

## The Entrepreneurship Concept: A Short Introduction

Magnus Hoppe\*

*School of Business, Society and Engineering, Mälardalen University*

The article provides a historic description of how the entrepreneurship concept has developed and now through political initiatives is closing in on higher education. By providing different reference points the article shows that entrepreneurship is not bound to economics and business but instead display divergent meanings depending on context. The article discuss how governmental initiatives, following the policy development in EU and Sweden, has made entrepreneurship a highly contemporary issue for university staff but where the exact meaning of the term is obscured, leaving us unsure of the political agenda driving the implementation. What kind of change the on-going promotion of entrepreneurship in higher education will lead to is thus still to be revealed where the ambiguity of the term together with connotations of success and progression makes it hard to resist. University staff is therefore encouraged to reading up on the concept, where the article provides a short introduction that might serve as a start.

*Keyword:* Entrepreneurship, Policy, Higher education, Sweden

### BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

In 2009 the centre-right government in Sweden launched an official strategy for entrepreneurship within the educational field (Regeringskansliet, 2009). The written strategy resulted in new curricula that guide primary school (Skolverket, 2011a) and secondary school (Skolverket, 2011b). So far, Swedish policy and governmental action has not been as explicit when it comes to higher education. Non the less, according to guiding policy from EU (European Commission, 2006, 2007, 2011, 2012, 2013; European Union, 2006) and existing Swedish strategy (Regeringskansliet, 2009) there is no clear division between educational levels although business creation is more explicitly mentioned for higher levels, i.e. secondary school and onwards.

The most immediate result from the on-going implementation of entrepreneurship policy in the Swedish educational system is that the complexity of the entrepreneurship education field is increasing (Hoppe, 2016). Existing policy encourages a multitude of interpretations about both means and ends, which together with the inherent experimentation in educational practice continuously adds ideas on how entrepreneurship could be taught and to what ends (Berglund & Holmgren, 2007; Leffler, 2015). Traditional ideas of entrepreneurship education for supporting business venturing are not as much challenged than complemented by new contexts where entrepreneurship is given meaning (Hoppe, 2016).

In 2014 The Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth (Tillväxtverket) was given a new appropriation. It states "Tillväxtverket will be coordinating matters relating to the promotion of entrepreneurship in higher education" (Näringsdepartementet, 2013, p. 6, author's translation). This mission was though not new to the agency, which has been working with entrepreneurship in compulsory schools since the early 1990s (Berglund & Holmgren, 2013)

\* Författarkontakt: [magnus.hoppe@mdh.se](mailto:magnus.hoppe@mdh.se)  
Förutsatt korrekt källhänvisning får texten användas och spridas icke-kommersiellt.



Artiklar är kollegialt granskade. Övriga bidragstyper granskas av redaktionen.

Se [www.hogreutbildning.se](http://www.hogreutbildning.se)

ISSN 2000-7558

and higher education since 2011. When Tillväxtverket first approached higher education in 2011 it was through promoting *entrepreneurship*, it was soon changed to promoting *entrepreneurial learning*, and in a new call in 2014 to promote an *entrepreneurial culture*; successively moving from focusing on students skills, over how entrepreneurship can be used in learning, to changes in the institutional learning context (Hoppe, 2016). Being part of this process, in a local project at Mälardalen University (Eriksson & Hoppe, 2016; Hägglund, Eriksson, & Hoppe, 2014), I came to realize how scholars of other fields could view my own position as a business scholar as problematic when discussing if and how entrepreneurship could be understood in e.g. a health context. My share presence made many people think that I would favour ideas of entrepreneurship as mainly a financial matter. At the same time, talking to entrepreneurship scholars within the field of business, many were reluctant to appreciate ideas on entrepreneurship emanating from e.g. the health sector (e.g. that business venturing was not so important for the understanding of entrepreneurship). The concept of entrepreneurship was indeed value laden where I came to be quite annoyed with a common academic tendency to close ranks and shut ones ears to, as I would put it, complementary views on entrepreneurship.

So far, neither the agencies nor the Swedish government has given any clear signals on how they will proceed in the future in order to fulfil strategy goals and governmental policy in higher education. At the same time, it's clear that most teachers in compulsory school before the change in curricula have had limited insights into entrepreneurship (Leffler, 2006; Otterborg, 2011). A similar tendency is also noticeable amongst teachers in higher education (Hoppe, 2016; Hägglund et al., 2014). This ignorance might be problematic, if and when the government or its agencies chose to press forward with reform, uninformed teachers, researchers, managers and administrators in higher education will not know how to react to this and on what grounds. Consequently there seems to be a need for boosting the general knowledge on entrepreneurship amongst university staff, making them interested in exploring the entrepreneurship concept beforehand without too many preconceptions. Accordingly, the aim of this article has been phrased to give a short introduction to entrepreneurship in order to encourage critical reflection on the subject and stimulate higher education professionals to engage in further reading on this issue.

The references given in the text might be a start for those adhering to this call, but these references should be complemented by others depending on the field and interest of each individual reader. Having stated this, I've done my best at giving as a neutral description as possible of the development and diversity of the entrepreneurship field. My voice is of course ever present, but it is more prominent at the end of the article, where I close in on the relationship between the political agenda and the position of higher education today.

#### THE CONCEPT OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The modern and popular use of the term *entrepreneur* can be traced back to the economist Joseph Schumpeter's work *The theory of economic development: an inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle* (1934). The term 'entrepreneur' precedes Schumpeter though, originating from French common language in the 12th century, denoting someone who undertakes a task (Landström, 2005). The first theoretical use is also French (by e.g. Cantillon, 1755), but it is with Schumpeter (especially after the publication of *Capitalism, socialism, and democracy* in 1942) the term becomes popular in first economics and later in business, politics and spreads to a more common vocabulary. The academic initialisation phase took long; where Plaschka and Welsch (1990) writes that it was not until the 1960s an initial formative stage of a specific scientific field became visible.

With the introduction of the term *entrepreneur* Schumpeter could explain how aggregated changes in society were initiated. It was the entrepreneur who introduced new products, processes and organizational forms, thus being the initiator of *innovation*. The Schumpeterian term *innovation* is accompanied with the term *creativity* in the sense of being able to envisage something else (and better) and change the current status quo. We still often see these three central Schumpeterian terms in conjunction: *entrepreneurship*, *innovation* and *creativity* (e.g. European Commission, 2010, p. 11), where one also can note that they are in frequent use in popular media, often intertwined with political as well as business rhetoric.

The entrepreneur as an agent for both economical and societal development started to interest researchers in business administration and psychology in the mid 1900s, with a special interest emanating from the end of World War II and the need for rebuilding industries and countries. The interest grew and in the 1980s innovation and entrepreneurship became managerial buzzwords (Drucker, 1985) and with this managerial interest, entrepreneurship as a special theoretical field within business administration was given even more attention.

The sediments from this development are still visible today in both popular media and business schools. Studying entrepreneurship is still closely related to start-ups and the continuous struggle for businesses to recreate themselves and stay viable (Landström, 2005). In this tradition much attention has been given the personal traits of the entrepreneur as business creator, linking this part of the business curriculum close to psychology (McClelland, 1951, 1961). Just as in economics the traits of the entrepreneur is deemed to be exceptions to what normally depicts man, especially the propensity of taking risks and acting to change the present situation, thus taking the role as change agent. Kuratko (2005) has condensed these personal traits into the idea of an *entrepreneurial spirit* that he describes as follows:

The characteristics of seeking opportunities, taking risks beyond security, and having the tenacity to push an idea through to reality combine into a special perspective that permeates entrepreneurs. (Kuratko 2005, p. 578)

This perspective is also common in popular media's descriptions of successful entrepreneurs. Over the years Ingvar Kamprad (IKEA), Richard Branson (Virgin), Steve Jobs (Apple), Yngve Bergqvist (The Icehotel in Jukkasjärvi) and now Elon Musk (Tesla) have become role models for the typical entrepreneur, which also is how most people first come to know about the concept. Even though role models like these still may be the most common way of depicting entrepreneurs in media, research has advanced and especially since the turn of the century come to question the economic focus of entrepreneurship as well as the stereotyped views on whom the entrepreneurs are. Ahl and Marlow (2012), for instance, argue that media supports special hetero-normative assumptions about entrepreneurship (visible in the male examples above) and distorts more nuanced views. In line with this, if there would be any norm for entrepreneurship, I would suggest that it builds on this quite circumscribed and popular description of male entrepreneurship for business purposes (cf. Berglund & Wigren, 2012); a view that is now being questioned.

More recent research, from the 1990s and onwards, distancing itself from the traits of the economically successful entrepreneur, has come to both pay more attention to the entrepreneurial process of organizing for the introduction of a novelty and the context of this process (Gartner, 1988; Griffiths, Kickul, Bacq, & Terjesen, 2012; Landström, 2005). With this movement, the field is becoming more pluralistic, where e.g. learning aspects of entrepreneurial processes have

become a theme for scholars of many fields (Gartner, 1990; Gibb, 2002; Sarasvathy, 2004; Steyaert, 2007). Based on a process approach, using two terms coined by Sarasvathy (2001) the typical entrepreneur learn through the constant feedback of 'effectuation' as they use changing means in their interaction with uncertainty instead of the planning typical of 'causation'. This process, attributed to entrepreneurs, is also now at the core of the deployment of the entrepreneurship concept within the pedagogical field and then especially through what has been labelled 'entrepreneurial learning' (cf. Leffler, 2006, 2014, 2015), which I'll come back to later.

As there is no consensus on the entrepreneurship concept, there are also complementary descriptions of the emergence of today's use, challenging any specific historical overview e.g. focusing on business as I just did (cf. Landström, 2005). One of these is Thornton (1999) who claims that entrepreneurship was incorporated into sociology already with Weber in 1904 describing how a specific economic behavior of individuals led to the rise of capitalism. The concept has since then never left sociology where Thornton stresses that sociology is not interested in entrepreneurship as a specific class, but in specific subsectors. The main contribution from the sociology field is its emphasis on the social ties in the demand side of entrepreneurship (instead of the entrepreneur as the explorer of novelty). Hence, sociology works to disunite the concept from psychology's emphasis on personal traits, giving it another foundation for theory development.

As business studies now moves away from personal traits, sociology and business interests seem to merge in recent years in an interest for entrepreneurial activities that encompass a social responsibility by focusing on other goals and values than purely economic gain. In business research we can notice this movement through expanding subfields such as 'social entrepreneurship' and 'societal entrepreneurship' (Berglund, Johannisson, & Schwartz, 2012; Berglund & Wigren, 2012). The main idea of this research can roughly be read into the title of the article "Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor" by Seelos and Mair (2005). For these particular sub-fields it can be noted that even though the interest rose before the millennium, according to Santos (2012), it was not until 2006 a more commonly used definition for social entrepreneurship was introduced by Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern (2006) which reads "Entrepreneurial activity with an embedded social purpose". Those looking for sharpness and clarity might be a bit disappointed by the vagueness of this definition, but it reflects the ambiguity of the whole field of entrepreneurship, where this definition can be used not only in economics, business and sociology, but in a variety of fields now taking an interest in this particular field of entrepreneurship and entrepreneuring.

Other fields that more recently have taken an interest in entrepreneurship are for example gender studies (e.g. Bruni, Gherardi, & Poggio, 2004), but maybe most prominent in relation to the development of social entrepreneurship is social work (e.g. Dees, 2007). What unites several of these subfields are entrepreneurship practices that spans several interlinked interests, e.g. empirical descriptions of entrepreneurial activity in conjunction with the establishment of rural internet kiosks for those in lack of resources (Rangaswamy, 2006) or how Nobel Peace Prize winner Muhammad Yunus micro-loans (Dees, 2007) lead to societal and social changes. Through the interest in these phenomena, entrepreneurship is now gaining attention from a growing number of academic fields where the concept is being adapted and adopted to a variety of research interests (cf. Landström, 2005). This development as well as other transformations of the field, as Berglund and Wigren (2012, p. 19) put it, opens up entrepreneurship "for people, who perhaps would never refer to themselves as entrepreneurs, to become engaged and involved in entrepreneurial activity" (cf. Sarasvathy, 2004).

*No natural academic home for opportunities*

Expanding what entrepreneurship is about; Israel Kirzner (1973) emphasise that entrepreneurship is related to seizing opportunities in the economy, where the entrepreneur is characterized by an “alertness to hitherto undiscovered opportunities”. For Kirzner, as an economic, opportunities are market imperfections that needs to be solved in order to balance the economy. For others, not confined to the economic tradition, opportunities can be much more. Opportunities can for example be categorized in three ways, as Eckhardt and Shane (2003) conclude after a review: by the locus of the changes that generate the opportunity; by the source of the opportunities themselves; and by the initiator of the change. Thus supplying us with several different approaches, complementary applicable depending on the aim and context of the research. To expand on this a bit further, an opportunity can also be viewed as a need not yet fulfilled, which makes it possible for us to differentiate between entrepreneurship stemming from voluntarily acting on an opportunity and entrepreneurship as a more or less necessary act for fulfilling a need. The latter interpretation makes the entrepreneurship concept more easily adoptable in fields outside economics and business such as social work.

At this point one might note that *attentiveness to opportunities* remains a vital ingredient in contemporary entrepreneurial theories (cf. Carlsson et al., 2013; Kirzner, 2009; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000) and may explain why it’s often difficult to demarcate entrepreneurship. Opportunities (and needs) exist on all levels of analysis from personal to societal and can be described in reference to all sorts of actors (cf. Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

Thus, opportunities as a theoretical construct transcend the unit of analysis, opening up a whole range of theoretical approaches and contributing to the obscure structure of the entrepreneurship field. Any academic subject where actors (individuals or groups) take initiatives in order to change the current status to something (for them) better, acting on present opportunities, is thus a potential user of the entrepreneurship concept. This has made e.g. Carlsson et al. (2013, p. 924) conclude that “the study of entrepreneurship has no natural ‘home’ in academia”. Instead, it’s up to each individual and each subfield to interpret and use entrepreneurship in a manner that suits one’s purposes best (cf. Landström, 2005; Sarasvathy, 2004).

*Defining a moving subject*

Although entrepreneurship has no natural home in academia, as Carlsson et al. (2013) argue, some definitions of entrepreneurship have gained common acclaim, usually connecting it to economics and business administration (and thus giving it a home indirectly), such as the following by Shane and Venkataraman (2000, p. 218):

We define the field of entrepreneurship as the scholarly examination of how, by whom, and with what effects opportunities to create future goods and services are discovered, evaluated, and exploited.

As the entrepreneurship field expands along with the critique of existing norms, so does the entrepreneurship concept. New and alternative interpretations of entrepreneurship are thus continuously created in order to disunite entrepreneurship from business (Gibb, 2002). This development is also a response to a growing critique on traditional entrepreneurship and the alleged economic growth it promises. The on-going implementation in the Swedish education system in general and compulsory school in particular, has for instance resulted in new defi-

nitions, adapted to the needs in this particular field. According to Berglund and Holmgren, today's teachers tend to favour the following definition of entrepreneurship, stemming from Nutek (a precursor to Tillväxtverket).

Entrepreneurship is a dynamic and social process, where individuals, alone or in co-operation, identify opportunities and do something with them to reshape ideas to practical or aimed activities in social, cultural, or economical contexts. (Berglund & Holmgren, 2013, p. 18)

These definitions are just examples of the diversity of definitions within the entrepreneurship field. Depending on use and context, the definition of the entrepreneurship concept changes, just as Gibb (2002) argue they should. In a review Steyaert (2007) emphasises the process aspect of entrepreneurship and identifies thirteen different approaches with their own core concepts and key assumptions. He also stresses that entrepreneurship is less interesting than *entrepreneuring*, where the verb more freely opens up the field for any research interest in processes.

I see the term *entrepreneuring* as a travelling concept, as a potential space for theorizing and undertaking conceptual experimentations in relation to the idea of process, rather than freezing or stabilizing the thinking that has just begun. (Steyaert, 2007, p. 471)

As Steyaert's review shows, even though we find entrepreneurship used within a certain field, there isn't automatically a consensus of a core. This also goes for business studies where there are several different views and definitions. For instance Cunningham and Lischeron (1991) divided entrepreneurship in business studies into six schools of thought; all with different definitions, measures and central questions.

#### *Conquering educational space*

Entrepreneurship is not only a research concept but also an educational subject, which in accordance with the research field displays a variety of ideas on how to educate in, for, through or about entrepreneurship (Hoppe, Westerberg, & Leffler, 2016). Correspondingly in this context, there is no consensus on what entrepreneurship education actually 'is' (Pittaway & Cope, 2007). There is neither a universal pedagogical recipe on how to teach entrepreneurship (Fayolle & Gailly, 2008).

The entrepreneurship concept is in the education context complemented by other concepts with their own research tradition and definitions, encompassing *entrepreneurial learning*, *entrepreneurship education* and more lately *enterprise education* (cf. Kyrö, 2008).

Entrepreneurial learning emerged in traditional entrepreneurship theory in the late 1990s describing how (small) business entrepreneurs learn (Cope, 2003; Rae, 2005). In today's educational context the term is used somewhat differently, where entrepreneurial activities are seen as action-based educational means to achieve learning that is hard to achieve via more traditional teaching methods (Leffler, 2014, 2015). The learning process of students (learning through entrepreneurial actions) becomes more central at the expense of teachers, who in turn take the role as educators; organizing different student centred learning activities.

This development has led to the emergence of two divergent traditions of thought that both use the term ‘entrepreneurial learning’, albeit differently. Within business studies focusing on *entrepreneurship education*, we have ‘entrepreneurial learning’ as a traditional and bounded view on how entrepreneurs learn as they start and run their businesses. Within the realms of mainly non-business studies focusing on *enterprise education*, we instead have ‘entrepreneurial learning’ as a more pragmatic view on how the concept itself can be used to challenge bounded pedagogical and didactical ideas (cf. Kyrö, 2008; Lackéus, 2013).

In contrast to the research setting, personal traits are still very much at the heart of the educational discourse, both at the political level and the practitioner level. The current implementation of entrepreneurship in Swedish compulsory school has in some ways also changed the perspective on entrepreneurial traits. The rare qualities of entrepreneurs, as traditionally studied by psychology mayors (e.g. McClelland, 1951, 1961), have become traits for all. Personal motivation and drive has e.g. been regarded as a selection criterion and a means in business focused educations (cf. Klofsten & Spaeth, 2004) but an end in policy and education; in policy described as a desired “sense of initiative and entrepreneurship” (European Union, 2006). In compulsory school this desired enterprising mentality is labelled *internal entrepreneurship* by Komulainen, Naskali, Korhonen, and Keskitalo-Foley (2011) in order to differentiate it from the business schools normal focus on *external entrepreneurship*, i.e. to enhance skills for setting up businesses (cf. Leffler, 2015).

These different ideas on means and ends in education also resonate with a division of different kinds of entrepreneurship education, where entrepreneurship educators differentiate between education in, for, through and about entrepreneurship. Early business education were quite analytical ‘about’ entrepreneurship aiming at understanding and explaining entrepreneurship (cf. Bjerke, 2005). Many students didn’t find it especially useful (Katz, 2003), and from this point a new more practical action-based education tradition grew with education ‘in’ and ‘for’ entrepreneurship. Learning by doing as entrepreneurs do, in the tradition of e.g. Dewey (1897), moved the field towards a more didactical approach to entrepreneurship, but still with the businessman as a role model. With the resent development of implementation of entrepreneurship in primary and secondary school, a fourth tradition ‘through’ entrepreneurship has come to grow rapidly, concerned with what can be learned by using entrepreneurship as a tool for learning all kinds of subjects, especially in areas outside business. A tradition that is now successively freeing itself from the traditional norms of entrepreneurship (Hoppe et al., 2016).

#### *Entrepreneurship as a political tool*

As described earlier, entrepreneurship (along with innovation and creativity) has become a concept in common use in politics. Through stimulating entrepreneurship in society, the expressed political ambition is both to create economical growth and to stimulate growth in personal traits deemed important in today’s society (Hoppe, 2016). Entrepreneurship is thus not only a subject for research and education; it is also a political tool.

With the increased intention from politics and the recent theoretical development, a more critical line of reasoning has gained ground. Berglund and Wigren (2012) describes it as a protest against *the great narrative of entrepreneurship* in which the term ‘entrepreneur’ is put forward as a saviour to a multitude of problems through (male) entrepreneurs’ contributions to further growth (cf. Dahlstedt & Hertzberg, 2011; Komulainen et al., 2011). The critique also turns against a contemporary neoliberal agenda where Dahlstedt and Tesfahuney (2010) labels the governmental

strives to both capitalize knowledge, schooling or learning and realize immediate returns from knowledge, schooling and learning as ‘speculative pedagogy’. Fostering entrepreneurs have become part of an agenda where societal problems should be solved through individualisation rather than through collective and social action, in the argumentation by Olssen and Peters (2005). The ‘enterprising self’ (or ‘entrepreneurial self’) as a ‘citizen ideal’ is in itself laden with ideological connotations, which make it difficult to implement the entrepreneurship concept straight off into a wider academic context, according to Komulainen et al. (2011).

In a complementary critical line of reasoning, but a few years earlier and with a more positive attitude towards entrepreneurial skills, Gibb (2002) argues that the concept of a traditional business-oriented entrepreneur does not fit current societal needs. Instead, he posits, we ought to focus on a broader definition centred on enterprising behaviours and enterprising organisations, a task that needs to be addressed with broader means than those advanced by traditional business schools. In Sweden Johannisson and Madsén (1997) reasons in a similar way, where they understand the entrepreneur as a critical individual who act on what they see as faulty in society. They conclude that

We see (...) the current interest in the concept of “entrepreneurship” as a renaissance for still valid educational ideals, which means that well-oriented and initiative-prone individuals in interaction with others realize visions. (Johannisson & Madsén, 1997, p. 17, author’s translation)

In this citation we can identify the entrepreneur as a searcher, that together with others work to enhance knowledge, quite like a scientist working to enhance theory. Whether entrepreneurship is good or bad for society, research and education, is thus also an open question with no distinct answers, except that the concept as such is really too vague and illusive to be judged by only one grand scale.

Where the political initiatives and use of the entrepreneurship concept will take us is still not clear, where present vagueness opens up for opportunistic actions from those concerned. Following one line of reasoning entrepreneurship in higher education constitutes a threat where neo liberal ideas of strong individuals as a platform for a strong society will dominate over alternative ideas, resting on collective solutions. On the other hand, it might as well be a part of the resurrection of reflexive and critical individuals and groups that actively participate in upholding a well functioning and democratic society. The problem with current political initiatives is that we actually do not know what the plan is, if there is a plan at all and maybe most unnerving, even if there is a plan – do we know that it will not change? Entrepreneurship is thus a political tool but without a predefined use.

#### SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Although disputed, entrepreneurship as a specific field of study can be said to emanate from economics in higher education and has successively been incorporated into other areas, where business administration might be the most prominent – linking entrepreneurship with the creation of new organizations for business purposes. Non-the less, other academic fields also have made significant contributions to the field, and then particularly psychology (in relation to entrepreneurial traits) and sociology (entrepreneurship as an organizing principle in society). Still, in all these fields the roots of the entrepreneur as a businessman is quite visible. What



has happened over time is that the entrepreneur as a subject has moved towards becoming a perspective in relation to human behaviour and value creating processes, and as such can be applied in a variety of settings and in relation to many subjects where humans act on opportunities (or needs). One of these settings is education, where we e.g. through political initiatives have come to see new deployments of the concept, where the concept entrepreneurial learning at the moment attracts attention from educators in all parts of the Swedish educational system.

The description of entrepreneurs through character traits is yet a common way of understanding entrepreneurship, especially in the educational context. Still, this relatively narrow approach to individual traits has been challenged with both process approaches and contextual approaches. Today, both situational settings and networks are regarded as central for understanding entrepreneurial actions. The lone entrepreneur who takes on the world on share will (or hunger for profit, depending on your view) simply don't exist as the central idea anymore, at least not in theory.

As this article has shown, the entrepreneurship concept is used in a vast area of circumstances and contexts, and is also followed by a resent growth in subareas such as social and societal entrepreneurship. There is no secluded academic home for entrepreneurship, instead it's being continuously adapted and adopted into new fields. It might have started as a concept for discussing how societies and economies develop in economics and become a well-used concept in business administration in relation to new business venturing, but it has not stopped there. As we speak, it's being adopted broadly in educational circumstances due to a political agenda, making it interesting for both pedagogical and political science scholars, but also for others affected by this movement.

The way we have come to speak about the "great narrative of entrepreneurship" (Berglund & Wigren, 2012) has created a language of success. These qualities and current use of the entrepreneurship concept makes it resemble the 'hegemonic ambiguity' of the leadership concept, which according to Blom and Alvesson (2015) is potentially dangerous as it appears as all inclusive and good. The danger lies in that you'll never know what exactly is meant with entrepreneurship, where many aspects of it appears as positive both for individuals and society, not giving much room for distance and depreciation. The current critique of the concept of being part of a neo-liberal agenda (cf. Dahlstedt & Tesfahuney, 2010; Komulainen et al., 2011; Olssen & Peters, 2005) is in this perspective both valid and invalid, depending on your view, but what we ought to recognize is that all types of critique, as well as praise, is *potentially* valid. As the concept now is implemented in the educational system, we actually don't know how it will be used and there are no guaranties that a favoured interpretation in the initial state will last. Instead, the implementation of a vague concept such as entrepreneurship opens up for any actor to use it for whatever interests one seems fit. When the governmental agent Tillväxtverket moves from the implementation of entrepreneurship, over entrepreneurial learning to entrepreneurial culture, it might look as if the objective is changing, but again we don't know. It both can and cannot mean a change in policy due to the concepts ambiguity. It both appears and can be understood as something good for education, but there are no guarantees.

With this history and few examples of the use of entrepreneurship concept, it should be clear that there are neither any definite boundaries, nor one definition suitable for all circumstances. Instead, what define the concept are a few reference points that are combined in different ways depending on context. Without any ambition of being conclusive, to simplify the essence of entrepreneurship it still denotes undertaking a task. Nevertheless, the theoretical development

also supply us with a few central connotations: acting on opportunities in order to create a value not yet realized but also questioning the existing and finding new ways of delivering a value that is superior to existing practices. As such, the entrepreneurship concept can be useful:

- As defining a large and loose scientific field, consisting of sometimes diverging knowledge interests,
- As a perspective, in e.g. business administration where one wants to study and describe certain aspects of business venturing, management and development but also in other areas where opportunities are pursued and new values are created, and
- As a tool, in e.g. education where one like to support knowledge where acting and practice is deemed important for learning but also as a tool for e.g. political and policy actors for changing the educational system towards ends still to be defined.

Stressing the last point, entrepreneurship is not just a tool for teachers and researchers. It has also become a tool for organizations and governments to implement changes in different societal systems such as education. Tillväxtverkets appropriation to coordinate matters relating to the promotion of entrepreneurship in higher education can be viewed as part of a political agenda for change, where Tillväxtverket as the chosen agency at least should tell us that the government would like to improve higher education's function as a tool for growth. But from that, the ambiguity of the entrepreneurship concept itself doesn't give us much guidance in what to expect next. Adding to this uncertainty, we can from the changing approaches of Tillväxtverket deduct that the agency is acting entrepreneurially, which in turn tells us that the current use of "entrepreneurship culture" as the key concept, in line with the entrepreneurial logic of changing means in order to succeed, very well might change in the future.

Together with the current implementation in primary and secondary school, one might speculate in that there will be an increasing pressure on higher education to implement entrepreneurship more broadly the coming years. At least, coming student cohorts confronted with entrepreneurship in compulsory school will already have ideas on how entrepreneurship can be viewed and used in educational circumstances. How higher education institutions will respond to this pressure is too early to tell, but with the variety in interpretations of the entrepreneurship concept there will most likely develop opportunities (sic!) for several different responses.

As discussed, entrepreneurship does not have to be about business or financial gain; it can just as well be about acting on opportunities in both education and research. What intrigues me the most though, is that entrepreneurship can be viewed as many things but not as something that supports stability and bureaucracy. An entrepreneurial university at least ought to be characterized by acting on opportunities, but also by taking risks. As such it contrasts today's quite homogenous bureaucratic structures of higher education. For those eager to change today's system in any way, the current development might result in the evolvement of opportunities for action in order to change current systems (to the better depending on view). For those more content with today's institutions, the development instead constitutes a potential threat. Whatever your stance is, asking yourself some critical questions will probably help you take a more informed position and thus make the best use of the entrepreneurship concept wherever you confront it. I therefore end with a few suggestions for questions to ponder. What is meant by entrepreneurship in each particular setting, who are the stakeholders and what objectives do they have? What is supposed to be effected by entrepreneurship; our organization, our research or our teaching? How can I in a constructive way relate to entrepreneurship in order to uphold and promote the values that I find important? And last but not least: are we talking about the same thing?

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I'd wish to thank both editors and the two anonymous reviewers for constructive feedback on previous versions of this manuscript. Beside this I'd also like to acknowledge an intellectual input from Eva Leffler and Mats Westerberg stemming from a most productive and interesting collaboration on the topic at hand.

## AUTHOR PRESENTATION

**Magnus Hoppe** is senior lecturer at Mälardalen University's Academy for Business, Society and Engineering. He holds a Ph.D. in Business Administration from Åbo Academy in Finland and is appointed excellent teacher. His research concerns innovation, entrepreneurship and insights management within both private and public organizations.

## REFERENCES

- Ahl, H., & Marlow, S. (2012). Exploring the dynamics of gender, feminism and entrepreneurship: advancing debate to escape a dead end? *Organization*, 19(5), 543-562.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1-22.
- Berglund, K., & Holmgren, C. (2007). *Entreprenörskap & Skolan – Vad berättar lärare att de gör när de "gör" entreprenörskap i skolan? [Entrepreneurship & School - What do teachers tell they do when they "do" entrepreneurship in school?]*. Örebro: Forum för småföretagsforskning.
- Berglund, K., & Holmgren, C. (2013). Entrepreneurship education in policy and practice. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 5(1), 9-27.
- Berglund, K., Johannisson, B., & Schwartz, B. (2012). *Societal entrepreneurship: positioning, penetrating, promoting*: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Berglund, K., & Wigren, C. (2012). Soci (et) al Entrepreneurship: The shaping of a different story of entrepreneurship. *Tamara Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry*, 10(1-2).
- Bjerke, B. (2005). *Förklara eller förstå entreprenörskap? [Explain or understand entrepreneurship]*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Blom, M., & Alvesson, M. (2015). All-inclusive and all good: The hegemonic ambiguity of leadership. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 31(4), 480-492.
- Bruni, A., Gherardi, S., & Poggio, B. (2004). Doing gender, doing entrepreneurship: An ethnographic account of intertwined practices. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 11(4), 406-429.
- Cantillon, R. (1755). *Essai sur la nature du commerce [Essay on the nature of trade]*.
- Carlsson, B., Braunerhjelm, P., McKelvey, M., Olofsson, C., Persson, L., & Ylinenpää, H. (2013). The evolving domain of entrepreneurship research. *Small Business Economics*, 41(4), 913-930.
- Cope, J. (2003). Entrepreneurial learning and critical reflection discontinuous events as triggers for 'higher-level' learning. *Management Learning*, 34(4), 429-450.
- Cunningham, J. B., & Lischeron, J. (1991). Defining entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 29(1), 45-61.
- Dahlstedt, M., & Hertzberg, F. (2011). Den entreprenörskapande skolan: Styrning, subjektskapande och entreprenörskapspedagogik. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 16(3), 180.
- Dahlstedt, M., & Tesfahuney, M. (2010). Speculative pedagogy: Education, entrepreneurialism and the politics of inclusion in contemporary Sweden. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 8(2), 249-274.
- Dees, J. G. (2007). Taking social entrepreneurship seriously. *Society*, 44(3), 24-31.
- Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. *The School Journal*, 54(3), 77-80.
- Drucker, P. (1985). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, New York, Harper & Row Published.
- Eckhardt, J. T., & Shane, S. A. (2003). Opportunities and entrepreneurship. *Journal of management*, 29(3), 333-349.

- Eriksson, S., & Hoppe, M. (2016). Entreprenörskap på HVV – Ett pilotprojekt som blev bestående via entreprenöriellt lärande. In I. K. Holmström, J. Stier, P. Tillgren, & G. Östlund (Eds.), *Samproduktionens retorik och praktik - inom området hälsa och välfärd* (1 ed., pp. 111-129). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- European Commission. (2006). *The Oslo Agenda for Entrepreneurship Education in Europe*. Brussels: The European Commission.
- European Commission. (2007). *Key competences for lifelong learning: European Reference Framework*. Luxembourg: The European Commission.
- European Commission. (2011). *Entrepreneurship education: enabling teachers as a critical success factor - A report on Teacher Education and Training to prepare teachers for the challenge of entrepreneurship education*. Brussels: The European Commission.
- European Commission. (2012). *Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes*. (COM, 2012:699). Brussels: The European Commission.
- European Commission. (2013). *Entrepreneurship Education: A Guide for Educators*. Brussels: The European Commission.
- European Union. (2006). *Key competences for lifelong learning* (EU recommendation 2006/962/EC). Retrieved from [http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/education\\_training\\_youth/lifelong\\_learning/c11090\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/education_training_youth/lifelong_learning/c11090_en.htm).
- Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2008). From craft to science: Teaching models and learning processes in entrepreneurship education. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 32(7), 569-593.
- Gartner, W. B. (1988). "Who is an entrepreneur?" is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(4), 11-32.
- Gartner, W. B. (1990). What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 5(1), 15-28.
- Gibb, A. (2002). In pursuit of a new 'enterprise' and 'entrepreneurship' paradigm for learning: creative destruction, new values, new ways of doing things and new combinations of knowledge. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 4(3), 233-269.
- Griffiths, M., Kickul, J., Bacq, S., & Terjesen, S. (2012). A dialogue with William J. Baumol: insights on entrepreneurship theory and education. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(4), 611-625.
- Hoppe, M. (2016). Policy and entrepreneurship education. *Small Business Economics*, 46(1), 13-29. doi:10.1007/s11187-015-9676-7
- Hoppe, M., Westerberg, M., & Leffler, E. (2016). Entreprenörskap och entreprenöriellt lärande. In T. Hansson (Ed.), *Pedagogik för högskolelärare* (pp. 311-334). Möklinta: Gidlunds Förlag.
- Häggglund, S., Eriksson, S., & Hoppe, M. (2014). *"Entreprenörskap på HVV" Slutrapport*. Eskilstuna: Mälardalens Högskola.
- Johannisson, B., & Madsén, T. (1997). *I entreprenörskapets tecken: en studie av skolning i förnyelse [In the sign of entrepreneurship: a study of education in change]*. Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Katz, J. A. (2003). The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education: 1876-1999. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(2), 283-300.
- Kirzner, I. (1973). *Competition and Entrepreneurship*, Chicago: U. Press, Chicago.
- Kirzner, I. (2009). The alert and creative entrepreneur: a clarification. *Small Business Economics*, 32(2), 145-152.
- Klofsten, M., & Spaeth, M. (2004). Entrepreneurship training for regional growth and innovation: A Swedish case study and ten year retrospective.
- Komulainen, K., Naskali, P., Korhonen, M., & Keskitalo-Foley, S. (2011). Internal entrepreneurship—A Trojan horse of the neoliberal governance of education? Finnish pre-and in-service teachers' implementation of and resistance towards entrepreneurship education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 9(1), 341-374.
- Kuratko, D. F. (2005). The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(5), 577-598.

- Kyrö, P. (2008). A theoretical framework for teaching and learning entrepreneurship. *International journal of business and globalisation*, 2(1), 39-55.
- Lackéus, M. (2013). Entreprenöriellt lärande - Vad innebär det och vilken betydelse kan det ha? En kunskapsöversikt [Entrepreneurial learning - what does it mean and what impact can it have? A knowledge overview] *Forskning i korthet* (Vol. 2013/2): Kommunförbundet Skåne.
- Landström, H. (2005). *Entreprenörskapets rötter [The roots of entrepreneurship]*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Leffler, E. (2006). *Företagsamma elever: Diskurser kring entreprenörskap och företagsamhet i skolan [Enterprising students: Discourses on entrepreneurship and enterprise in schools]*. Umeå universitet, Umeå. (Doktorsavhandling i Pedagogiskt arbete Nr 8, 2006)
- Leffler, E. (2014). Enterprise Learning and School Subjects—A Subject Didactic Issue? *Journal of Education and Training*, 1(2), 15-30.
- Leffler, E. (2015). Entreprenöriellt förhållningssätt i undervisning och lärande [Entrepreneurial approach in teaching and learning]. In I. F. O. Haara & I. K. Røe Ødegård (Eds.), *Grunnskolelærerutdanning gjennom pedagogisk entreprenørskap* (pp. 60-72). Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Mars, M. M., & Rios-Aguilar, C. (2010). Academic entrepreneurship (re) defined: significance and implications for the scholarship of higher education. *Higher Education*, 59(4), 441-460.
- McClelland, D. C. (1951). *Personality*. New York: William Slone.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- Näringsdepartementet. (2013). *Regleringsbrev för budgetåret 2014 avseende Tillväxtverket inom utgiftsområde 19 Regional tillväxt och utgiftsområde 24 Näringsliv [Appropriation for the year 2014 regarding the Swedish agency for economic and regional growth, within category 19 Regional growth and expenditure 24 Enterprise]* Stockholm: Näringsdepartementet.
- Olsen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313-345.
- Otterborg, A. (2011). *Entreprenöriellt lärande: gymnasieelevers skilda sätt att uppfatta entreprenöriellt lärande [Entrepreneurial learning: upper secondary students different ways of perceiving entrepreneurial learning]*. Jönköpings universitet, Jönköping. (Dissertation Series No. 11 • 2011)
- Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). Entrepreneurship education: a systematic review of the evidence. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(5), 479-510.
- Plaschka, G., & Welsch, H. (1990). Emerging structures in entrepreneurship education: Curricular designs and strategies. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 14(3), 55-71.
- Rae, D. (2005). Entrepreneurial learning: a narrative-based conceptual model. *Journal of small business and enterprise development*, 12(3), 323-335.
- Rangaswamy, N. (2006). *Social Entrepreneurship as Critical Agency: A study of rural internet kiosks*. Paper presented at the Information and Communication Technologies and Development, 2006. ICTD'06. International Conference on.
- Regeringskansliet. (2009). *Strategier för entreprenörskap inom utbildningsområdet [Strategies for entrepreneurship in education]*. Stockholm: Regeringskansliet.
- Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of business ethics*, 111(3), 335-351.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of management review*, 26(2), 243-263.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2004). The questions we ask and the questions we care about: reformulating some problems in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(5), 707-717.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle* (Vol. 55): Transaction publishers.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. New York and London: Harper & brothers.
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. *Business horizons*, 48(3), 241-246.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of management review*, 25(1), 217-226.

- Skolverket. (2011a). *Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet 2011* [Curriculum for primary schools, pre-school class and kindergarten 2011]. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Skolverket. (2011b). *Läroplan, examensmål och gymnasiegemensamma ämnen för gymnasieskola 2011* [Curriculum, degree objectives and upper secondary school subjects in secondary school in 2011]. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Steyaert, C. (2007). 'Entrepreneuring' as a conceptual attractor? A review of process theories in 20 years of entrepreneurship studies. *Entrepreneurship and regional development*, 19(6), 453-477.
- Thornton, P. H. (1999). The sociology of entrepreneurship. *Annual review of sociology*, 19-46.