial process”, and that traditional methods do not facilitate this. Furthermore, Lowman (1984) observe that to develop students’ thinking skills, faculty must create a supportive intellectual and emotional environment *that encourages students to take risks*. However, enterprise education is typically situated within existing study programmes at existing universities, hence, the learning environment is often already highly routinized and involves a given social structure. Therefore, students may act on already existing, underlying knowledge structures, such as pre-instructional conceptions and frameworks or ‘the collateral learning in the way of formation of enduring attitudes’ obtained through prior learning (Dewey, 1938/1998:49). These pre-conceptions may act as a barrier to embracing enterprising action and therefore need to be de-learned before it is possible to replace them with new knowledge structures (Mauer et al 2009). Existing routinization and structure may thus actually counteract the learning goals embraced by enterprise education. The purpose of this paper is therefore to explore two questions related to the interaction between enterprise education and learning environment:

- Q1. *What happens when enterprise educators replace existing routines in the classroom with a conscious use of ritualization in order to create critical learning experiences?*
- Q2. *How can educators provide scaffolding and markers to assist the assimilation of new rituals during a course?*

In the following we will therefore first explore what the literature establishes as the main differences between traditional education and entrepreneurship/enterprise education. We will then highlight how understanding rituals can help us in delivering knowledge in ways that motivates the students and help them learn in ways that last beyond the time of delivery. We show how a conscious replacement of old routines with new rituals may assist teachers and students in (co)creating critical learning experiences, and we provide suggestions for how this may be achieved.

Prior knowledge

Much of the literature operates with three overall types of entrepreneurship education: about, for or through entrepreneurship (see e.g. Hannon 2005). Teaching *about* entrepreneurship reflects the traditional university approach to most subject matters and emphasizes learning the theory underlying the phenomenon of entrepreneurship; also called understanding entrepreneurship (Heinonen and Poikkijoki 2006). The link between what is taught and the students’ envisioned later engagement in entrepreneurial activity is therefore only implicit. Teaching *for* entrepreneurship prepares individuals for enacting an entrepreneurial life by providing the necessary skills for entrepreneurship, e.g. accounting or marketing skills become entrepreneurial; to become entrepreneurial (Heinonen and Poikkijoki 2006). Teaching about and teaching for courses generally follow the same format, where students sit in rows facing the teacher, potentially with each their computer in front of them. Finally, teaching *through* entrepreneurship invokes the idea that students must engage in hands-on activities relevant to the practice of entrepreneurship to learn entrepreneurial competencies: to become an entrepreneur (Heinonen and Poikkijoki 2006; Fiet

2001). These hands-on activities are generally interpreted as going through the process of actually starting a business for the sole purpose of learning. However, more recently researchers have proposed that learning from experience does not only mean learning *by* doing, but also learning *from* doing (Günzel-Jensen et al 2016; Olilla and Middleton, 2011). Thus, the typology of about, for, through gains an added from. The ‘from’ entails two elements: (i) mimicking entrepreneurial behaviour and (ii) that in order to learn, students have to reflect on what they do in order to understand what is going on and what alternative routes for action they have for the next steps. In other words, students have to engage in sense-making – the process by which individuals make sense of experience (Weick et al, 2005). Importantly, as illustrated above there are different routines involved depending on which approach is chosen and it is important that we understand the classroom as a ‘ritual room’.

It would seem logical that the easiest approach to adopt in a traditional university setting is the ‘about’ because this approach follows the regimented and well-accepted rules; however, the further we remove ourselves from the traditional approach, the closer we come to what could be termed real-life experiences. In doing so, we also break with tradition (e.g. science is generally decoupled from real-life), and the rituals (routines) that we are familiar with. When we break with these it is important to understand that we have to create new rituals to replace them because one of the basic functions of a ritual is the inevitable framing that place the activity at hand within a *subjunctive mode*, within which reality can be (re-)negotiated (Seligman *et al* 2008). At the same time, the *frames* that a ritual provides of certain excluded and included behaviours within the ritual space (here: the learning environment) are pointing to and supporting new ways of social behaviour (Bateson 1972; Sjørlev 2007). In order to understand how to facilitate this process we deem it fertile to look to those fields that deal with creating a platform for students where they feel safe to experiment with an entrepreneurial identity.

Rituals have traditionally been analysed by both anthropologists and scholars in the science of religion. Within these two traditions there are huge differences in the interpretation of rituals; however, in this paper we rely on insight from both disciplines. From early on, the debate on the origin and essence of religion arose from evolutionism in early social sciences and the humanities. Scholars within these disciplines have preoccupied themselves with analysing the role of rituals in relation to myth, psychology, emotion, language, symbols, as well as in social function, structure and ecology. Although many of these early ritual studies established ritual as both a central sociological concept and a universal category in social life (cf. Bell 1992), it was not until the late 1970s that a growing interest in secular ritual outside its original setting of religion, led scholars in various fields to analyse ritual, e.g. in theatre (Turner 1977; 1982), performance (Schechner 1977; 1987; Schechner and Appel 1989), media and communication studies (Couldry, 2003; Carey, 1989, in everyday life (Sumiala 2013) and, as part of this also to studying ritual as ‘simply’ a way of performing social practice (Bell 1992, 1997; Seligman et al 2008).

Taking the study of ritual outside of its original research context has made it clear that it is very productive to approach ritual as a broader cultural category, as a mode of social and cultural practice, closely related to identity work, community building and installing certain kinds of frames and structures – also in modern social life. Bell (1997:168) defined a ritual – or ritualization (the performance of a ritual) – as ‘*the simple imperative to do something in such a way that the doing itself gives the acts a privileged status*’. Humphrey and Laidlaw (1994:100), in line with this, argued that ritualization depends on a change of commitment, a shift from ordinary intentions with an act to a certain mode of intentionality that transcends the everyday meaning of an act, into an act that can mean something entirely different, and can be performed with a certain awareness and

focus (ibid: 90). Indeed, some of the power of rituals lie in the fact that these are carried out within, for instance, a certain cultural tradition, which stipulates the action in such a way that the performer of the ritual has a strong sense of *not* being the author of the ritual (Humphrey and Laidlaw: 96); that he or she, when going into a ritual mode, is just performing this “as it goes”. Bell (1997:168) formulates this sense of ritual being as “natural” as a certain relation of the present and the past and that ways of the past guide the actual present ritual performance.

Although this paper is inspired by these arguments, the basic conditions differ, since the task is actually to invent new rituals or, perhaps more correctly, to turning certain acts and ways of doing things into ritualized actions: The idea is that the use of ritualization in the classroom can (i) create a safe yet explorative environment; (ii) that rituals can provide scaffolding structures for replacing old forms and norms with new ones in teaching, and, that (iii) ritualization may also be used in teaching students to sense and evaluate their own progress in a course. Many practices and routines in the classroom have originated from behaviourism (Robinson et al 2016). In enterprise education, however, we often deliberately seek to break these routines in order to facilitate ‘learning through’ or ‘learning from’. Reframing the performance of non-conscious or sub-conscious routines into a number of new ritualized actions and making students feel safe about and to actually practice these rituals will, initially frame or reframe – to use Bateson’s ideas (Bateson 1972) – the teaching-learning environment into a new kind of socio-cultural arena with a new set of roles and practices in which to engage. Eventually, these will turn into a new naturalized ‘tradition’, new routines. As we all know, changing an accepted routine will often meet with disapproval or even direct resistance, particularly if the individuals involved cannot see the immediate improvement or benefit from such a change. According to Collins (2004:48) the establishment of successful new rituals involves four elements: (i) the physical co-presence of two or more actors; (ii) barriers to outsiders (feelings of group membership); (iii) a common focus of attention on the activity in question; (iv) and a shared mood. In our work in the classroom, we therefore have to identify how to invoke these four elements early in the educational experience. Further, we find it productive to distinguish between two mutually inclusive kinds of ritualizing: First, *scaffolding* involves the kinds of acts that can help students (and educator) navigate and re-frame their own understanding of what is going on in the classroom by introducing and rehearsing a number of new ways, thus addressing (i and ii) above; while second, *markers* involve making clear, what is gained by these new acts, by explicitly pointing them out or explaining them, addressing (iii) and (iv) above.

Method and research approach

A number of methods have been developed to study student conceptions and learning processes. Most of these methods are of qualitative nature and originate in qualitative social studies (Fetterman et al 1988). In particular, ethnography has a long tradition within education research. According to Erickson (1985) to conduct interpretive research in teaching, intense and long-term participant observation in the particular educational setting is required, followed by deliberate and long-term reflection on what was observed. This requirement is fulfilled in the present research as this research builds on extensive insight from six cohorts of students at two Scandinavian universities over a four-year period (2012-2015). The data was procured using an experiential-explorative research approach in which one of the researchers was personally involved in reflective processes as co-learners (Kyrö et al 2009). The *experiential* part denotes that the researchers know about and understand things and events through direct engagement, hence incorporates the actual experience itself along with the meanings attributed to the experience by the teacher experiencing it. The *explorative* part involves that given our knowledge as researchers we can explore and analyse the meanings that we attribute to these events in more depth and relate them to theory. Indeed, Erickson (1985) comments that such a detailed scrutiny of everyday teaching routines is a valid route to

improving educational practices. There is currently scant evidence of this approach being used in entrepreneurship education.

The illustrative data consisted of participant observation, learning logs, videos, and narrative essays from close to 150 students (distributed with between 15 and 34 students in each class). Classes were organized as 7 x 4 lectures and all students were required to hand in reflection logs after each class, totalling more than 1000 learning logs. In addition to the participant observation, which was documented in the format of a diary, a sub-sample of these, that in particular addressed student reactions to the changes in the classroom, was included as data, as not all students reflected on the changes in the classroom and the ways of teaching. We have thus followed a Piagetian inspired research strategy, in that we have used detailed and systematic observation of the students and their interaction with and in their environment, as well as student perceptions as captured in their learning logs, and not with questionnaires, which is the usual medium for gathering student perceptions (Opdenakker and Minnaert 2011). Students gave consent to the use of the information in anonymised form.

We divided the data according to four central characteristics of the physical learning environment: (i) context, (ii) content, (iii) process, and (iv) purpose. The four characteristics did not derive from the data but are anchored in the requirements for a course description at the authors' university. We have thus allowed a prior theoretical understanding to play a role in how we have worked with the data. These elements have to be considered each time an educator produces a new course description and students' pre-understanding of what the learning experience contains is influenced by the course descriptions. Using data from the observations above, we account for what was done in the classroom, illustrated with students' experiences of moving from old routines to new rituals, thus answering the first research question. Figure 1 below illustrates the four elements and associated dimensions.

Figure 1: The four central dimensions and characteristics of the learning environment

Findings

The findings are organized according to the four characteristics, first addressing context and content, then process and purpose. Based on educator experiences from the classroom, table 1-4 exemplifies

the move from the traditional classroom teaching (the old habits) to the introduction of new entrepreneurial teaching rituals (shedding the habits) using scaffolding and markers, thus answering how scaffolding and markers can be used in the entrepreneurial classroom.

Context and course setting

Context and course setting are constituted by the learning environment; the place in which the learning activities take place. Classroom design is mainly researched at elementary and secondary level, and if discussed for higher education it mainly addresses how the classroom integrates technology in the best possible way (REF). Indeed, there is little research on the problem of designing physical spaces for teaching and learning (Blunden and Arnold 2006) even though it is an influential dimension because classroom setup controls what type of interaction between teacher and student is possible. Classroom design consists of the physical classroom and all the instructional features and teaching devices, and it is not possible to achieve the same type of interaction in a traditional lecture theatre as in a classroom where e.g. you can move tables and chairs about. In entrepreneurship, however, it is critical that the context is designed to reflect the complexity of students' future task environment and if the teaching takes place in an ordinary classroom, this can be changed in small ways to support a different pedagogy. Indeed, the classroom spaces provided by universities rarely lend themselves easily to the type of activities involved in learning from doing since they tend to be arranged for teacher-centred methods of instructions. They have either fixed tables and chairs or tables and chairs that are difficult to move around to facilitate small or large group work. Hanrahan (1998) found that teacher-centred methods of instruction constrain both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation because they promote passive learning. According to Cross (1987:4) '*when students are actively involved in ... learning ... they learn more than when they are passive recipients of instruction*'.

Table 1 Context and course setting

TRADITIONAL TEACHING: ROUTINE	'Old' habits and grips	Traditional classroom set-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher centred - Students sitting with each their laptops.
ENTREPRENEURIAL TEACHING: NEW RITUALS	Scaffolding	Introducing new forms and structures, for instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moving tables out and establishing circle of chairs in the middle - Replacing computers with pen and paper - Making students sit at smaller tables with their working groups.
	Markers	Making clear to all that new ways are introduced; what is going on; what roles to take on, for instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - De-centralizing and democratizing responsibility of what is going on in the classroom - Getting the students to articulate the reasons underlying the changes.
OUTPUT/GOAL: ENTREPRENEURIAL ROUTINES	New naturalized routines	Learner-centred set-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students take responsibility in co-creating the framing of the teaching-learning environment.

Traditional set up: with tables in rows, one student behind and next to another, sometimes in auditorium where tables cannot even be moved. Students hide behind their computers and the lecturer cannot control whether they are on Facebook or actually following the teaching. Lecturer stands in front of black/whiteboard.

New set up: a circle of chairs with students facing each other and the lecturer is part of the circle. Students are only allowed a notebook and a pen. Computers (preferably) stay in their bags. Lecturer sits among the students. The lecturer becomes a facilitator, coach or consultant rather than a teacher.

Marker: students help set up the circle at the beginning of class and put the tables back in the traditional way before leaving the classroom again.

Scaffolding: (i) asking the students ‘why are we sitting in this new way?’ They pinpoint that the dialogue is limited in the traditional setting and the fact that they can see each other’s faces is a huge advantage; (ii) it changes the hierarchy that the lecturer sits among the students – students address each other as much as the lecturer; (iii) the class starts with students telling everyone else who they are, where they come from and why they are there – even though they cannot remember it all later, they feel ‘safe’ because they feel part of a group: one student remarks: “*After the beginning we had to present briefly ourselves. This was interesting because even if I forgot more than a half of the presentations, I remembered some of them which made me curious to learn more about it, especially the ones who have already had an experience of launching a company or are trying right now to develop one. We are lucky to have so much different profile in our group.*” Another student remarks: *the learning environment was inspiring and relaxing and I was able to leave everything else outside the classroom.*

Content and learning mode

Content and learning mode are concerned with the pedagogy of the class such as mode of instruction, participation (individual/groups) and actual material used in class, e.g. textbooks, articles, power points etc. Most existing literature concerned with content and learning mode mainly compares traditional content to the use of blended learning in terms of the advantages of e-learning.

E-learning and blended learning is usually used with a view to optimizing learning outcome and cost of delivery; that is saving money on teaching (Singh and Reed, 2001). Although integrating various IT-based instructional modes of learning may be advantageous in some contexts, and facilitates the cooperation of dispersed students, e-learning tends to distance the educator/facilitator from the student and students from each other. Nevertheless, mixing instructional modes takes into consideration that students may have diverse ways of learning and drawing on IT as a transmission medium invokes familiarity.

Materials do not teach, but provide support for the student’s learning process. Hence it is important to design content for the purpose of the process. Generally speaking, one becomes better at doing something with practice, so if it is only the educator who gets to present, it is only the educator who becomes an expert. Thus, it is important to choose forms of engagement in which the students get to practice.

According to von Glaserfeldt (1989) teamwork stimulates learning because other people may challenge our own, current views. A classroom should therefore be a learning community in which ideas are discussed and understanding enriched not only between the lecturer and the student but also among students. Students need to become each other’s primary sparring partners or colleagues and learn to respect each other’s knowledge and competencies. Far too often, students refer to the imagined lack of competencies in their peers as the reason for wanting the teacher to instruct them.

Table 2 Content and learning mode

TRADITIONAL TEACHING: ROUTINE	‘Old’ habits and grips	Repeated structure: Teacher as ‘oracle’ Power point provided upfront by teacher and used for presentations in class. Textbook or theory articles Students listen passively and take notes.
ENTREPRENEURIAL TEACHING: NEW RITUALS	Scaffolding	Variation of new structures, for instance: Repeating the new structure in each class so students know exactly what the agenda is Establishing a dialogue between teacher and students Making students become each others’ primary points of reference When asked a question turning it to a point of reflection for the students and helping them to provide answers Making clear at all times what they learn through the different processes.
	Markers	Actually changing content and forms from classroom to learning-facilitating environment: Articulating and explaining the new but precise structure of course Helping students to understand the power of actual participation Helping students to understand what they gain from the educators move to facilitator rather than teacher.
OUTPUT/GOAL: ENTREPRENEURIAL ROUTINES	New naturalized routines	A variety of new ways, for instance: Teacher as facilitator Power point inputs always secondary and post-class Using an untraditional ‘textbook’ + theory articles Limited time spent on traditional lecturing Students contributing through enacting theory in practice, assignments, portfolio, café models, peer-to-peer evaluation.

Traditional content: mode of instruction is the lecture. The educator, who is the know-it-all oracle, presents textbook or theoretical article content. Students work individually to avoid the potential for cheating. Participation is individual.

New activities: if a textbook is used, it is used as a basis for working with theory-in-practice e.g. through a real-life case. If theory is presented, students who take turns to present their learning in groups present it. The theory is further illustrated through in-classroom and out-of-classroom activities where students have to work with the theory through interventions. Thus, students are engaging with the material being learned (Stark et al 1988:95).

Marker: the lecturer introduces the theoretical material using You-tube videos or other untraditional formats and materials and argues for the choice of this particular approach. Students can use e.g. wikis as a medium for working on and sharing material. Students are required to form self-selected groups or are placed in groups and work in these groups.

Scaffolding: students developed presentations in their group work where they relate ‘theory to practice’. Each presentation is discussed in the plenary. One student remarks: “*The case was interesting since all the notions we learned could be applied on the case, giving more understanding into what they mean in reality.*”

Process and course structure

Process and course structure concerns the didactics of learning, the educational style adopted in order to engage student's mind. A pre-specification of what the student needs to study may work against triggering the internal motivation. According to Fink (2013) it is important to create critical learning experiences in order for students to feel ownership of the learning process.

Table 3 Process and course structure

TRADITIONAL TEACHING: ROUTINE	'Old' habits and grips	Repeated structure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Read-listen-learn - Feedback by teacher
ENTREPRENEURIAL TEACHING: NEW RITUALS	Scaffolding	Variation of new structures increasing students' possibilities of acting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Games, café models, peer-to-peer feedback, collaboration with relevant external partners
	Markers	Teaching-learning as a shared effort <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage, instil passion, courage, exhilaration, cooperation, tolerance, ambiguity and openness towards one another - Make students share results generously - Creating, selecting and preparing tasks, experiences and activities, preparing resources, performance of tasks, roles and responsibilities - Assessment and feedback on learning - Read-experience-learn - Students become co-creators of the learning process – experiential learning • Feed forward or ipsative feedback: reflect on learning
OUTPUT/GOAL: ENTREPRENEURIAL ROUTINES	New naturalized routines	Inclusion and broadness of horizons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher and students are both professional and human beings with interests, feelings, passions and agendas and these are always present in the teaching-learning environment

Traditional approach: task oriented and procedural.

New approach: The process is designed to give the student ownership of the learning process. One way of doing this is to let students choose their own material. Hence, process becomes intricately linked to content. Students get to lectures without power point, theory is learnt through participating in activities and co-creating the learning experience by discussing the theory in connection with the activities they have to undertake. The students prepare by reading theory and applying it to practice or analysis? Students are required to keep a reflection log documenting their learning process and provide opportunity for meta-reflecting on it.

Marker: the lecturer explains why the learning process is structured the way it is, drawing on research which shows what types of teaching produces which forms of learning. The lecturer also uses two pictures as metaphors for the two teaching methods: one of a mother bird feeding its chick by regurgitation and the other of a mother hen feeding its chick by pushing the corn into the path of the chick.

Scaffolding: all lectures follow the same structure with the same four elements: (i) discussion of last weeks home assignment, (ii) student presentation relating theory to practice, (iii) activities/interventions (based on theory), (iv) preparation for next weeks home assignment. The format is repeated in every single module, so the students become familiar with it and know what they can expect and what is expected of them. One student considers the new format in the following way:

Today, I learned that a lecture can be so much more than that, or at least different from the traditional lecture. It makes sense not to use class time to go through all the minutiae of theory when that can easily be read individually. However, another student remarks: *The effectiveness of this type of lecture greatly depends on the students' believing it is beneficial for them in quite the same sense as being able to achieve something greatly depends on the individual's belief regarding his or her competence.* It was clear that there was a vast difference in students' belief in the benefit of the process approach. Reflection logs are also used as a scaffolding technique. The lecturer provides ample feedback on all activities and hand-ins.

Purpose and learning goals

Purpose and learning goals deals with why students study and hence their motivation for engaging in the activities offered. According to Savory and Duffy (2001) a learning “goal is not only the stimulus for learning, but is a primary factor in determining what the learner attends to, what prior experience the learner brings to bear in constructing an understanding, and, basically, what understanding is eventually constructed.” They continue to assert that learning must have a purpose beyond being assigned and that the purpose has to be clear to all students. However, there is a vast difference between being externally motivated by the purpose of learning by heart to pass an exam, and internally motivated by the purpose of learning for life.

Table 4 Purpose and learning goals

TRADITIONAL TEACHING: ROUTINE	‘Old’ habits and grips	Reproduction of teacher’s knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Passing exam test which is the same for all - Testing trivia knowledge through e.g. multiple choice or short examination formats, written or oral - Students are kept apart in order to avoid cheating/copying each other’s answers.
ENTREPRENEURIAL TEACHING: NEW RITUALS	Scaffolding	Breaking existing routines and introducing a variety of new ones <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Examination assignments are closely linked to the individual and cannot be copied among students - Students are therefore encouraged to read and discuss each other’s assignments to improve and enhance learning before hand-in
	Markers	Discursively construct and practically maintain focus on changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Articulating changes by providing detailed guidelines throughout the course. - Stress that cheating is not possible.
OUTPUT/GOAL: ENTREPRENEURIAL ROUTINES	New naturalized routines	Reflection on own knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning for life - Meta-reflection - Applying thinking across boundaries - Portfolio assignments introduced that are all part of the final exam using novel formats such as videos.

Traditional purpose: learning what is necessary to pass the exam. Students study for the exam through learning by heart, which results in short term recall of trivia that is usually forgotten shortly after the exam is over. Indeed, according to Dale (1969) students only tend to recall a maximum of 20% of what they only hear or read after just two weeks.

New purpose: reinforces the purpose of learning for life – through entrepreneurship. Students prepare for the exam throughout the course by participating in the classes, and handing in a

portfolio of assignments that all add up to the final exam. In order to achieve the best results students need to find their intrinsic motivators. Indeed, Dale (1969) found that students tend to remember up to 90% of what they have said and done after a period of two weeks. Doing a dramatic presentation, simulating the 'real' thing or doing the 'real' thing is therefore the best way of creating critical learning experiences (Pittaway and Cope, 2007). However, simulating entrepreneurial experiences may be difficult because it *'requires the creation of an uncertain and ambiguous context that encourages students to step outside taken-for-granted assumptions'* (ibid:213). Even though the course was marketed as a 'process' course, right from the start, some students would repeatedly ask for information on the final exam. *'What do I need to do to get a good grade?'* was a typical question. Thus, they were clearly externally motivated.

Marker: explaining that the exam will be different and that it will build on their learning throughout the course. Providing them with a good idea about what the exam will involve.

Scaffolding: linking the exam to assignments handed in throughout the course helps students realize that they learn by building blocks of learning upon each other. It also encourages them to prepare for each class consecutively. Finally, the use of a learning log helped stress that the purpose was learning for life, not just for the exam. The fact that the exam assignment was introduced already in the beginning of class and not kept secret until the end, helped students to relax as they understood that the learning achieved throughout the course was important in terms of how they would document it at the end. The fact that they got a chance to improve on the grade after having handed in the written assignment by reflecting on their mistakes in a video was also helpful in enhancing their understanding that the course was about learning for life, and not just for the exam.

Discussion

It is appropriate to place our analysis and suggestions in this article in a wider societal perspective because certain developments in the life and conditions of youth have occurred and these influences society's and young people's views on education. These set the scene for the frames that we, as educators, are submitted to when we develop – and not the least *negotiate* - learning spaces both with our institutions as well as with our students. In a number of studies and publications, Centre for Youth Studies (www.cefu.dk) points to the fact that a growing number of young people suffer from bad wellbeing, loneliness, anxiety and insecurity (see e.g. Nielsen & Sørensen 2010). Such studies have pointed to the foundation of this being the competitive late-modern society (parents and other actors) and its performance- and result-orientated approach to life and to young people, and following from this, young people's experience of themselves. This means that, on the one hand, their expectations to themselves are very high, and, on the other hand, they are not very robust and do not feel they are good enough. This affects their relations and ways of being in the world in general, and it highly affects their educational life. At the same time, replacing the approach to education as *formative*, that is, as a means through which you learn for life and for making life rich and meaningful for yourself and others, with *performance measurement and instrumentality*, a large number of young people have come to lack the basic internal motivation to acquire learning.

Following from this, there are a number of challenges involved in introducing new routines into a university learning setting. The biggest obstacle is probably that students have to buy into the process. On the one hand, they are insecure, poorly motivated, with little interest and, therefore need scaffolding to feel re-assured. On the other hand, they only want to learn something if they have a very precise understanding of it being *necessary* to learn. They are familiar and comfortable with the old, accepted ways and may be frustrated with or even refuse to embrace new approaches because the old way produces a sense of safety, even if we can show that it is detrimental to their

learning (Bartsch and Cobern 2003). Hence, the effectiveness of the approach also depends on whether students believe it is beneficial for them. Here, the use of markers is really essential. Students have to believe and actually sense for themselves that the new is better than the old, which is replaced. At the same time, it is highly important to scaffold their insecurities and the pedagogic and didactic processes in learning, make use of markers that actually make it transparent what learning is acquired by engaging in these processes. It is not unusual that educators are met with suspicion when introducing new modes of learning that might also challenge the pure performance approach to education. More than ever educators today have to be aware of building relations to the students and repeatedly negotiate why and how certain things in the curricula must be learned.

So what happens when enterprise educators replace existing routines in the classroom with a conscious use of ritualization in order to create critical learning experiences? First, the successful use of rituals definitely fosters student engagement, and they will become more attentive and motivated and, hopefully, providing the students with abilities – not only in regard to the actual curriculum but, in a larger learning and knowledge perspective, in developing motivation and self-scaffolding abilities providing students with a deeper sense of courage and ability to apply their knowledge and competences in life. Further, as noted by Collins (2004) when new rituals are successfully enacted, they create what he calls ‘a collective effervescence’ that translates into individual emotional energy. This energy may promote internal motivation, which is a crucial for students because if they will learn more as they become more actively involved in their own learning and explore the learning landscapes more fully.

However, it is important for educators to be aware that they can ease the transition from traditional to entrepreneurial education for students through the use of markers and scaffolds. It is crucial to consider what markers to use and how to implement scaffolding, to take into account that not all students may embrace the changes fully from the outset. The tables above can be used as a template for educators to register the characteristics of their current approach, what they want to achieve with a new approach and what markers and scaffolding they need to implement to support student acceptance on all four dimensions. Further, it is decisive that the changes of all four dimensions of context, content, process and purpose are mutually supportive. Thus, a move from the behaviourist paradigm to the experiential paradigm must take place simultaneously on all dimensions. Adhering to the old paradigm in one of the dimensions whilst incorporating changes in the rest will seem inconsistent to the students and may counteract the objective.

Conclusion

The courses analysed deliberately break the ordinary behaviourist routines of university teaching. The findings illustrate how educators can use rituals actively to change how students learn. However, students are very wary of embracing new structures and rituals, indeed, some feel so comfortable with the old rituals that they would prefer not to change from the old way of just being receivers of knowledge to becoming co-creators of the learning situation. It is therefore important to exchange existing routines with rituals that enhance the feeling of safety and involve the students in creating the change. This is achieved through scaffolding and the setting of ritual markers, which are continuously repeated. The scaffold approach results in less unease with the introduction of new ways of doing things. Ritualization markers used to emphasize how the learning environment functions, decouple existing routines and create new rituals, further helps students feel reassured and safe. Thus, it is important to load these new rituals with meaning that makes sense to the students. If the ritual room is installed properly then it can provide space for experimentation. However, as lecturers we can only achieve so much without universities thinking in novel ways when establishing new classrooms for enterprise learning and without research on these aspects it is

difficult to persuade university planners that enterprise and entrepreneurship education requires different and more flexible set-ups to traditional education.

References

- Bateson, G (1972) *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. University of Chicago Press
- Bartsch, RA & Cobern, K M (2003) Effectiveness of PowerPoint presentation in *lectures Computers and education* 41(1) 77-86
- Bell, C (1992) *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, Oxford University Press: Oxford and New York.
- Bell, C (1997) *Ritual Perspectives and Dimensions*, Oxford University Press: Oxford and New York.
- Blenker, P; Frederiksen, S. H; Korsgaard, S; Müller, S; Neergaard, H; Thrane, C. (2012). Entrepreneurship as everyday practice: towards a personalized pedagogy of enterprise education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 26(6), 417-430
- Blunden, A and Arnold, M (2014) Formation of the concept of “collaborative learning space”. Chapter 6 in Blunden (ed) *Collaborative projects and interdisciplinary study*. Koninklijke BRILL Publishing 158-175
- Chickering AW and Gamson ZF (1987) Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 3, 2-8
- Brown AL (1992) Design Experiments: Theoretical and Methodological Challenges in Creating Complex Interventions in Classroom Settings. *Journal of the Learning Sciences* 2(2) 141-178
- Carey, J. 1989 [1975] A Cultural Approach to Communication, in *Communication as Culture*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman, pp.13–36. [1]_{SEP}
- Chickering AW and Gamson ZF (1987) Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 3, 2-8
- Collins, FL (2004) Education techniques for life-long learning: giving a powerpoint presentation. The art of communicating effectively. *Radiographics* 24(4) 1185-1192
- Collins, R (2004) *Interaction Chain Rituals*. Princeton, NJ. Princeton University Press
- Cope, J (2005) Toward a Dynamic Learning Perspective of Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. 29(4) 373–397
- Cooper, S; Bottomley, C; Gordon, J. (2004). Stepping out of the classroom and up the ladder of learning: an experiential learning approach to entrepreneurship education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 18(1), 11-22.
- Couldry, N (2003) *Media Rituals: a critical approach*. New York: Routledge
- Cross, PK (1987) The adventures of education in Wonderland: Implementing education reform. *Phi Delta Kappa* 68: 496-502
- Dale, E. (1969) *Audiovisual methods in teaching*.
- Dewey, John (1938/1998) *Experience & Education. The 60th Anniversary Edition*. West Lafayette: Indiana. Kappa Delta Pi
- Erickson, F (1985) Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.) Macmillan, New York pp. 119–159

- Fetterman, DM; Pitman, A; Bishop, RJ (1988) Educational evaluation. Ethnography in theory, practice, and politics. *American Anthropologist*. 90(1): 183-184
- Fiet, JO (2001) The Pedagogical Side of Entrepreneurship Theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*. 16: 101-117
- Fink, LD (2013) *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses*. John Wiley & Sons
- Gibb, AA (1987) Designing effective programmes for encouraging the business start-up process. Lessons from the UK experience. *Journal of European Industrial Training* 11(4) 24-32
- Gibb, AA (2002) In pursuit of a new 'enterprise' and 'entrepreneurship' paradigm for learning: creative destruction, new values, new ways of doing things and new combinations of knowledge. *International Journal of Management Review*, 4(3) 233-69
- Günzel-Jensen, F; Moberg, K; Mauer, R; Neergaard, H (forthcoming) Self-efficacy and the entrepreneurial mindset revisited. In Carsrud, AL and Brännback, M (eds) *Understanding the entrepreneurial mind (II)* Springer: Dordrecht
- Hannon, PD (2005) Philosophies of enterprise and entrepreneurship education and challenges for higher education in the UK. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 6(2) 105-114
- Hanrahan, M (1998) The effect of learning environment factors on students' motivation and learning, *International Journal of Science Education* 20(6) 737-753
- Heinonen, J and Poikkijoki, SA (2006) An entrepreneurial-directed approach to entrepreneurship education: mission impossible? *Journal of management development*, 25(1) 80-94
- Humphrey, C and Laidlaw, J (1994), *The Archetypical Actions of Ritual*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Kyrö, P 2008. A theoretical framework for teaching and learning entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, 2, 39-55
- Kyrö, P; Hägg, O; Peltonen, K (2009) *Experiential explorative research – An unexploited opportunity for entrepreneurship education research*. RENT XXIII. 19-20 November, Budapest, Hungary
- Lowman, J (1984) *Mastering the Techniques of Teaching*. Jossey-Bass, San Fransisco
- Mauer, R, Neergaard, H and Kirketerp AL (2009) Self-efficacy: Conditioning the entrepreneurial mindset. *Understanding the entrepreneurial mind*. Springer: New York, 233-257
- Ollila, S & Williams Middleton, K 2011. The venture creation approach: integrating entrepreneurial education and incubation at the university. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, 13, 161-178
- Opdenakker, MC and Minnaert, A (2011) Relationship between learning environment characteristics and academic engagement. *Psychological Reports*, 109(1) 259-284
- Pittaway, L, & Cope, J (2007) Simulating entrepreneurial learning integrating experiential and collaborative approaches to learning. *Management learning*, 38(2) 211-233
- Rae, D (2000) "Understanding entrepreneurial learning: a question of how?", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 6(3) 145-159
- Rae, D (2004). Entrepreneurial learning: a practical model from the creative industries. *Education+ Training*, 46(8/9), 492-500
- Robinson, S, Neergaard, H, Tanggaard, L, & Krueger, NF (2016) New horizons in entrepreneurship education: from teacher-led to student-centered learning. *Education+ Training*, 58(7/8) 661-683
- Ryan, MP and Martens, GG (1989) *Planning a College Course: a Guidebook for the Graduate Teaching Assistance*. National Center for research to Improve Post-secondary Teaching and Learning. Ann Arbor, MI
- Savery, JR & Duffy, TM (1995) Problem based learning: An instructional model and its constructivist framework. *Educational Technology*, 35(5) 31-38

- Schechner, R. (1977) *Essays on Performance Theory 1970-1976*. New York: Drama Book Specialists.
- Schechner, R. (1987) The Future of Ritual, in *Journal of Ritual Studies* 1(1) 5-33.
- Schechner, R. & W. Appel (eds.) (1989) *By Means of Performance: Intercultural Studies of Theatre and Ritual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seligman, A.B., Weller, R.P., Puett, M.J. and Simon, B. (2008). *Ritual and its Consequences: An Essay on the Limits of Sincerity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Singh, H., & Reed, C. (2001). A white paper: Achieving success with blended learning. *Centra software, 1*.
- Sogunro, OA (2004) Efficacy of role-playing pedagogy in training leaders: some reflections. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(4) 355-71.
- Stark, JS; Lowther, MA; Ryan, MP and Genthorn, M (1988) Faculty reflect on Course Planning. *Research in Higher Education* 29(3) 219-240
- Sumiala, J. (2013) *Media and ritual : death, community, and everyday life*, New York: Routledge.
- Thielens, W(1987) *The Disciplines and Undergraduate Learning*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 198
- Turner, V. (1977) Variations on a Theme of Liminality, in S. F. Moore and B. G. Meyerhoff, *Secular Ritual*. Amsterdam: van Gorcum, pp. 36-52
- Turner, V. (1982) *From ritual to theatre: the human seriousness of play*, New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.
- Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization science*, 16(4) 409-421.
- Weinstein, C.S. (1981) Classroom Design as an External Condition for Learning. *Educational Technology*, 21(8) 12-19
- van Note Chism, N & Bickford, DJ (2002) The importance of physical space in creating supportive environments. *New directions for teaching and learning* 92Oblinger, DG 2006 *Learning spaces*. Lexington KY:Educause
- von Glaserfeld, E (1989) Cognition, Construction of Knowledge, and Teaching, *Synthese*, 80: 121-140.