

Learning as an Entrepreneurial Process¹

Par

Daniel HJORTH

Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

Bengt JOHANNISSON

Jönköping International Business School and University of Växjö, Sweden

1. Opening: points of departure

1.1. Challenge

Contrasting management and its concern for control and economic efficiency when governing people and resources, entrepreneurship, as we relate to in this chapter, is practiced as the playful and desired making of opportunities and ultimately actualities (in unique ventures, new socialities, novel materialisations) out of coincidences. Entrepreneurial processes are in this sense understood as forms of social creativity that are also opportunity-creating, not simply opportunity recognising/exploiting (Hjorth, 2003a; Gartner et al 2003). Reflecting upon such descriptions, in the context of inquiring into entrepreneurship education – and we consider education to be the achievement accomplished through learning processes – it seems to us that students and practitioners are faced with a double challenge:

The general/classical paradox of learning is intensified in the case of 'learning entrepreneurship': Firstly, if new knowledge is incompatible with prior learning, and the latter is a precondition for understanding what is new, then there is no basis upon which to build new knowledge. And, secondly, if entrepreneurship is a creation process, then learning in the case of entrepreneurship would be creating new knowledge about the making of the new, about creation. In the case of entrepreneurship education it is not only about learning what to do, but also learning how to do *new* things, how to create. Still new knowledge *is* created and acquired.

The question is: do we have knowledge at all about entrepreneurship as a creation process, or has entrepreneurship become subject to managerial knowledge whose primary focus is on efficiency and control? One tentative conclusion would be that every attempt to study entrepreneurship as a creation process through representing, studying, and analysing in a managerial language would inevitably squeeze whatever entrepreneurship there is out of the study and leave the student with a managerialised process, i.e., something else than entrepreneurship. Our point is that we need to intensify what is distinctly entrepreneurial by creating concepts and frameworks that affirm the uniqueness of entrepreneurship processes. This means letting go of a management-envy inherited from the inaugural time of entrepreneurship at the universities (1960s to 1980s; cf Katz, 2003; Landström & Johannisson, 2001; Hjorth, 2003a) and related primarily to the strive for collegial status vis-à-vis established disciplines in business schools. Considering that entrepreneurship is a young academic discipline and its need for legitimacy strong there are however several forces driving entrepreneurship into management:

1) *Collegial*: At the general Academy of Management meetings (the U.S. version),

entrepreneurship is part of (strategic) management. We have had too much unchallenged continuation of management knowledge and perspectives into the field of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship education is consequently transformed to learning what to do within an existing repertoire rather than learning how to do new things – that is, it is transformed into management education. When this flow of management knowledge into entrepreneurship is discussed, it is usually from the point of view; 'how can entrepreneurship benefit from management' (cf. Sandberg, 1992).

2) *Institutional*: The role of generalising theoretical models, as developed in business administration, as well as the design of pedagogical systems are nowadays increasingly directed by the needs of competitive educational markets (universities as businesses). Management knowledge, dominating not only today's business schools but also society more generally (Burchell, Gordon, Miller, 1991; du Gay, 1997; Dean, 1999), is legitimised by its expertise in handling the problem of order and economic efficiency. Emphasis is put on the precise management of what already is there via the standardising vocabulary of management. Such a frame for knowledge, such a conceptual and practical horizon for learning, forecloses the open nature of a relational involvement in life and the potentiality of the event, of life becoming.

3) *Discursive*: We live in the age of 'managerialized personal identities' (Gordon, 1991: 44) for which 'the enterpriser' (peaking during the 1990s) was launched as the latest 'thing to be'. It is therefore important to point out that what is represented as 'entrepreneur' and 'entrepreneurship' in everyday language and public debates is often a product of managerial discourse. Management turned to entrepreneurship to further its genesis: from being associated with bureaucracy (Weber) and administration (Fayol), via slowly moving into the sphere of personal government (phrased as HRM, Mayo), to finally targeting the individual through representations of her/him as entrepreneur and making employees governable according to enterprise discourse. In this chapter, we obviously reserve for entrepreneurship something other than what is prescribed for it by management.

We want to interrupt this tendency, this historically mediated and collegially sanctioned reproduction of management thinking within entrepreneurship studies and emphasise entrepreneurship as different in kind. In an attempt to intensify what is entrepreneurial about entrepreneurship, we thus end up with something quite different from management. Entrepreneurship is not one box-room in the oversized mansion of management (Hjorth, Johannisson and Steyaert, 2003). An original genealogy would rather trace the entrepreneurial along paths laid down by creation, desire, passion, play, spontaneity, immediacy and intensity. We will then discuss entrepreneurship as a social creation process, meaning it is the passage from the virtual to the actual in a process of creation. As indicated we need an approach, we need concepts, and we need a language that can affirm this view/practice of entrepreneurship. This is still emergent like a foreign language to the vocabulary of business administration. In this chapter we will face this double task of developing a language of entrepreneurship as creation and discuss the consequences for entrepreneurship education (*educare* – 'to rear', 'to erect by building', 'bring up'; *educere* – 'to lead forth', 'to draw out', 'to bring out as something latent', Merriam Webster's Dictionary, www.britannica.com) working towards our suggestion that learning², in the case of entrepreneurship education, can become, indeed needs to be, an entrepreneurial process.

1.2. Purpose and structure

In this paper we will approach the question of how learning entrepreneurship happens. The intention is to open up the discussion on learning so as to allow space for developing a conceptual framework in which the how-question can be given new meaning and illustrated accordingly. We will present learning itself as an entrepreneurial process, as a process of social creation. This will allow us to discuss implications for how entrepreneurship is learnt and how learning is conceptualised and practised by teachers in dialogue with students.

We believe we can clear up some of the mystique concerning learning when conceptualised as entrepreneurial from a processual perspective. In order to accomplish such an endeavour we bring in a discussion of a becoming philosophy, or, what we with the help of the philosopher Gilles Deleuze will call a philosophy to enhance life. From such a conceptual horizon we conceive of learning from a dialogic perspective, inspired by the writings of Bakhtin. Such a re-thinking of learning, something we consider to be a central part of our output in this chapter, we argue, allows new imaginations and offers new possibilities for entrepreneurship learners. We will demonstrate our view by way of two cases – one more elaborate than the other - in the context of academic education (in entrepreneurship).

The chapter proceeds towards its aim in the following order. After describing how we frame our approach, we move on to our task to re-think how learning entrepreneurship happens (section two). From this basis for a conceptual development we move on to proposing a processual and dialogical approach with the help of the process philosophy and applications of Bakhtin and Vygotsky in discussions of learning (section three). Setting the scene for our cases, section four reports a context for teaching entrepreneurship in Sweden. In section five we bring two stories from experiences of staging possibilities for learning in entrepreneurship courses/programmes. We analyse these (in section six) by the help of our conceptual development in section two and conclude (section seven) with implications of our study for how we might approach learning as an entrepreneurial process.

1.3. Framing the approach

Creation processes are difficult to conceive and conduct. Also learning – when understood as an entrepreneurial and thus creation process – is a ‘mystery’ that thickens when concerned with knowledge about entrepreneurship. How is learning possible generally and learning entrepreneurship specifically? When perceived as an entrepreneurial process, learning can be described as both the creation of concepts that bridge the familiar/understood and the alien/incomprehensible and to bring this alternative vocabulary into practical use. Learning, more specifically, thus is the process of becoming-user of concepts and their related (socially contextualised) language and practice, resulting in enhanced possibilities for living. Sarasvathy's (2001) notion of effectuation' proposes a muddling-through image of entrepreneurial venturing. Latour (1987) discusses knowledge in terms of a resource for being able to ‘act at a distance’ while pragmatists and associates such as Weick (1995) talks about decisiveness and output-driven retrospective narrative history-making: prospectively as trial and error, retrospectively as reconstruction of a narrative that binds the outcome to a history. Lyotard (1979), in his ‘report on knowledge’ says that “[L]earning is the set of statements which, to the exclusion of all other statements, denote or describe objects and may be declared true or false” (p. 18) Lyotard's description points us in the direction of Foucault's, when discussing Nietzsche's concept of ‘wirkliche historie’ or effective history (history as ‘introducing

discontinuity into our very being'), saying that "...knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting." (1977: 154). For our discussion this emphasis on knowledge as cutting – as making breaks, drawing boundaries, differentiating – is an important background both when imagining how sense can be made out of ambiguity (Weick 1995), and for making clear that knowledge is as much discursive as experiential.

Knowledge as cutting puts emphasis on the dynamic and creative/productive force of knowledge. This view on knowledge, as making breaks, singling out anomalies and producing the objects of its attention also discloses learning as an entrepreneurial process. Learning – and this will become clearer with the help of our discussion on becoming and dialogue in section three – is not limited to the acquiring of concepts through which our thinking is directed. Learning as an entrepreneurial process, in addition, we believe should not be limited to the synthesising function of a brain (connecting 'a' with 'b'), the brain being the site where connection takes place³. What is central instead is the creative/imaginative function that starts to relate present and past and produce laws and models, ideas and images, anticipations and expectations that extend life beyond experience. Learning as an entrepreneurial process is the openness to the creative/excessive power of life in which sense happens. "Sense expresses not what something actually is but its power to become." (Colebrook, 2002: 60). Like when we sense the power of becoming of a knife, not what it actually is, but what it might become, the possible 'cutting' of the knife. We sense the fear of the knife, which is not a fear of what the knife is, but what it can become – a weapon. Sense is in this way related not to what something is but to what it could become – to its potential. A life-enhancing philosophy affirms this openness towards the becoming and transformation of life. So, and this is a central point for this chapter, cultivating such openness to the event of sense, through learning as an entrepreneurial process, would increase ones possibilities to enhance life, to create life beyond present experiences (Spinoza et al. 1997). That is, it would enhance our entrepreneurial possibilities.

Learning, when considered in perspective of life-enhancement, is also a process of self-creation and re-creation. Learning is then a process of becoming-other, of moving beyond the prescribed boundaries of a socially stabilised self. "...we are always more than the closed image of the self we take ourselves to be." (Colebrook, 2002: 142). So learning is a road to self-actualisation (Foucault, 1986; Kostera 2005). In addition, we have inherited a Cartesian reflex reproducing an essentialist view of the individual subject. The result being that we take every image of the self as expressing an underlying or original self. "The idea of an original or underlying self or essence is the *effect* of the produced masks and copies. The simulacrum produces the effect of an original, producing new selves and originals with each performance." (Colebrook, 2002: 100). A self is rather an effect of a performance, a self-fashioning (Greenblatt, 1980).

This means that we share with relational constructionists and poststructuralists (such as Deleuze) the view that 'processes make people' rather than 'people make processes'. Social processes, including the now central process of learning, are relationally co-constructing self and other, self and world (Hosking, Dachler and Gergen, 1995; Hosking and Hjorth, 2004). This underlines the view on stabilised self-constructs as achievements, as the result of repetitive work of co-ordinating relations so that a self can be held in place. Such relational co-constructions always reference available repertoires of styles for doing this (Hosking and Ramsey, 2000). Learning as an entrepreneurial process breaks such patterns through moving people to new self-constructs: new self-other and self-world relations.

2. Learning entrepreneurship

Paraphrasing Schumpeter entrepreneurship means initiating social processes of actualisation, energised by desire to compete and create. Entrepreneurship education faces the challenge of becoming-knowledgeable of such processes as well as generating hands-on experiences of such processes for further reflection. How can that be accomplished? That is for us an open question, one we always have to deal with in contexts of education. Our case stories are suggested as examples of how to creatively respond to the challenges carried by this question.

The educational alternative, that is the re-production of courses via standardised content would distance learning from the creation of new knowledge and produce/frame entrepreneurial practice as an anomaly and a kind of mistake – happening against the odds. Such an effect is, from both a processual and an experiential-learning perspective, almost inevitable and has an unfortunate damaging impact on learners who become excluded from this ‘strange entrepreneurship’. Thinking with concepts of management will keep it out of reach. This partly explains the difficulties experienced with business school students who enter into entrepreneurship studies only after their undergraduate education is almost finished. They bring with them management knowledge and perspectives, fit for a future anticipated position as manager, thus severely limiting their openness towards processes of becoming. Instead, educators responsible for learning processes in the context of entrepreneurship education need to be sensitive to local/temporal specificities. Together with students they would need to cultivate an openness before the event of sense, the power of becoming, the possibilities of creation. Sense has a power of incorporeal transformation, e.g. whether I refer to an object as ‘art’, ‘product’ or ‘stolen’ will alter what it is in its incorporeal being. The event of sense – always on the verge of arriving and just having passed - anticipates the actuality of the virtual, addresses us towards what something could become rather than what it is (cf. Colebrook, 2000).

From an ontology of becoming, in which processes can be described and understood, it becomes clear that entrepreneurial processes of creation emerge out of multiple dialogic relations between actualities and potentialities: between what ‘is’ and ‘what could become’. Learning – from a dialogic perspective – as we have described this here, i.e. as a creation process of becoming user of concepts that allow an enhanced life, is an example of entrepreneurial processes. In addition, entrepreneurial processes need to proceed with an open mind and responsiveness to life, characterised by a ‘learning mode’ of becoming. Let us briefly develop this entrepreneurial perspective on learning and learning perspective on entrepreneurship.

3. Becoming and dialogue – towards a processual perspective

3.1. Becoming philosophy

Life comes into being as becoming. Becoming is the force of life, whereas every being (identity, origin or telos) is an achievement of representation. We constantly need to become open to the intensity of life, for this counters the ‘normal’ tendency to perceive life through the fixed beings. As we have pointed out above, such beings are constructs, the effect of using repertoires of stabilizing relations. In order to achieve this openness we need to understand how experience is related to affect and concept. Our historically mediated tendency is otherwise to

take experience as something given to a subject (the subject being our most common instance of transcendence) who is made into the ground of knowledge (the Cartesian construct). Process philosophers (Whitehead, Bergson, Deleuze) relate to this subject as an effect rather than as a ground. There are experiences, movements, intensities that produce subjectivity, not subjects that experience. When we think we start from scratch saying 'What can I know?', we have already differentiated an 'I' from a 'world' that 'I' then strive to know.

Language is not a tool for speakers, but a "...differential force that produces speaking positions." (Colebrook, 2002: 76). A becoming philosophy points us beyond the more common notion of a subject determined by culture, class, gender, history. The subject has come to function as a transcendence – when God or truth has been abandoned for science and (statistical) certainty – filling the place of these external foundations, operating as this image of thought that we take to be an ultimate foundation. In a becoming-philosophical view, philosophy, science and art can help us overcome this over-coded, synthesized or composite tendency of thinking. "Philosophy allows us to think the forces of becoming by producing concepts of the differentiated or dynamic power of life; science allows us to organise matter by creating functions that allow us to extend our perception beyond what is actually given; literature allows us to become by creating affects that transform what we take experience to be." (Ibid., p. 126). The affects brings us back from the composites and help us start from intensities of experience which is from where the subject is created.

One central thinker for a philosophy of becoming is Henri Bergson. Gilles Deleuze devoted a book to the study of Bergson's philosophy – *Bergsonism* (1988) – for which a novel conception of time was central. Bergson argued that we experience 'real time' (*durée réelle*) as duration, apprehended by intuition. 'Chronos', the mechanistic clock-ticking measurement, was to him an analytical construct⁴. Intuition also receives the function of an approach (not to say method) in Bergson's writings. Relating to his processual view of the world, intuition also operates processually in processes of knowing, or, becoming-knowledgeable of things in the world. Linstead describes (2002: 9) :

"Intuition, [...], pursues not what can be made to seem familiar within the object, but that which is unique to it, and consequently may be inexpressible or unrepresentable. It is 'knowable' only by the intuitive process of 'intellectual sympathy', placing oneself within the object—or as Deleuze might put it becoming-object—in order to know it without expression, translation or representation. For Bergson, this is the truth of the object, accessed by a truer empiricism than the abstracted empiricism which is the obsession of representational analytical strategies."

When we think with Bergson on organisation, we are led to turn around the problem of creation or change. Organisation would be the arresting of becoming, the flow of process that characterises life, and result in temporary stabilities. Such stabilities are in conventional management- and organisation studies represented as order (and related to managerial control), in relation to which change has to be instigated from the outside, typically by a managerial initiative. Now, such initiatives are false, Bergson would point out, as they operate with a false problem of change and movement. Order, in this perspective, is indeed an accomplishment, artificial and not natural. For this reason Chia (1999) can argue that organisation contrasts change and is far from a fixed entity, but instead a 'repetitive activity of ordering and patterning itself'. This has implications for how we think learning in contexts of entrepreneurship education. It would take little to show that university courses approach learning processes from

the point of view of stability as normal and change as its other. For entrepreneurship education we believe it is pivotal to approach the world as becoming. Learning needs an openness to this flow in order to understand the role of desire and creation in processes of actualisation.

Change as a concept of course also stabilises what we try to think by the concept. With Deleuze we would emphasise that language is problematic in this sense. We need to start thinking *from* experience – where we pragmatically-intuitively all know that things don't stay the same – and not from the concept (of change) *into* experience. That is, we need to keep the openness of experience alive and not box it into concepts of change. Education would then have to engage in both organisation – to socially construct learning in recognisable forms – and in relaxing such order to allow the flow of life to become. As Linstead notes, we could think: "...organizing not as the opposite pole of the dualism to change, as its absolute other, but as a shifting qualitative relation between order and change which might at different times display more patterning than others, more evidence of environmental intervention than others, more creation and surprise than others." (2002: 12).

Gilles Deleuze's philosophy of becoming (or life-enhancing philosophy) can be said to be part of a poststructuralist reaction to structuralism more generally. That is, instead of studying the world through language as a closed system of signifier – signified – sign, poststructuralism is interested in how languages, cultures, political movements, organisations, institutions necessarily mutate or become. Life is an immense diversity of becomings. The temporary relation between a wasp and an orchid build a block of becoming through which both the flower and the insect becomes: the flower-becoming-feeder and the insect-becoming-fertilizer, and, in addition they together form a moment of movements (attraction and repulsion). Our habit of tracing every becoming back to an origin, to an original being, is described by Deleuze (and Guattari, together with whom he wrote a lot) as 'interpretosis': as a kind of pathological behaviour, the tendency to reduce, to operate negatively, backwards. We can see this as an heritage that rests on a representationalist view of language (language mirrors nature) and a Freudian model of psychoanalysis (always tracing backwards, negatively, to a reduced stage, primary, original). Desire, as an example, is conventionally interpreted as referring to a loss, a lack of something. Against this Deleuze stresses desire as a connection, a positive becoming, the wanting to increase the productive capacity, to expand and become-other through what is more than oneself. Desire is thus central for becoming. "Life is desire, and desire is the expansion of life through creation and transformation." (Colebrook, 2002: 135).

"Becoming," Colebrook further describes, "in its true force, is not bounded by what has already become or is actualised, but it is spurred on by perceiving the virtual powers that are expressed in actions." (Ibid., p. 136). This describes that when we let go of the idea of an original, a founding thought, an essence of being, we are no longer bound by a general and cumulative model of knowledge/science into which we seek to fit every step called progression/evolution. Instead we approach life as a multiplicity of becomings. The powers of creation processes – processes of moving from the virtual to the actual – that are processes of actualisation are what we desire. Humans can become more than they are in themselves by processes of becoming-hybrid with what is not itself. When education is also a creative process we become-hybrid by the help of co-learners as we desire images of the learned. That is, images of what we can do, think, create when having-become learned. Deleuze calls such movements of becoming-hybrid or becoming-other 'lines of flight'. Art – working through creating affects – takes us back from composite meanings and makes us start from the non-human or the meaningless in order to experience the event of sense, the potential of

becoming-other. In contexts of formal higher education, dialogue is crucial in order to prevent the tendency to closure that re-produces itself in knowledge. Teachers' responsibility in learning processes can in this sense be described as fighting for keeping the openness. Again, the role of art/literature is important here.

To exemplify: for the business school student there is not first a world of business and then a language representing this world in educational contexts, a language that should be polished and sharpened through training and examination. Before a language is representative it is intensive. Signs (meanings) are first intensive and then representative. A system of business school language – or a managerial vocabulary; the language of market – is formed by investments in various images, in their intensities. This is when a business world, a managerial praxis, a society of markets becomes stretched out before the student. These investments – e.g. in the image of a manager, in the image of the market – produce an assemblage of bodies; the 'managerial class' or the business school students. An enjoyed image of 'manager' will become over-coded – in education and in society – so as to become a sign of something. It will receive a social meaning. This meaning will refer back to some assumed underlying real, truth. We thus come to think of language as "...a vehicle for messages among speakers, rather than as a creative and intensive event that produces speakers." (Colebrook, 2002: 109). We again loose becomings out of sight and relate to beings.

Deleuze gathered from Bergson his conception of creation as moving from virtual to actual in processes of actualisation. He also made use of Bergson's idea of duration as this lived time in which all intensities will be experienced (for example the dissolving of a piece of sugar in a cup of tea). Memory is a drive for repetition. It is, Goodchild (1996) points out – discussing Bergson's influence in Deleuze – the source of both passion and association.

"Passions are no longer to be considered as universal drives and instincts; they are effectively constructed through previous experiences – such experiences are grasped as synthetic wholes, and passion becomes a power of transference, a desire to repeat the quality of the whole. [...] When knowledge is taken as a Bergsonian experience of durations [...] [T]he fundamental division is no longer that between the subjective and the objective, the mental and the material, artifice and nature, but between spontaneity and receptivity: the power to affect and the power to be affected. (Deleuze, 1988: 71; used in Goodchild, 1996: 27).

This provides us with a new perspective on the importance we have reserved for openness above. Openness could be described in terms of receptivity and spontaneity, friendly 'cousins' to intuition. These forces are mutually creative, as with resistance/freedom and power: there is only power as there is first freedom. Creating this encounter, bringing into play the forces of passion – to affect and to be affected – is a central element of learning as entrepreneurial process. It is in such processes we are affected, that we experience affect and can enter into processes of creating concepts through which we form perceptions of the world and what we do. Let us now turn to dialogue as this style in which learning can happen.

3.2. Dialogue and its enemies

We turn to Michail Bakhtin as a dialogic thinker. We have made clear the need for openness above and Bakhtin's dialogism provides us with a conceptual possibility to stay in the open (dialogue) when developing our thinking on learning. There is an ethics of dialogue which we

find crucial to every attempt to counter the modernist heritage of thinking learning through a 'pedagogical peer' sitting on one's shoulders and whispering that you're in the gaze of the dark angel of correct answers. Bakhtin's dialogism points us into an ethics that Bauman has described as: "...one that readmits the Other as a neighbour,...an ethics that recasts the Other as a crucial character in the process through which the moral self comes into its own." (1993: 84) It is within the context of such an ethics that the cultivation of desire for learning can take place. This is an ethics that no longer relies on Kantian foundationalism, the subject as the grounding presence. Kant's subject is what must be presupposed in order to think a world; the unity of ordered experience. Instead, we are thinking here with an active ethics, not a passive ethics of a subject dealing with representations of a given world. Such an ethics unites Foucault, Derrida and Deleuze (poststructuralists) in the sense that they all shared a view of the world as created through language (as discourse). An ethics of a genuine dialogue is about how to actualise the world in its multiple becomings without foreclosing such processes by ideology and opinion.

Michelson (1999) makes use of Bakhtin's study of carnival to emphasise the sociality of experience and concludes that this also works as an antidote to Cartesianism. Descartes has set up what Michelson calls the 'paranoid knower' emerging from doubt and suspicion, which frames knowledge as an accomplishment of an autonomous individual in search for certainty. Withdrawing from our passions, denying the body, and grounding identity in the substance of the mind is a way to accomplishing certainty. But is it a way to learning? Bakhtin's carnivalesque approach to learning instead affirms relational identities, transformative/subversive knowledge and leads us to learning as what makes us less rather than more certain. Bakhtin's carnival, we believe, should be read in the history of governmentality (governmental rationality) and the control of 'docile bodies' being central in modernity. Learning in the carnivalesque sense would therefore operate against a heritage of education as part of an apparatus of social control. The carnival resists forces producing the docile – from Latin *docilus*, meaning 'teachable' – body and, again, brings learning into the open, experiential in a relational sense. This is where we might learn from Vygotsky's ideas of learning in collaboration with a 'capable peer' through which the 'zone of current development' (ZCD) can be expanded to the 'zone of proximal development' (ZPD, which becomes the new ZCD) (Harland, 2003)⁵.

Bakhtin's and Vygotsky's ideas are fruitfully combined in so-called problem-based learning when the student's day can start with a writing session in which students are asked to explore their learning – to consider themselves as students of learning and not only students of entrepreneurship. This brings them into a double dialogue: between the student-becoming-professional and the student-becoming-learner; and between knowledge more or less instrumental to their future professional role and knowledge about how they learn. In addition Vygotsky emphasises a dialogue between problems and whole situations rather than fragmented pieces presented de-contextualised (see support for in Raffo et al, 2000). In contexts of business schools one might well argue that this dialogic style of learning is subversive. Today we do not control professionals by managers, instead we convert professionals into managers through a certain self-awareness (Townley, 1995) that suggests the rationality of technologies of the self operating (via HRM, self-assessment, screening) to maintain control and efficiency. Indeed, these tendencies as realised also in university-based education where schools are encouraged to standardise according to international accreditation systems; where courses are standardised according to global text-books and need for measurability of efficiency in reaching educational goals; and the subsequent gap between teaching and research, a kind of de-skilling

demanded by the system. Universities are already factories, apparatuses optimised for the efficient 'production' of education to 'consumers' of knowledge. Such organisations need primarily managers. The learners – students and teachers – are policed, "...yet this may be placed in a rhetoric that celebrates student empowerment." (Avis, 2000).

In a time when management knowledge has gained a status as normal and neutral, affecting universities generally; when management is applied far beyond its initial boundaries, learning processes generally and within entrepreneurship education especially are threatened to become squeezed into models serving primarily control and efficiency, standardisation and exchangeability. Such models, central for today's management practices, cannot serve learning processes as entrepreneurial creation processes any more than they can serve entrepreneurial processes as creative learning processes. We need to be moved by the concrete (read context-specific) orientation of entrepreneurship and cultivate intimate relations with student practices, professional practices, as well as research practices. Only then will a learning dialogue, relevant for entrepreneurship emerge.

3.3. Summing up: A processual approach

Our perspective on learning as a creative process, as an entrepreneurial process, urged us to develop a processual approach. We did so by turning to process philosophers; primarily Bergson and Deleuze. We learned from them the need to affirm life as creation and to cultivate a desire to connect and enhance the possibilities of 'lives' (in plural). A becoming philosophy – or a life-enhancing philosophy – made it important to consider learning as contextualised by an openness to the event of sense. Sense, in a processual perspective, expresses not what something is but its power to become. We emphasised that cultivating such openness to the event of sense would increase ones possibilities to enhance life, to create life beyond present experiences', which would be a responsibility of learners – students and teachers alike. The ethics of our approach is to be found in the relational constitution of self as a response to the call of the other's spontaneity of existence. Rejecting modernist foundations of the subject we instead turned – with Bakhtin – towards the dialogism language, meaning and self. With reference to Vygotsky we then developed some implications for learning in the context of business schools.

This is where we are interrupted by the silent dialogue with our case stories which have driven us up to this point. In order to provide you with a more rich possibility of relating to those field reports we will next contextualise them in a brief introduction to entrepreneurship education in Sweden.

4. Teaching entrepreneurship in Sweden

Three decades ago entrepreneurship was synonymous with small business in the Swedish context. When the academic community approached entrepreneurship, whether for research or education, the basic attitude was a need for knowledge transfer to the underdeveloped small firms and their (owner)management. As much as small firms then were considered as inferior supplements to large firms, the self-image of academics involved in education was that of a missionary needed to conscientize the small firms of their position in a hostile world. In this context Växjö University, in 1975 still just a college subordinate to Lund University, on the initiative of one of the authors (Johannisson) launched a full academic programme in small

business management. Recognising that small firms oriented towards change and renewal need to focus on (inter)action and vision, students were trained to cope with needed bridging management activities, such as planning and control. The students themselves then epitomised bridges between the academic community and the everyday business world. By way of internships (two days every week) in one firm for the whole programme period, a needed space for genuine dialogue was created. In order to recognise the local context for learning, meetings between management and university staff generally were held on site in the company. Evaluating the student's ability to establish a dialogue with the staff of the partner company was especially considered. The students had to take own responsibility in this dialogue by proposing appropriate measures to be taken based on their reflections in formal reports.

In order to gain legitimacy in the academic world the small-business management programme at Växjö University in the 80ies was turned into a complete bachelor programme. Two years of study were extended into three and a half years where the first two covered general management courses and the final one-and-a-half years included internships in small firms as outlined above. This on one hand meant that the students brought a more qualified managerial tool-kit to the company, on the other that they had adopted a vocabulary that was alien to the small-firm context. One purpose, therefore, of the programme was to 'unlearn' this management vocabulary and the dominant managerialism that made it normal (cf. Johannisson, 1991 and Johannisson et al., 1998). In the 90ies the course administration as a response to the increasing international concern for entrepreneurship (as opposed to small-business management) tried to make the students launch their own ventures. However the original academic formal training, preaching a wage-earner career in Sweden, then hit back. After a couple of years filled with tensions and frustration among both students and teachers, the programme administration decided to cancel the programme altogether. After a few years, new academic staff replaced it with a programme in 'enterprise and business development', including internship not just in small firms but in large as well. Such a programme could be described as a natural product of enterprise discourse, productive throughout the 90s. And, as such, it maintains a close affinity to management education (cf. Hjorth, 2003).

In the mid 90ies a research team, including the present authors as well as educationalists, was commissioned by the Swedish government to study the Swedish educational system with respect to its concern for entrepreneurship (Government report: Ds 1997:3). The point of departure was an understanding of entrepreneurship as a way to approach the everyday world - interactively with alertness, curiosity and playfulness and with a sense of responsibility for own initiative. This approach constructed the uneducated child as genuinely entrepreneurial and formal venturing as just a special case of entrepreneurship. Adopting this image of entrepreneurship as social creativity the study proposed that children in the comprehensive school should mainly be encouraged to pursue their spontaneity while pupils in the upper secondary school should channel their need for interactive creativity into group assignments.

The report concludes that the Swedish comprehensive and upper secondary schools offer reasonably well a decent setting for encouraging entrepreneurship, possibly because they do not explicitly preach an enterprise ideology. A recently published study (Lundström, 2005) not only confirms but even enforces this finding. A national survey carried out in 2004 states that 21% of the Swedish elementary schools and 78% of the upper secondary schools use concepts such as "entrepreneurship" and "enterprising" to describe pedagogical activities (Holmgren, 2005: 313). Also, at the turn of the millennium, special 'Enterprise secondary schools' in an increasingly privatised Swedish school system have

been established, emphasising already existing 'Young Enterprise' programme. In the educational system where the potential for formal venturing is largest, the universities, the interest in entrepreneurship courses and full programmes sky-rocketed in the early 90ies. The students' dialogue with the business community was by far the most appreciated part of these course/programmes. However, few firms were ever started as an outcome of young academic entrepreneurship in Sweden (cf. Johannisson et al. 1998). Today an abundance of national and regional public programmes are launched that encourage entrepreneurship generally in Sweden and in the educational system in particular. The regional authorities, implementing a 'decentralised state' policy, generally promote training for entrepreneurship and so do the financially strong local municipalities. Yet the Swedish society and its institutions signal norms and values that do not recognise entrepreneurship as social creativity. The public discourse is rather dominated by large-scale high-technology driven growth reflected in one-sided, thus normative, concern for innovation systems and Triple Helix concepts. Obviously there is a mis-match here: the cultivation of an entrepreneurial approach in elementary and upper secondary schools creates life-enhancing graduates that run into a normality dictated by managerialism supporting the choice of a professional career in a major corporation.

In 1998 the other author (Hjorth) became academically responsible for a National Workshop on Entrepreneurship and Learning starting. This annual workshop, gathers some 40 participants from about 20 Universities in Sweden, providing the participants with opportunities to debate challenges in running entrepreneurship courses. The workshops also provide an arena for presenting novelties such as new courses and programmes or innovative pedagogical/didactic approaches put to use in contexts of entrepreneurship education. Apart from learning from each other, the workshop provides educators in Sweden with an overview of the whole system, which per se drives the speed of development and challenges the individual universities to stay alert. Over the last years the workshop has gradually grown into a Nordic Workshop. It is presently (2005) in the process of developing a second stream open to high-school teachers interested in entrepreneurship education. (www.esbri.se)

5. Cases

5.1. A Master programme in Entrepreneurship as social creativity

- *"This course has meant the best ignition possible."*
- *"I was provided with possibilities to reflect about my ideas, and that did tear down all barriers I have had previously."* (Student, Malmö, who started a business as a result of the educational programme)

At the universities of Stockholm and Malmö a master programme in entrepreneurship is launched open to all students. It started in Stockholm in 2001 and in Malmö in 2003. Participants with backgrounds in such diverse fields as fine arts, medicine, engineering, biology, and business have graduated from this programme. They bring with them different professional identities (as rehearsed in educational contexts) and formal knowledge bases which together constitute a generative set of in-betweens. These differences challenge the students to create new knowledge – knowledge that can make use of these creative tensions. In addition, their previous training is challenged by the organising practices of entrepreneurship as this programme invites them to develop (and actualise) their own business concepts.

The master programme invites students to approach entrepreneurship as part of *society* rather than simply part of *business*. A view on entrepreneurship is initially communicated, stating that 1) the world is not a perfect place; 2) there are alternative ways to deal with that; 3) I want to be part of this challenge. Entrepreneurship is thus framed as a matter of life. The wholeness as context for learning is clearly emphasised as part of the introduction. Importance is placed on entrepreneurship education as providing room for diversity and multiplicity (in terms of knowledge backgrounds, as well as personal goals). Central to the programme is that students learn from each other:

-“I have learnt that I should not do everything myself. That’s what I did wrong before.” (Student, Malmö)

The more specific outline of the programme tells that it runs over one year: four courses during the first semester and two projects during the second: a) variations on entrepreneurship; b) the practice of entrepreneurship; c) the software of entrepreneurship (a processual perspective on creativity and innovativeness and on running projects); d) the hardware of entrepreneurship (a structural point of view; focus on marketing, financing, and business law, centred on the start-up phase). The projects focus on: 1) life-images of entrepreneurship (entrepreneurs visit the programme and tell stories; students write report reflecting upon their learning from these ‘live cases’); 2) my entrepreneurial project (students can choose from: engaging in an entrepreneurial venture, developing their own business plan, or investigate a topic from an entrepreneurial perspective).

The master programme seeks to simulate entrepreneurship as a process where possibilities and problems are formulated throughout the process. Students work with business development project in relation to real-life cases. Precisely because the programme is based on ‘real life entrepreneurship’ experiences it is also firmly anchored in research in entrepreneurship. It is important to create knowledge for as well as about entrepreneurship. Students different educational backgrounds are explored in training supervision: they guide each others according to their different lines of expertise (medical students; engineers; business school students; theatre students...), thereby creating a heterarchical learning context.

-“Now I know that it is not about atom physics, but rather knowledge of the everyday that shows how to take care of ideas.” (Student, Malmö)

5.2. Designing a Multiplex Educational Space

The university offers a setting for organised activity that presents it as a general arena for more or less causal encounters and not as a fully-fledged organisation (Brunsson and Sahlin-Andersson 2000). On one hand this suggests that boundaries (at least the outer ones) are easily crossed, on the other that commitment and responsibility, both crucial to the enactment of entrepreneurship, are not easily triggered in the university setting. This is especially that case in management programmes where there is an opportunity cost (e.g. as a consultant) associated with being a teacher and a clear-cut labour market available for those who complete there studies. In such a setting crossing the boundaries between the university and the (business) community should not cause confusing and calculating behaviour but release passion and playfulness.

Since the mid-90ies Växjö University, as a part of its standard bachelor programme in business administration, offers a one-month course on entrepreneurship. Its basic design means that the students in teams of three establish a dialogue with a nascent or recently established entrepreneur to tailor their accumulated skills in management to address a challenge as perceived by the (would-be) entrepreneur. Repeated evaluations suggest that all stakeholders - the students, the budding entrepreneurs, the small-business associations that operate as liaisons between the entrepreneurs and the university teachers appreciate the course design, cf. Johannisson et al. (1999).

In November 2004 a more rigged version of the course was offered to a heterogeneous group of international students. The dramatised teaching events included stating management and entrepreneurship as different discourses (managerialism and entrepreneurialism respectively, cf. above and Hjorth 2003a; b). Thus, the textbook on venture management and associated articles were formally presented by way of structured overhead slides and with the teacher formally dressed. In order to provide a contrast the teacher, when communicating the enterprising approach to venturing, in front of the students took off his dark suit, revealing a very casual dress. The presentation of the entrepreneurial mode to venturing then adopted a narrative style where the teacher provided stories that illustrated key practices associated with entrepreneurship as process, such as making opportunities out of coincidences, spontaneous dialogue and networking and micro-events as important beginnings in the venturing process. This change in apprehension turned the once silent student group into an intensively multi-conversing local community. In the evaluation of the course the students however made no reference to that happening which suggests that they only for the moment broke out of their managerial mental cage.

The group of would-be entrepreneurs that was invited to collaborate with the students was very heterogeneous as well. At the time of their collaboration with the university and its international students the nascent entrepreneurs participated in a one-year vocational programme on business venturing. The group thus included individuals who just graduated with a Master of Science as well as persons who only had passed the comprehensive school, not only well-experienced persons in their fifties but also young people who just finished school. Their venture ideas were equally diverse both with respect to substance and how far they had reached in the venturing process (in terms of how many measures they had already taken to enact the venture). Their training paralleled that of the international university students: normative managerial monologues were combined with visits by reflective practitioners narrating their experiences. The knowledge thus created was then fed into the experiential learning that guided their emerging entrepreneurial career.

At the very start of the course the university students were generally informed about the entrepreneurs and their ventures, organised into teams and encouraged to arrange meetings with the novice entrepreneurs. Soon several 'collaborative agreements' were established and, still in a managerial mode, the student groups presented 'their' firm to their classmates. This seminar was carried out the very same day that the normative main course literature was examined in writing. A considerable share of the students failed or postponed the examination. The course evaluation reveals that the literature was read quite selectively which meant that the students only could bring quite a rudimentary vocabulary in 'entrepreneurial management' to their encounter with the budding entrepreneurs.

As told above the students were introduced to the entrepreneurial mode before taking on a more substantive task for their partner entrepreneurs. The students then for two weeks worked with the venture assignments in dialogue with the novice entrepreneurs while being supervised by junior university teachers in meetings and by email. On the final examination day the students

first reported their findings group by group to their respective entrepreneur. Then the student teams were completed with their entrepreneurs and joined an 'Entrepreneurial Forum'. Facing a critical panel of qualified people, including e.g. an experienced entrepreneur who is also a business angel, the three students and 'their' entrepreneur(s) were asked for a joint presentation of the inquiry and associated proposed measures.

The evaluation of the course as designed revealed that the students generally recognised the collaboration with the budding entrepreneurs as the very essence of the course. All students contributing to the evaluation argued that the collaboration with the budding entrepreneurs had been exciting and/or had offered a genuine learning opportunity. However, although they were intrigued by the assignments in the firm and caught by the dialogue with the would-be entrepreneurs, their commitment did not reach far beyond what seems to be a standard in academic (business) studies. On one hand many students complained about time shortage, on the other a majority of them frankly stated that they spent maximum 20 hours a week on the course including all practical and academic assignments⁶. The nascent entrepreneurs revealed considerably more varied reflections from the dialogue with the students. Some were concerned by the indifference, occasionally even laziness, demonstrated by the students while other would-be entrepreneurs were impressed by the students' industriousness. As much as the students generally appreciated the collaboration as an encounter with entrepreneurship in an every day setting, the budding entrepreneurs often explicitly acknowledged the alternative perspectives on their operation that the foreign students highlighted.

“Collaborating with the international students provided the opportunity to test my business concepts on three more people with different cultural backgrounds.” (Nascent entrepreneur, Växjö)

“The collaboration with the entrepreneur in the project, not the lectures, meant learning for entrepreneurship.” (International student, Växjö)

6. Analysis and discussion

We open with a discussion more directly commenting on the cases in order to move from there into a further development of when might be concluded from our processual perspective.

6.1. Master programme

The master programme is developed to make the most possible of learning. Learning is then understood as a result from a dialogic openness to the potentialities, the becomings, of life. This 'dialogic space' and its openness is what can be organised by the person(s) responsible for the learning processes. The principle of openness is communicated also by the welcoming of students with diverse disciplinary backgrounds into the programme. As a master programme it simultaneously guarantees relatively well-established identities and reflexive competencies among the various students. This has proved important in the composing of project teams throughout the programme. Evaluations with students often include them stressing this point: that they have had to learn how to deal with other skills, and other forms of knowledge than their own. The challenge thus has been not only to make each other contribute in the context of a project team, a group assignment, but also make the most use possible of the heterogeneity of the team. We believe this is an important lesson to learn from the students' feedback: that

heterogeneity drives creativity. We can understand this from a general view of entrepreneurship as creating in-betweens (in-between 'what is' and 'what could be'), openness, and create opportunities in these fragile states.

Learning, for students in the master programme, includes not only how to make use of the course literature and related lectures, but to an equal extent how to order ones history of knowledge in perspective of new experiences and constantly position oneself vis-à-vis other students' disciplinary training in shifting areas of knowledge. This puts pressure on students to move in-between a clear professional identity, something that helps them and others know how to deal with problems, and stay open to the relative advantage of that identity in the context of many other professions represented within the programme. We could describe this as a process of a Vygotskian 'zone of proximal development' (ZPD) set up in relation to fellow students' shifting professional-disciplinary knowledge. The advantage here, as we see this, are twofold: 1) we accomplish an intensified dynamics of the ZPD as the challenges shift with shifting disciplines represented by shifting student backgrounds; 2) the hierarchical problem related to the historically mediated relationship between 'teacher and student' is here reduced – students function more as peers in self-reliant teams and have no reason to 'subject to' external authority as part of their learning. We arrive at the ZPD through a dialogic relationship between various professional-disciplinary identities.

As long as entrepreneurship is stressed as something belonging to society rather than simply economy (Hjorth and Steyaert, 2003) the upper hand of the business student is less evident, something that keeps the openness of these multiple dialogues (multilogues) between students of different training. The conditions are set for self-formation in the positive sense of creating one's professional identity in the context of an open dialogue, rather than self-awareness as a process of normalisation vis-à-vis a generalised norm (management knowledge) to which the individual is made accountable (through writing, grading, and examination; Hoskin, 1998). Another central task for the educator (responsible for staging learning processes) emerges from this note: there is a continuous need to cultivate the kind of generosity and tolerance for failure in which entrepreneurial imagination enters the dynamics of spontaneity and receptivity, the power to affect and to be affected, the passion of continuous learning that we above have emphasised in our 'life-enhancing philosophy'.

From the perspective of this philosophy, and the subsequent need to relax conventional processes of organising in order to allow becomings to happen, we can also understand the point with 'interdisciplinary' educational set-ups as in the reported master programme. Intra-disciplinary courses/programmes emphasise a thinking in 'depth', homogeneity and accumulation vis-à-vis a certain discipline. The inter-disciplinary set-up, in contrast, invites students to seek the in-betweens of a heterogeneous set of different forms of knowledge and to create sense dialogically, with fellow-students, in this openness where learning becomes an entrepreneurial process.

6.2. A diverse educational space

Due to its short duration the course in our second case could never trigger any reflexivity, not even a questioning of previous formal knowledge in business organising, among the students. Their restrained dialogue with the entrepreneurs and minimal adaptation to their local context suggests that they never left their traditional role as university students. Their limited involvement meant that they, in completing their assignment in the ventures, rather used the formal knowledge that they had acquired before joining the entrepreneurship course. Possibly this

return to managerial framing and sense-making, its linear logic, established vocabulary and homeostasis, reflected an existential anxiety that they experienced when confronted with extramural challenges. Used to take responsibility only for themselves, possibly also for classmates, they refrained from a genuine dialogue that might have caught them in commitments out of their role expectations and control.

The nascent entrepreneurs, on their hand, under-socialised and (often) inexperienced, also renounced the opportunity to commit themselves to a genuine dialogue. Homogeneity rather than heterogeneity, monologue rather than dialogue were held on to. A major concern to several of the budding entrepreneurs was that the student teams did not whole-heartedly embrace their ideas while one budding entrepreneur in contrast argued that the student group might steal her business idea. Thus, as regards the students, the problem was not a lack of practical mindset. Quite on the contrary, several of the would-be entrepreneurs were locked into 'closed monologues' where the need for further conceptualisation and information processing was taken as an excuse for failing to actualise of their venture.

These dormant barriers to open dialogues may explain why the 'Entrepreneurship Forum' as a neutral arena was welcomed by both groups. The criticism communicated during that multilogue was perceived as constructive tensions and energising friction, providing learning opportunities for all. When the students were asked about their overall experience of the collaboration with the nascent entrepreneurs no negative statements were made (although four students refrained from answering the question), the others showing either a generally exciting experience or a 'real' learning opportunity. The 'Entrepreneurship Forum' might have worked as a 'zone of proximal development' for both parties. Vygotsky, as we noted in 3.2 above, emphasises a dialogue between problems and whole situations instead of fragmented pieces confronted without context (Raffo et al, 2000), and the Forum seems to have provided such a genuine learning experience. The Forum is dialogic in organisation and provides immediate reflection possibilities over the multiple ways ideas can be actualised in different business contexts.

The reflection and the learning that the encounter and induced dialogue between budding entrepreneurs and international students triggered opens up for several interpretations. First, both groups partook in a formal educational process rigged up with needs for personal investments: needs to affect and become affected. Second, although the expectations regarding the collaboration differed, varied and were not always met, the dialogue between the entrepreneurs and the students took place in a setting that communicated an entrepreneurial and 'opportunitizing' mode. Mismatching and surprises were integrated in a legitimising context. Third, already Normann (1977) pointed at the potentiality of tensions and Åkerman (1993) provides a number of perspectives on friction as a genuinely relational concept that creates knowledge by having both a stabilising and destabilising effect, undermining both linearity and a dominance of what is passing as rational for reasons of convention. More important to the production of friction than contrasting technical knowledge and learning modes was probably the use of the English language: the work of translation challenged the students to make sense of their reflection and communicate this sense in everyday language. Fourth, the fact that both groups complained about lack of time for further encounters indicate that they were entangled in the dialoguing process. Fifth, the 'Entrepreneurial Forum' that was staged was not considered as the end of a learning experience, as an examination, but rather provided openings for further dialogue. Not only had the students and the nascent entrepreneurs a concerted presentation; the panel also included both practitioners and academics.

In sections two and three we conceptualised learning as a creation-process of becoming-user of concepts that help learners extend life beyond the present. The point with internships,

interdisciplinary set-ups, and staging of a Forum can be understood in perspective of such a definition: it brings immediacy and spontaneity into the learning process in providing possibilities of a direct feed-back on experiments; the experience of the power to affect and the power to be affected (the passion of learning).

7. Concluding: the difference made

The staging of a learning context for entrepreneurship as reported from Växjö University has so far only offered initial lessons. Nonetheless these demonstrate the importance and potential of a diverse/heterogeneous learning context where asking what something could become, and multiple dialogues become self-enforcing. Casual meeting with students who decades ago joined the small-business management programme with internships at the same university indicate some long-term effects in terms of dialogues between business and academic communities. At these encounters the students do not praise the university context in general or individual teachers. They rather repeatedly communicate a holistic learning experience associated with the challenge of always having to bridge the academic and business communities of practice by way of active involvement in a hands-on multilogue including peers. Training for entrepreneurship by necessity must actively deal with the multiplicity of becomings which is life by sensitive conversions with local situations. This does not only mean trusting Weick's (1995) point that sensemaking is indeed retrospective but does also imply that the situated conversations are – by being open/responsive and spontaneous – also prospective. We would urge educators – teachers and students alike – to trust life in this sense, life as creation. Asking how conventions, structures, 'stabilities' generally have become, how they are accomplished as reproductions of social co-constructs in itself opens up life as an arena for possibilities.

From the master-programme in Stockholm and Malmö we learn that openness is important in order for learning to happen. This prompts reflections over the instrumentalism of managerial knowledge; generally limited by the horizon of economic efficiency and control. There is an inherent tendency towards closure in this knowledge. Management sees no limits for itself but manages both order and change. It seems important, therefore, to stress the need to dis-associate entrepreneurship from management. As relational co-constructions always reference available repertoires of styles of co-ordinating or co-constructing (Hosking and Ramsey, 2000). As we pointed out in the opening section, business school students have a strong tendency to turn to dominant available repertoires or styles of constructing sense: i.e., often textbook management. From a processual philosophy, entrepreneurship is closer to life in the sense that it is about creation (Hjorth and Steyaert, 2003). Again, approaching management as a 'science of control' provides the entrepreneurship students with both analytical and practical possibilities to imagine their contribution as interruptions of such effects in fields of practices (cf. Chia, 1999).

Learning – as an entrepreneurial process – is about extending life beyond experiences. Facing a heterogeneous set of skills, in the inter-disciplinary set-up of an entrepreneurship programme, students are provided with multiple versions of sense as related to how different educational backgrounds make virtual different becomings of life. A challenge for 'teachers' in such processes of students' connecting with other desires to learn is to refrain from ordering these processes into the conceptually limiting horizons of general models or theories. Teachers, we learn from Bergson (Chia, 1999; Linstead, 2002), need instead to relax and allow the multiple becomings happen as manifestations of life as creation.

Reframing entrepreneurship and learning we think that we have provided another understanding of the relation between the concepts. The difference between learning *about* and learning *for* entrepreneurship is often pointed at, suggesting that the former is an intellectual activity while the latter calls for embodied knowledge as experientially acquired. However, in spite of different scopes, these learning modes are both monologues, assuming an example to follow. When experienced entrepreneurs learn (with)in their practice dialogue with peers as a reflective, intellectual activity is paramount. Our approach is based on dialogue as well but understanding and constructing learning as an entrepreneurial process suggests that all human senses must be invited since what is aimed for – the invention of new practices, the making of new worlds – happens *in* entrepreneurship, in learning as an entrepreneurial process.

Indeed, if learning is becoming-other, is creating and becoming-user of concepts that enhances the possibilities for living, interdisciplinary set-ups or internships in business start-up processes seem indispensable for this to happen. We have stressed – particularly in section three – that processes make people. We believe that experiencing multiple processes of extending life beyond the present creates life-enhancing people, i.e., people of becomings, entrepreneurs. We believe that our re-thinking of learning entrepreneurship in this chapter has demonstrated the effects of history and philosophy on our possibilities to imaginise the present. We encourage such an approach also in entrepreneurship, a young discipline that needs to resist the stabilising effects of a little schooling readily provided by neighbouring disciplines.

Notes

1. Cet article est la reprise intégrale d'un chapitre, intitulé « Learning as an entrepreneurial process », de l'ouvrage *Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education, Volume 1, A General Perspective*, édité par Alain Fayolle et publié par Edward Elgar Publishing en 2007. Ce travail est publié dans la Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat avec l'aimable autorisation d'Edward Elgar Publishing.
2. We do not use pedagogy in this discussion. Mainly for its highly problematic status, i.e., how it has become inscribed in a history of schooling and its related hierarchised positions of teacher and pupil/student. Pedagogy (from Greek *ped-* meaning 'child', 'boy', and + *agōgos* meaning 'leader'; *Paidagōgos* meaning 'slave who escorted children to school') which was intended to support the practices of education. We will discuss support in a language distanced from pedagogy as this is used in everyday language. Perhaps our discussion brings it closer to the ancient Greek meaning.
3. We have come to name this power of connections 'mind'.
4. 'Karios', or the 'right' moment is yet another image of time that relates to synchronicity and (therefore) invites itself to images of entrepreneurship as process.
5. Vygotskis original concept of 'zone of proximal development' referred to an arena for dialogue between a child and an adult where the child with its spontaneous reasoning appropriated the logic of adult reasoning (Kosulin 1986:xxxiv-xxxv). Similar ideas, actually meaning that (child) spontaneity had to submit to (adult) rationality were put forward by Dewey (1902/1920)
6. This modest time involvement in full-time studies by no means is unique for this group of international students but instead quite representative for (Swedish) students in business administration.

Bibliographie

ÅKERMAN N (ed.) (1993), *The Necessity of Friction*. Heidelberg: Physica Verlag.

AVIS J. (2000) « Policing the subject: Learning outcomes, managerialism and research in PCET », *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 48(1), p. 38-57.

BAUMAN Z. (1993), *Postmodern Ethics*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

- BRUNSSON N., SAHLIN-ANDERSSON K. (2000), « Constructing Organizations: The Example of Public Sector Reforms ». *Organization Studies*, 21 (4), p. 721-746.
- BURCHELL G., GORDON. C., MILLER P. (eds.) (1991), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- CHIA R. (1999), « A "Rhizomic" Model of Organizational Change and Transformation: Perspective from a Metaphysics of Change », *British Journal of Management*, 10, p. 209–27.
- COLEBROOK C. (2000), « Incorporeality: The Ghostly Body of Metaphysics », *Body & Society*, 6(2), p. 25-44.
- COLEBROOK C. (2002), *Gilles Deleuze*, London and New York: Routledge.
- DEAN M. (1999), *Governmentality – Power and rule in modern society*. London: SAGE.
- DELEUZE G. (1998), *Essays critical and clinical* (transl. By Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco). London/New York: Verso.
- DEWEY J. (1902/1990), *The Child and the Curriculum*. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.
- DS 1997:3 *I entreprenörskapets tecken. En studie av skolning i förnyelse* (Dans the Name of Entrepreneurship. An Inquiry into Education for Renewal). Stockholm: Ministry of Industry and Trade.
- du GAY P. (ed.) (1997), *Production of culture, cultures of production*. London: SAGE.
- FOUCAULT M. (1977), *Language, counter-memory, practice*. Selected essays and interviews by Michel Foucault (Donald. F. Bouchard, ed.). New York: Cornell University Press.
- FOUCAULT M. (1986), *The History of Sexuality, (Vol. 3) The Care of the Self*. New York: Vintage Books.
- GARTNER W., CARTER N. M., HILLS G. F. (2003), « The language of opportunity », dans Steyaert, C. and Hjorth, D. (eds.) *New Movements in Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- GERGEN K. J. (1995), « Relational theory and the discourse of power », dans D. M. Hosking, H. P. Dahler and K. J. Gergen, *Management and Organization: Relational Alternatives To Individualism*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- GOODCHILD P. (1996), *Deleuze & Guattari: an introduction to the politics of desire*. London: SAGE.
- GREENBLATT S. (1980), *Renaissance self-fashioning – From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- HARLAND T. (2003), « Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development and Problem-based Learning: linking a theoretical concept with practice through action research », *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8(2), p. 263-272.
- HJORTH D. (2003a), *Rewriting Entrepreneurship – for a new perspective on organisational creativity*. Malmö/Copenhagen/Oslo: Liber/CBS Press/Abstrakt.
- HJORTH D. (2003b), « In the Tribe of Sisyphus: Rethinking Management Education From an 'Entrepreneurial' Perspective », *Journal of Management Education*, 27(6).
- HJORTH D., STEYAERT C. (2003), « Entrepreneurship beyond (a new) economy: creative swarms and pathological zones », in Steyaert, Chris and Hjorth, Daniel (eds.) *New Movements in Entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, p. 286-303.
- HJORTH D., JOHANNISSON B., STEYAERT C. (2003), « Entrepreneurship as Discourse and Life Style », in zarniawska, B. and Sevón, G. *The Northern Lights: Organization theory in Scandinavia*, Malmö/Copenhagen/Oslo:Liber/ Copenhagen Business School Press/Abstrakt

HOSKING D.M., RAMSEY C.M. (2000), « Research, intervention and change: A constructionist contribution to process ». *Research paper 0004*. Birmingham: Aston Business School.

HOSKIN K. (1998), « Examining accounts and accounting for management: inverting understandings of 'the economic' », dans McKinlay, A. and Starkey, K. (eds.): Foucault, *Management and Organization Theory*. London: SAGE.

HOSKING D.M., HJORTH D. (2004), « Relational constructionism and entrepreneurship: some key notes », dans Hjorth, Daniel and Steyaert, Chris (eds.) *Narrative and Discursive Approaches in Entrepreneurship Studies*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

JOHANNISSON B. 1991, « University Training for Entrepreneurship: Swedish Approaches. », *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*. 3 (1), p. 67-82.

JOHANNISSON B., HALVARSSON, D., LÖVSTÅL E., TIDÅSEN C. (1999), « Learning Synergies on the University and Community Border - Business Students in Dialogue with New Starters' in Evans », D S (Ed.) *International Dimensions of Teaching Entrepreneurship*. École Supérieure de Commerce et de Management, p. 17-35.

JOHANNISSON B., LANDSTRÖM H., ROSENBERG J. (1998), « University Training for Entrepreneurship - An Action Frame of Reference. », *European Journal of Engineering Education*. 23(4), p. 477-496.

KATZ J. A. (2003), « The chronology and intellectual history of American entrepreneurship education », *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, p. 283-300.

KOZULIN A (1986), « Vygotsky in Context.» dans Vygotsky, L *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press. p xi-lvi.

LANDSTRÖM H., JOHANNISSON B. (2001), « Theoretical Foundations of Swedish Entrepreneurship and Small-Business Research », *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 17 (2), p. 225-248.

LATOUR B. (1987), *Science in Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

LINSTEAD S. (2002), « Organization as Reply: Henri Bergson and Casual Organization Theory », *Organization*, 9(1), p . 95-111.

LYOTARD J-F. (1979) *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

MERRIAM Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, on www.britannica.com.

MICHELSON E. (1999), « Carnival, Paranoia and Experiential Learning », *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 31 (2)p. 140-152.

NEALON J. (1997), « The Ethics of Dialogue: Bakhtin and Levinas », *College English*, 59(2)p. 129-148.

NORMANN R. (1977), *Management for Growth*. Chichester: Wiley.

RAFFO C., O'CONNOR J., LOVATT A., BANKS M. (2000) « Attitudes to Formal Business Training and Learning amongst Entrepreneurs in the Cultural Industries: situated business learning through 'doing with others' », *Journal of Education and Work*, 13(2),p. 215-230.

SANDBERG W. (1992), « Strategic Management's Potential Contribution to Theory of Entrepreneurship », *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, Spring, p. 73-90.

SARASVATHY S. D. (2001), « Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency », *Academy of Management Review*, 26 (2), p. 243-263.

SPINOSA C., FLORES F., DREYFUS H. (1997), *Disclosing New Worlds – Entrepreneurship, Democratic Action and Cultivation of Solidarity*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.

TOWNLEY B (1995), « Know Thyself’: Self-awareness, Self-formation and Managing », *Organization*, 2(2), p. 271-289

WEICK K E (1995), *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.