

This article has been subject to blind review.

Entrepreneurship in Translation: From a Techno-economic to an Educational Context

Dag Ofstad, University of Nordland, Norway

This article focuses on the concept of entrepreneurship, which, during the last 20 years, has undergone a translation process and a change of meaning from techno-economic, via a political to an educational context. The purpose of this article is to go deeper into the “history of impact” of the entrepreneurship concept. In dialogue with some few thousand pages of texts, pre-understanding, prejudices and some experiences of my own, I have studied the phenomenon entrepreneurship, how the translation process has progressed and some of the implications it faced during the implementation of the concept into the education context.

Key words: Entrepreneurship, Translation process, History of Impact, De-Contextualisation/Contextualisation.

Introduction

The concept of entrepreneurship has been known to the modern world for at least three centuries. In this period it has been a very powerful and dynamic concept within the economic context and has played a key role as one of the major forces in economic development. My intention with the article is to bring into focus the exciting multi-step history to tell about entrepreneurship from the mid nineteen eighties up to our time. The concept went through a de-contextualisation process within the economic context in the nineties, transferred via actor network organisations like epistemic community networks, was contextualised again, translated, and

This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license. The license text is available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

put into practice as we entered the new millennium, in a completely different environment than the original, namely the educational context. The research question posed for this explorative study is: How could this kind of silent educational revolution happen? How could an economic approach to teaching and training so heavily influence the didactic methodologies in the Norwegian school system, considering that the professions that became overruled in this process were the powerful professions of teachers and educators?

Based on a broad-spectrum approach, my specific aim is to problematize the discourse of entrepreneurship. For the purpose of reaching a broader overview and a deeper understanding of the evolutionary processes the entrepreneurship concept has undergone in the last decades, I have used both a historical, sociological and organisational mind-set.

These processes are studied in the light of the optics the German philosopher Hans Georg Gadamer has provided the reader with through his hermeneutic theory. My aim has thus been to investigate and articulate the entrepreneurship concept's history of impact. Furthermore, I have chosen to search for some answers by studying the dynamics of epistemic community networks, governments, systemic constitutions and innovation as sociological systems and linked this to the special branch of organisational theory known as translation theory, with inspiration from pragmatism (Røvik, 2009). It should also be said that I am not only looking into how these translation processes seem to be in progress, but also give some inputs into how these could be promoted and focused.

Entrepreneurship as macro arena

A glimpse of the macro arena of both the term and conception "Entrepreneurship" can be found when searching on the net. Within less than a second 81.3 million hits are shown (and this amount is increasing every day). Entrepreneurship as a conception and a tool within both economy and education has become one of the major hypes of postmodern times.

Entrepreneurship in business, industry and education has during the last 10-15 years been a mainly politically focused area, aiming to make Europe more competitive towards the US and Asia. The strategies agreed upon by the European Commission at a meeting in Lisbon in 2000 emphasised the importance of strengthening people's entrepreneurial skills and energy and thereby encouraging individuals to increase business activity. The European governments wanted to promote a view, telling that it is

equally important and appropriate to make a career as a self-employed work creator as it is as being an ordinary employee (EU Commission, 2003).

In Norway, the governments since 2003 have regularly launched both strategies and action plans for entrepreneurship in education. These strategies have emphasised the importance of striving to develop a culture of entrepreneurship education in Norway. The concept entrepreneurship was to be implemented in attitude, mind-set and linked to the development of practical and action-oriented teaching methods, encouraging behaviour that promotes collaboration skills, creativity and the innovation abilities of children and adolescents. This was in turn supposed to encourage young people to have faith in their creative energy and ability to see and use local resources. By growing up as self-reliant individuals, they could create jobs and prosperity and take a co-responsibility role in the development of their communities (Kunnskapsdepartementet, Nærings- og handelsdepartementet og Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet, 2004-2008 & 2009-2014¹).

Entrepreneurship as a linguistic term

Entrepreneurship has its origin from the word *entreprendre* (French) which means go ahead, initiate, start up, boot, make up something, do something and perform. *Prendre* in French means to take. It also has close affinities with the German word *unternehmen* which means to make, do, initiate. The term's first syllable – *entre* – means the same as the English *enter*, and the neighbouring expressions *entering*, *enter into*, *introduce* and *enterprising*, which means active and entrepreneurial, which again means operational, enterprising, innovative and implementative. In some of the Nordic countries the terms are linked to entrepreneurship, for example the Swedish word *företagsam*, or Norwegian *foretaksom*, which both mean enterprising. The Danes use the term *iverksetting*, which is slightly more convenient and dynamic in the sense of effectuating/executing a start-up situation (Solstad, 2000, p. 6-30).

¹ The Government's Strategy for Entrepreneurship in Education from 2004 to 2008 and Action Plan for Entrepreneurship in Education 2009 to 2014.

Entrepreneurship as a contextual concept within economy

The concept of entrepreneurship has a history going back to the ancient and medieval worlds. From the beginning, entrepreneurship has been intertwined with the ability of capital and the risk associated with commercial ventures (Hebert & Link, 2009, p. 6).

In modern and post-modern times, entrepreneurship in the economy has, broadly stated, been heavily influenced by two scientists. The first to recognise entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur in economic theory was the Irish-born financial actor, Richard Cantillon (1680?-1734?)². Cantillon's economic theory, written down in the "Essai sur la Nature du Commerce en General", sketched the outlines of a nascent market economy, founded on individual property rights and based on economic interdependency, or more precisely mutual need – and necessity. In this market economy Cantillon recognised three classes of economic agents: (1) landowners who were financially independent, (2) entrepreneurs who were engaged in market exchanges at their own risk in order to make a profit, and (3) hirelings who forego active decision-making in order to secure contractual guaranties of stable incomes (ibid). Cantillon placed entrepreneurs as the most central economic actor of society. Entrepreneurs played multiple roles in the economic process, since they were responsible for all the production, circulation and exchange in a market economy, especially exercising business judgement in the face of uncertainty.

The second economic scientist to mention is probably the most known and influential of them all. Almost all modern theories concerning entrepreneurship take their origin from the Slovak/Austrian economist Joseph Alois Schumpeter (1883-1950). Also for Schumpeter the entrepreneur was the main instrument of change in his theories of economic development, simply the *persona causa* of economic development. He laid the foundation of the modern understanding of the concept, defining entrepreneurship as the creative response of economic development and promoted it as a basic knowledge to explain economic alteration/change. Entrepreneurship for Schumpeter was to do something new, or some things which have been done before – in a new way.

² The details of Cantillon's life and activities are rather sparse. The exact year of his birth has so far defied identification. He was a successful banker and financier, but controversy dogged him everything and even the circumstances of his death were a drama as he was killed by an angry officer whom he had discharged a couple of days earlier.

Schumpeter describes economic development as something that comes from within, which is uneven and spontaneous and gives qualitative breaks with the prevailing conditions and creating radically new conditions – and thus could be seen as something that breaks with the static equilibrium state of the economy (Elliot, 1983; Spilling, 1998, p. 15). He argued that economic development leads to growth, but economic development in Schumpeter's sense is more than pure growth. In his concept of economic growth, qualitative changes are also essential. Schumpeter was keen to develop new combinations related to production processes in industry, and to contribute to stronger growth and diversification of the economy. He introduced five strategic combination stages of industrial development, all of them having an entrepreneurial function: the introduction of new products (ideas), the introduction of new production methods, the introduction of new markets for old existing products, utilization of new raw materials or semi-finished products in production, and new forms of organization within the industry through monopolies – or violation of the monopoly situation (Landström, 2005, p. 40-41). Deeply rooted in the dynamics of the five previous mentioned strategic combinations, Schumpeter claimed that we would find the entrepreneur. According to Schumpeter's theory, successful innovation requires an act of will, not of intellect. It depends, therefore, on leadership, not intelligence, and it should not be confused with invention. He was insistent that innovation and invention require entirely different kinds of aptitudes. Although entrepreneurs may be inventors just as they may be capitalists, they are inventors not by nature of their functions, but by coincidence – and vice versa. Furthermore, Schumpeter emphasised that the entrepreneur has an aptitude for leadership stemming in part from the use of knowledge (Hebert & Link, 2009, p. 69-73).

Entrepreneurship as a mind-set – a tool in education

Based on the text “Green paper – Entrepreneurship in Europe” (EU Commission, 2003, p. 5) entrepreneurship is described as a *mind-set*. This indicates that entrepreneurship is a way of thinking, a formation process in which you have developed your entrepreneurial abilities and aptitude through experience since you were a child. The entrepreneurial mind-set emerges like an inner impetus that strengthens your human abilities and qualities such as your integrity, humility, intuition, dedication, creative forces, passion, innovativeness, flexibility, courage, will to risk, self-confidence and stamina. Gradually, experiences filled with these mixed strengths

provide you with a strong attitude and make the approach and response time to problems or challenges shorter, both in time and action.

Entrepreneurship is also about people, and the choices and the actions they have become a part of. It regards starting, taking over or managing an activity/a project, or involvement in a group's strategic decision-making. Entrepreneurship arises from within the person and not from the business idea. An entrepreneurial mindset is not about what you do, but who you are (Luczkiw, 2007, p. 54). An entrepreneurial mindset emerges through being able to wonder, to reflect on experiences, to think independently, showing receptivity and sensitivity and thus by handling the universal drama of life. The entrepreneurial mindset covers an individual's motivation and capacity, independently or within an organization, by identifying opportunities and pursuing them in order to produce activities giving new experiences, excitements, ideas, added value or economic success.

A hermeneutic approach to entrepreneurship research

The Norwegian philosopher Tore Nordenstam (2005, p. 52) underlines that hermeneutics is the science of understanding. Hermeneutics is about truth – or about both understanding and truth. “When we understand the tradition, we not only understand texts, but acquire knowledge and acknowledge the truth” according to the German philosopher Gadamer (2010, p. 21).

To trace the history of a translation of entrepreneurship as both a concept and a mind-set is a quite complex matter. It is essential that I as researcher learn to know how to build up an understanding of understanding and truth. I have to make what is written about entrepreneurship understandable to me as researcher. A hermeneutic approach to a phenomenon emphasises that there is not one actual truth, but that phenomena can be interpreted in different levels, and that meaning can only be understood in the light of the context of what we study. We understand parts in terms of the whole, and the whole in terms of the parts. I could obtain this understanding by seeking knowledge in the sources that give me a greater insight into, and a better understanding of both entrepreneurship as a concept, and as a mind-set when translated from one context to another. My sources can bring me into a refined understanding of both others and myself.

There is always a risk that I will become a victim of my own horizon of understanding, caused by the fact that everything I understand seems to be understood in the same way, within the same frame of understanding. If that happens, it will probably be said that my understanding is not at all

in motion. On the contrary, it could be said that my understanding is free of dynamic and that I am not vigorously and curiously searching for new insights and further understanding. How can I avoid prejudice governing my understanding of my work and how can I avoid becoming a victim of my blind spots?³

To avoid it I must, according to Gadamer, dare to put myself at risk in the pursuit of this new insight and understanding. I have to dare to be a stranger to myself, let go of my regular patterns of thought, old forms of understanding and prejudice in order to let the text speak to me – and let it affect me as a human being. The prejudice of perfection not only means that a text should express its opinion in a perfect manner, but also that what it says is the perfect truth (Gadamer, 2003, p. 40). Understanding means primarily to understand myself in the cause – and only then to distinguish and understand the other's opinion, as Gadamer writes: “It is in dialogue with the text I can anticipate perfection of understanding” (ibid.). If I want to understand the translation process the conception of entrepreneurship has been put through, I must be prepared to look for new records of understanding. In this process, the hermeneutic circle⁴ will be my central system of analysis, where I, by being in dialogue with the past, can contribute to creating real and genuine understanding by being in motion, and through that contribute to creating a form of mutual adjustment between the whole based on the parts and the parts based on the whole. Furthermore, we need to uphold the dialogue between what we must interpret and our own understanding – or between what we should interpret and the context in which it will be interpreted (Gadamer, 2003, p. 33-34). The anticipation of meaning, with a reference to the whole, becomes explicit understanding when the parts, which can be determined based on the whole, decide the same whole itself (ibid.).

³ “Blind spots” introduced as a phenomenon by Gadamer and the Danish Philosopher Steen Wackerhausen (2008) can, among other things, mean that we are locked inside customary thinking – and do not risk being a stranger to ourselves – in order to find new perspectives of known problems.

⁴ The Hermeneutic Circle – “The circle cannot be a nuisance and must not become something that could not be tolerated either. In the circle we will find well hidden a positive possibility of the most original recognition, which we only can apprehend when the interpretation has understood that the first, the permanent and last job will be to avoid simple opinions to decide purpose (Vorhabe), foresight (Vorsicht) and anticipation (Vorgriff), but to ensure the scientific subject when preparing these, based on the things itself” (Heidegger, quoted in Gadamer, 2003, p. 36).

For me, this means that when I am in a hermeneutic circle motion, I understand by virtue of what I already have understood. I will carry pre-understanding with me, and it constitutes my linguistic capability, my genuine way of being in the world. Furthermore, Gadamer writes that it is important that I as a researcher know that I do not know, in order to be sure that I am open to new perspectives and safeguarding the duty of expanding the unit of implied meaning in concentric circles. The fact that all the parts fall into a whole in each case is a criterion that I have understood correctly. If such a correlation is absent, it means that I have failed to reach a full understanding (Gadamer, 2003, p. 33).

By having this implanted in my intellectual baggage, I start the trip further into the process of understanding and preparing myself to outline the *impact history* of the conception and mind-set of entrepreneurship.

Towards an entrepreneurial society

However, the strongest political go signal for making Entrepreneurship a powerful tool in European education emerged through an exceptionally clear strategy, carved out ready for use for the purpose of creating a time-adapted, broad based, cross-science education system, for people and organisations with a learning approach, as expressed by the British OECD delegate Colin Ball at an OECD conference in Paris in 1989:

In short, people will need to be creative rather than passive, capable of self-initiated action, rather than dependent; they will need to know how to learn rather than expect to be taught; they will need to be enterprising in their outlook, and not think or act like an 'employee' or 'client'. The organisations in which they work, communities in which they live, and societies in which they belong will, in turn, also need to possess all these qualities.

When tracing the concept of entrepreneurship and its contextualisation into the educational system, this Paris meeting has become a milestone. Politicians, bureaucrats, business and industry actors were given a wake-up call about the importance of entrepreneurship as a vital factor in education.

At the same time in Europe, the unemployment rate steadily increased, especially among young people. The competition between the US and Europe was hard and the vast growth in the East affected Europe deeply. The rules and regulations that served Western democratic societies well into the industrial era no longer served us well at that time. An organic

network replaced the machine metaphor. The scientific method, the dominant science in the modern age, was challenged by a new science of complexity as the emerging scientific paradigm. The practice of entrepreneurship held a great deal of promise for navigating in chaos, complexity and disruption. But while the discipline of entrepreneurship reflects the science of complexity, the school and university culture continues to be the repository of scientific method (Luczkiw, 2007, p. 44). The reason for the strong focus on contextualisation of entrepreneurship into education, schools and training environments, was primarily rooted in the knowledge of the new market-oriented economy and increasing globalisation. It became more and more accepted that the future would bring continuous rapid and comprehensive changes in most life areas. Continuous technological inventions and a new world market brought about new international competition. These global features have capital consequences for the labour market, concerning both employment conditions and the organisation of work. We are moving towards a society where entrepreneurship is becoming more significant than ever and we can claim that we are entering a more entrepreneurial society (Spilling, 1998, p. 13).

Entrepreneurship in translation

But why was this sudden translation process started and set in motion, how was it set in motion, by whom and when? What really happened, and what did not happen, when entrepreneurship was introduced as a learning strategy in education throughout Europe?

To be able to understand the translation process of the entrepreneurship concept from the economic to educational context, I will use “Translation Theory”, previously used to translate languages, but which during the last thirty years has more and more become a discipline preoccupied by development and distribution of organisational ideas and concepts.

The theoretical approach in this article is built upon the theories of the Norwegian professor in Political Science, Kjell Arne Røvik, who has designed a theory that is appropriate for the questions I will meet when identifying and describing this translation process. *Translation theory* is a pragmatic approach to how to transfer knowledge, where the main factor is to be preoccupied with the normative and potential implications regarding knowledge transfer as interpretation. It has become a theory tradition with great relevance to the understanding of the translation of ideas and concepts between organisations. The phenomenon translation of organisa-

tional knowledge can in an analytic perspective be divided into two types of processes, namely de-contextualisation and contextualisation.

De-contextualisation refers to bringing something out of a context. This refers to all incidents where organic practices and/or recipes are identified and taken out of a context, for example the concept of entrepreneurship, with the aim of being translated and inserted into one or several other contexts. It is possible to differentiate between two types of de-contextualisation – *detachment* and *packing*. In this connection detachment means, for example, that a concrete successful practice in one particular context is formed with a view to be translated to other contexts. Packing gives a concept a more general form, and by doing that, makes it more transferable to a new context, contributing to a universalization of a context-based idea or concept (Røvik, 2009, p. 22).

Contextualisation can be understood as the demand, receipt, implementation and utilization of popular ideas or concepts. It is described as an unpacking process of concepts regarded as a possible new and added value for organisations preoccupied by innovation. The generating, transfer and receipt of organisational ideas can in a broad perspective be understood as a kind of translation: something is brought forth from a particular context, transferred and applied, transformed to and inducted into one or several other contexts (Røvik, 2009, p. 23). This could, for example, be a description of how the concept of entrepreneurship was transferred from the context of economy to the context of education. By separating between de-contextualisation and contextualisation, we can obtain an analytic conceptualisation of the whole chain of transfer.

International networks

In the last decades the amount of international collaborator networks has increased immensely and could be described as political or scientific regime structures. New fields of practice in international politics and science are today assembling for frequent meetings between representatives of many nations. Several field-restricted cooperative arrangements have been established, often referred to as international regimes (Stokke & Claes, 2001, p. 258-278).

A regime is generally divided into two parts – a substantial part, which includes written goals, basic causal beliefs and description of norms, rights and obligations – and an operational part consisting of folded procedures, embodied practices and artefacts.

One direction in the type of international regimes is called knowledge-based regimes. They occur often as a result of knowledge-oriented approaches in which the players' perceptions of the world are largely formed through international collaboration (Haas, 1989). Such performances may be superior images of how the world is connected, but also more specific normative principles and beliefs about the cause-effect relationship. The Norwegian-Russian Fisheries regime in the Barents Sea, The International Atomic Energy Agency, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and diverse humanitarian missions, may serve as examples of this type of regime (Stokke & Claes, 2007, p. 258-278; Haas, 1990).

Through the influence of such performances, international regimes create network arenas where players get together to express and create areas of growth for their own interests, creating conditions for a common pattern of behaviour and helping to create the instruments needed to achieve their own objectives.

Within the regime context, the Epistemic Communities are the impetus of international regimes. Through having control of knowledge production, the Epistemic Communities have a high degree of influence on diverse issue areas (Galbreath & McEvoy, 2012).

The OECD can be called an epistemic community. The power of the OECD pervades academia and society and diffuses beyond democratic decision-making through various networks of political decision makers, civil servants and experts. Research done by the Finnish researcher Johanna Kallo cements the view that the OECD's legislative power is limited. Parallel to its narrow legislative influence, the organisation has, however, created other effective forms of "soft laws". OECD peer reviews, recommendations and indicator studies combined with the EU's methods represent "soft laws", which are "rules of conduct" aiming to steer the national level decision-making, higher education agendas and future legislative reforms (Kallo, 2009). Without the influence of OECD experts concerned about entrepreneurship in education and of promoting the entrepreneurial spirit of Europe the regime organisations within the EU would have had great difficulties to translate Entrepreneurship as a vital issue in education as well as in the labour market context in Europe, in Norway and the other Scandinavian countries.

The rise of entrepreneurship in the educational context

It is reasonable to look upon the de-contextualisation of the entrepreneurship concept from the economic context and the contextualisation of it into Norwegian education, at least partly as a result of processes between professionals in actor networks that have been given birth to within an epistemic community. Furthermore, it is reasonable to understand that much of what can be experienced as pre-political preparations are displayed in these kinds of sub-political meeting spaces and at a later stage will end up as formal political strategies. Confronted by the knowledge of the entrepreneur as a risk-taking, creative, entrepreneurial and innovative human figure who also possesses entrepreneurship skills and abilities, it is opportune to think that some of the most influential people throughout Europe started to reflect about how it could be possible to stimulate and nurture entrepreneurial humans in schools and education systems. It is also likely that it became one of the subjects of the national and international regime groups and epistemic communities travelling around meeting each other, talking, reflecting and discussing different approaches to entrepreneurship. Over some time new ideas developed on how to promote entrepreneurship, how to reach the entrepreneurial talents, and how to educate them, so that their entrepreneurial abilities were strengthened. The discussions continued and these new ideas started to create precedence. From the first substantial speech about the subject by Colin Ball in Paris in 1989, it took about 14 years before the EU commission gave the entrepreneurship concept its formal political birth, shown in a written strategic document.

In January 2003 the EU Commission published the “Green paper Entrepreneurship in Europe” describing the new strategies for job creation, increased competitiveness, to unlock personal potential, and to increase societal interest in entrepreneurship as a first step towards creating an entrepreneurial culture in Europe.

The year after the Green paper, the Norwegian government came up with the strategy document including a government vision: “See the opportunities and make them work”, saying:

Entrepreneurship in the education system shall renew teaching and training and create quality and multiplicity in order to foster creativity and innovation.⁵

⁵ The Strategic Plan of Entrepreneurship in Education 2004-2008. The Norwegian Govern-

Two scenarios

Having outlined an impact history of entrepreneurship, I chose to turn the time clock back 10 years. Then the contextualisation of the concept began. To show how the process can be described, it is tempting to dramatize it by creating a *sliding door* effect. What if we had the opportunity to follow two different development scenarios?

The first one is as close to the truth as my experience can bring me. This I will call *The translation of young enterprise into the educational context in Norway*. The second one is perhaps an example of how the process should have been accomplished. This I will call *The translation of the thought of entrepreneurship as a method of human action in Norway*.

Scenario I – Entrepreneurship as a method

The models that characterize today's entrepreneurship education in schools are models adapted and developed within the Confederation of Norwegian Enterprise. However, we will find that many of them have been adapted to the Norwegian education system from being artefacts for promoting entrepreneurship in the US through the organization Junior Achievement/Young Enterprise (JA/YE) (Ungt Entreprenørskap Norge – UE Norge, 2012). This organisation, which has now gone global, is a very efficient and coordinated network. Being a global network, it was likely to play a role in the translation processes of the entrepreneurship concept to different countries and languages. The major factor in the JA/YE concept is the idea of mini-enterprises within schools. The mini-enterprise is a training method giving pupils or students an opportunity to develop and design an idea: to plan, organise, start up, run, and finally, to shut down a company. Usually this process lasts one school year.

In Norway the contextualisation of JA/YE started in NHO system during 1996 and for the next couple of years up till the millennium Young Enterprise Norway appeared and grew fast into being an organisation represented in all counties throughout Norway.

In 2010 there were 150,000 pupils/students, 14,000 teachers and 13,000 mentors participating in some kind of entrepreneurship related program

ment (2004:1) Kunnskapsdepartementet, Nærings- og handelsdepartementet og Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet (2009-2014).

through Young Enterprise Norway. The organisation has about 20 well-prepared and professionally developed programs for the whole education system, from primary school up to higher and further education, both for teachers and pupils. All the evaluations reveal that there is a high degree of satisfaction among the users, politicians and private actors involved (Ovesen, Gjertsen & Rønning, 2011).

A paradox is, however, that entrepreneurship in education in Norway, all in all is brought into Norwegian schools from outside actors. The education authorities on the governmental level have modelled the strategic directives for the activity, and are apparently quite confident with Young Entrepreneurship's standardized learning concepts.

Young Enterprise Norway today is so interwoven with the context of education that no competitors are challenging them. Two thirds of the annual budget of Young Enterprise Norway is covered by the Norwegian Government and the counties and one third is covered by private sponsors. The organisation has now reached a budget close to 90 million NOK and has 40 very engaged and enthusiastic employees throughout the country assisting schools in a very professional way.

Scenario II – Entrepreneurship as a mind-set

The teaching professions were probably taken by surprise when the wave of entrepreneurship was washing over the education system just before they were about to enter the new millennium. There had neither been prepared nor initiated any real reflection or discourse about the subject in their organisations.

What would have happened if the government ten years ago had told the teaching organisations and school owners as follows: "We know that the key to success in schools is to have confidence in teachers and school managers. We want to invite you to be responsible for creating an entrepreneurial school, with entrepreneurial learning strategies and methods and furthermore to outline a strategy for creating an entrepreneurial culture within education and training for the best of our children and youth."

Inspired by an invitation to be a part of a bottom up strategy process, I would assume that the participating actors would initiate a good discourse about entrepreneurship in education and training in Norway. Through a good second order reflection they could be inspired to create all the good approaches possible, and make the implementation of entrepreneurship in school a very successful process for all the interested actors. A superior goal

would be to create a clear vision, mission and passion, some values and dynamic goals, and some educational strategies for active and interactive participation.

Through a pedagogical process the expected aim should be making pupils fit to meet the challenges of the future, by keeping focus on applicable skills and innovative problem-solving attitudes built into education. This would be called entrepreneurial mind-set training. Through entrepreneurial mind-set training young people could be trained in working on their own life project, continuously developing it. A process like this, if it were monitored well as an action oriented project built on a passionate belief of success, could succeed in making the school a more time adapted learning system. These adaptations should, however, rest on some insights and principles. First of all, they would have to take into consideration their target group. Their macro insight would tell that our young generation is communicating in global virtual communities, in which they are accessible 24 hours a day. Furthermore, they are travelling a lot, both electronically and physically. Their arenas of experience, training and discovery are becoming more and more global; they are becoming technologically expansive and trendsetters with the highest technological education in history. Their electronic playing field is borderless via mobile phones, the Internet and social media.

What kind of school system could fit these individuals and groups? I suggest: A school where astonishment and curiosity are focused, where questions are asked, answers found and mediated, and evaluations made. A school where all the members have responsibility for their own learning (participatory) or a school where the pupils and students work together solving real life challenges (problem-based). A learning environment where the pupils/students could have learning programs linked to own experiences (experience-based), or a school where the involved pupils are preoccupied by working with many subjects at the same time (project-based), and finally a school where all the work done could be for the benefit of themselves, their environment and local community, and even globally (result-oriented). The most exciting would be a flexible combination of all these school concepts.

Discussion

If I am challenged to conclude and to summarize the final result of this process, there would probably be a majority of those who meant that scenario I is the winner. Entrepreneurship as a strategy in education at present could to some extent be called a product of liberal market forces. Young enterprise Norway has, based on a level-headed view of the current status, achieved almost a monopoly situation as supplier of training concepts to all educational levels in Norway. All the public strategy plans are nurturing and encouraging co-operation between business and industry, and the labour market perspective. Teacher organisations also have a school–working life perspective, where the skills fit for profit making activities get the focus. This is looked upon as a great achievement for the necessary strengthening of collaboration between business and trade, industry and the education system and schools.

However, there is a critical question to pose: is it plausible to claim in this connection, that instrumentalism has won over humanism or that the capitalisation of society has been so strong that it is not possible to make any major changes? Have teachers managed to break the code of pedagogical entrepreneurship and taken up action-oriented learning processes where multiple arena learning is the rule, not the exception – or will the four walls of the classroom still be the issue? (Eide, 2012) This is up to the future to reveal.

Furthermore, is it likely to claim that we, instead of initiating critical reflection and discourse about future oriented work forms adapted to the spirit of our times have seen outlines of a technocratic methodological system. The Norwegian professor in pedagogy Gunn Imsen asks:

For how long will teachers and educators be forced into roles as administrators of instrumental learning concepts and control regimes, developed by actors from outside schools, based on market economy principles? Key persons in this process were neither school leaders nor teachers. The “outsiders” seem to have taken over the power of definition of what is and should be pedagogical work (Imsen, 2009).

The Action plan for Entrepreneurship in Education in Norway includes the vision and the mission, the beliefs and aims teachers and educators should follow in the coming years up to 2014. However, the critical factor in future education seems to be whether we can further motivate teachers in schools by giving them responsibility, confidence and freedom for future

teaching and didactic planning. History shows that it is through mutual confidence and freedom to create educative teaching environments that teachers and school managers can contribute to enterprise, growth, innovation and progress. To succeed in creating broad-based entrepreneurial teaching as well as training forms a suggestion would be to reinstate teachers and educators as driving forces in the development of the context of a future entrepreneurial learning culture, readily in close cooperation with interested and enthusiastic outside actors.

Conclusions

My aim for this article was to put the entrepreneurship concept in a broad historical sociological and organisation theoretical context, seeking to follow the concept's translation from the economic to the educational context, its entry into the European and Norwegian political context, and to highlight the concept's contextualisation into the Norwegian education system. The concept has influenced Norwegian education for more or less 20 years in various ways. I have illustrated how the concept has gained its status today, and which processes it has been part of in order to obtain this status.

For the sake of future generations it seems to be necessary to come up with a joint effort to renew the school system so it will be possible to stimulate young people to look for opportunities – and make them work. By doing this they could be prepared to face the interdependent culture that is taking shape among them, rapidly emerging as a new global paradigm, a paradigm that is transforming the culture of any one nation state. Whether we look at environmental, social or economic issues, a global paradigm has begun to emerge, sharing values that are more similar between nation states than those found within. This emerging external environment has its own complex and divergent structures, system and behaviours (Luczkiw, 2007, p. 45). Admitting this, there is a great opportunity to develop a practical action-oriented educational system that could give young people the golden key to their future as both self-creating individuals and as inspirational creative workers.

Since I have chosen a partly normative and advocating approach to this vital subject, I will risk indicating that a sound strategic entrepreneurial bottom-up culture building process has not yet been seriously introduced to Norwegian teachers and schools. At best, one can see traces of culture fragments, but they mostly belong to the neo-liberal understanding of the

concept. Norwegian schools are full of professional and qualified teachers; they are long overdue for innovation, and students are impatiently waiting for new entrepreneurial work forms, and the change agents in schools are eager to become a part of a critical reflection (Imsen, 2009).

In the midst of a wilderness of questions and answers within this field of practice, the most interesting approach to the above mentioned issues is provided by the two American professors, Sarasvathy and Venkatamaran (2010, p. 114) asking:

What if we have been thinking about entrepreneurship the wrong way?
What if we temporarily suspend our thinking of it, as a sub-discipline of economics or management, or a subset of courses taught in business schools?

They fear education may be in danger of falling into a category error. One way out of this error could be to reformulate entrepreneurship as a method of human action, comparable to social forces such as democracy and the scientific method, namely a powerful way of tackling large and abiding problems at the heart of advancing our species.

References

- Eide, O. S. (2012). Aksjonsforskning og pedagogisk entreprenørskap. In J. Sjøvold (Ed.), *Entreprenørskap i utdanningen* (pp. 35-47). Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag.
- Elliot, J. E. (1983). Introduction to the Transaction edition. In J.A. Schumpeter (Ed.), *The Theory of economic development* (pp. vii-lix). London: Transaction Publishers.
- EU Commission (2003). *Green Paper Entrepreneurship in Europe*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.
- Gadamer, H. G. (2003). *Forståelsens filosofi. Utvalgte hermeneutiske skrifter*. Oslo: Cappelen Akademiske forlag.
- Gadamer, H. G. (2010). *Sannhet og metode*. Oslo: Pax Forlag.
- Galbreath, D. J. & McEvoy, J. (2012). European Organizations and Minority Rights in Europe. *Security Dialogue*, 43(3), 267-284.
- Haas, P. M. (1989). Do regimes matter? Epistemic communities and Mediterranean pollution control. *International Organization*, 43(3), 377-403.
- Haas, P. M. (1990). Obtaining International Environmental Protection through Epistemic Consensus. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, December 1990, 19(3), 347-363.

- Hebert, R. F. & Link, A. N. (2009). *A History of Entrepreneurship*. New York: Routledge Studies in History and Economics.
- Imsen, G. (2009). Målstyring i klasserommet. Klassekampen 2009. *Reprint of articles, chronicles and editorial letters. Klassekampen in the period 14th of February – 26th of August 2009*, pp. 70-71.
- Kallo, J. (2009). *OECD Education Policy. A Comparative and Historical Study Focusing on the Thematic Reviews of Tertiary Education*. Research in Educational Sciences, No. 45, Finnish Educational Research Association, Helsinki.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet, Nærings- og handelsdepartementet og Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet (2009–2014). *Regjeringens strategiplan for entreprenørskap i opplæringen – “Se mulighetene – og gjør noe med dem”*. Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- Landström, H. (2005). *Entreprenørskapets rötter*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Luczkiw, E. (2007). The end of entrepreneurship: a holistic paradigm for teaching and learning about, for and through enterprise. *Industry and Higher Education*, 2(1), 43-57.
- Nordenstam, T. (2005). *Eksemplets Makt. Dialoger 2005*. Retrieved from www.dialoger.se
- OECD conference “Education and economy in a changing society”, Paris 1989.
- Ovesen, S., Gjertsen, A., & Rønning, W. (2011). *Evaluering av KRD’s og NHD’s tilskudd til Ungt Entreprenørskap*. NF Rapport (09).
- Røvik, K. A. (2009). *Trender og Translasjoner. Ideer som former det 21 århundrets organisasjon*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Sarasvathy, S. & Venkatamaraman, S. (2010). Entrepreneurship as Method: Open Question for an Entrepreneurial Future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Special Issue: Future of Entrepreneurship, 35(1), 113-135.
- Solstad, K. J. (2000). *Entreprenørskap, noko for oss*. Bodø: Nordlandsforskning.
- Spilling, O. R. (red.) (1998). *Entreprenørskap på norsk*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Stokke, O. S. & Claes, H. D. (2001). Internasjonale regimer. In J. Hovi & R. Malnes (Eds.), *Normer og makt: Innføring i internasjonal politikk* (pp. 271-299). Oslo: Abstrakt forlag.
- Ungt Entreprenørskap Norge – UE Norge (2012). Young Enterprise – YE (2011). Retrieved November 15, 2012, from http://www.youngenterprise.org/company/about_ye/
- Wackerhausen, S. (2008). Erfaringsrum, handlingsbåren kundskab og refleksion. *RUML/Refleksion i praksis*, 1, 3-21.