

*Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe
(FIERE)
Literature Review*



Dr. Valerie Brett, Centre for Enterprise Development and Regional Economy (CEDRE)

Prof. Bill O’Gorman, Centre for Enterprise Development and Regional Economy (CEDRE)

School of Business, Waterford Institute of Technology



*This project has been funded with support from the European Commission.
This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held
responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

The FIERE (Furthering Innovative Regions of Europe) Project actively supports the concept that within regional economies public organisations, societies, clubs and not-for-profit organisations could be more entrepreneurial and innovative in the way they organise their entities and deliver services to their clients. This entrepreneurial and innovative foresight and behaviour is important in the context of community and regional social engagement and economic development. Individuals who work within community and regional stakeholder entities need to view and manage their domains just as enterprise and social entrepreneurs do in developing and sustaining their organisations and in providing a service/product to their clients.

Enterprise and social entrepreneurs have many similar traits and qualities however interventions through education, training and learning can help them and others working within their organisations to become even more innovative, creative, and entrepreneurial. FIERE aims to support local communities and regional economies by specifically focusing on the development of entrepreneurial and innovative skills and attributes of policy makers, managers, administrators, enterprise development officers, community leaders and developers, founders of community and social enterprises, and organisers/managers of local community entities. The purpose of this literature review is to explore relevant literature pertaining to entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, and enterprise education. This paper also reviews content and curricula of a range of entrepreneurship and innovative training and education programmes.

It is a significant challenge to develop an education programme that caters for all aspects of the enhancement of innovative and entrepreneurial skill-sets. However, the purpose of this review is to provide a grounding for the FIERE consortium partners so as to assist:

- (i) In identifying local, community and regional entities to engage with,
- (ii) To develop the survey content that will be used to identify the Training Needs Analysis (TNA) of local, community and regional entities vis-à-vis education and training with regard to entrepreneurship, innovation, and creativity; and
- (iii) To provide an input into the development of a training and/or education programme for those managing, supporting, employed in, and/or volunteering in local, community and regional entities.

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Introduction

Entrepreneurship as a concept of learning, behaviour and practice is seen as something that primarily only business owners should be concerned with. With globalisation and the demand for increased international competitiveness of all nations and in the context of the recent recession it is imperative that an “enterprise culture” is developed across all walks of professional life (Gibb, 2002). There are connections and relationships between entrepreneurship and regional, community and local development (Malecki, 1997). The popular policy of supporting the knowledge based economy also encourages the incorporation of enterprise learning within the higher education curriculum (Great Britain: DTI/DFEE, 2001). Furthermore, if entrepreneurship as a practice involves all local, community and regional stakeholders, then the manner in which entrepreneurship education, training and practice is taught also needs to be addressed to suit the needs and entrepreneurial objectives of the learner. Entrepreneurship teaching, learning and research is an integral part of enterprise and social policy across Europe and the US (European Commission, 2009) as policy makers and economic and regional development stakeholders support the positive impact entrepreneurship education can have on the entrepreneurial engagement of citizens at local, community and regional levels. Therefore it is of paramount importance that education and training across all domains support the development of an entrepreneurial culture at local, community, and regional levels.

However, a question often posed is - can entrepreneurship be taught? (Henry, Hill and Leitch, 2005; Fiet, 2001). Over the last three decades there has been a rapid expansion in training and education programmes in entrepreneurship and there are many different kinds of approaches, dimensions and aspects to this type of education. Kuratko (2005) argued that certain facets of entrepreneurship can be taught and the concept of entrepreneurship as something you are only born with is redundant (Davies and Gibb, 1991). However, many consider (for example Timmons, Muzyka, Stevenson, and Bygrave, 1987) entrepreneurship education as limiting and that entrepreneurship is something you are born with or in some cases best learned through experience and cannot solely be based on theoretical teaching (Davies and Gibb, 1991). Entrepreneurship education often takes two core approaches which are in general (1) the understanding of entrepreneurship as a phenomenon or (2) the

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

acquisition of skills, experience and support to become an entrepreneur. The individualistic approach has been the most popular (Laukkanen, 2000) and provides instruction on how to be or become an entrepreneur as entrepreneurship is mainly seen as an overarching behaviour. The decision to start a business is a planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) and that intention is in part their individual attitude and mind-set, however this is influenced by skills, social, cultural and financial support (Shapero and Sokol, 1982).

The Entrepreneur

Before we can understand the complexities and educational needs of public, social or voluntary entrepreneurs it is important to understand the perception and opinion of what is an entrepreneur and what it means to be an entrepreneur. The debate on the definition of an entrepreneur is extensive and still without any concrete conclusion. Timmons and Spinelli (1994) argued that the successful entrepreneur is someone who has achieved their goals, it is the perception of their own value and the pursuit of their own goals. Furthermore, Timmons and Spinelli (1994) described the entrepreneur as someone who: *possesses not only a creative and innovative flair and other attitudes and behaviours but also solid general management skills, business know-how, and sufficient contacts.*

An entrepreneur is often described as the “owner or manager of a business who by risk or initiative attempts to make a profit” (Collins English Dictionary, 2014). An entrepreneur can see business opportunities and gather and utilise the resources necessary to create the desired action (Henry, et al, 2005). Stevenson and Jarillo (1990) define entrepreneurship as;

“a process by which individuals—either on their own or inside organizations—pursue opportunities without regard to resources they currently control” (p.23)

Furthermore, in the context of the need to broaden all professionals in entrepreneurial or enterprise spirit, literature supports the fact that one does not have to be an owner of a business to be an entrepreneur or entrepreneurial in your work (Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990), nor that entrepreneurship means only specified skilled people and sectors of industry such as High Potential Start-ups (HPSUs) (Gibb, 2002). This definition is particularly relevant to the

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

individuals or public servants who volunteer or work in local, community and regional entities. It also highlights the characteristics an individual should display in the role and professional environment in which they inhabit so that it does not restrict or impede personal motivation and drive.

In terms of entrepreneurship there are two aspects to consider, there is the entrepreneur and the process of entrepreneurship itself. It is necessary to understand both these aspects and in particular to be aware of the distinction between them. This is especially important when considering the implementation of any training and education programme for entrepreneurs/ entrepreneurship. Low and Mcmillan (1998) considered entrepreneurship as the creation and establishment of a new enterprise while Bygrave (1989) referred to it as a process; on the other hand Bruyat and Julien (2000) argued that the change or creation is within the individual or the production of something novel either in production, services or innovation (Curran and Stanworth, 1989).

Schumpeter (1926) stated that successful entrepreneurs should be innovative, creative and risk-taking. Hisrich and Peters (1998) highlighted risk taking, innovativeness, change oriented, persistence and visionary leadership as the key qualities that distinguish the entrepreneur from the manager. Entrepreneurs display a high level of recognition, they see potential opportunities and are generally not risk adverse (Politis, 2005) along with having well-developed cognitive skills (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000). The level of prior experience ensures that entrepreneurs are more creative and supports the argument that prior knowledge from experience is a key attribute of an entrepreneur's proficiency in the analysis and evaluating of outside knowledge and exploiting that knowledge for economic gain (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). In terms of developing a programme for social entrepreneurship, understanding how people learn is paramount to any programme design and implementation.

However, as discussed the concept of the entrepreneur and the social entrepreneur is a multifaceted and complicated phenomenon. Therefore mainstream learning theories and processes are not always the most applicable as learning deliverables very much depend on student 'type' and the objectives of the learning programme. Kolb's (1984) four stage

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

learning cycle for example does not recognise prior learning and experience gained by entrepreneurs and their ability to use that experience to leverage value from the learning. The learning theory also fails to provide comprehension to the complexity of the entrepreneurial environment.

Despite an abundance of prior research, it is difficult to conclude an exact formula of skills an entrepreneur requires, however there is a strong reference to behaviour and personality having considerable impact on entrepreneurial potential (Tautila, 2010). It is the nature or nurture argument that fuels the debate on the effectiveness of teaching entrepreneurship. The following section investigates in further detail the concept of the social entrepreneur and the similarities and differences between the entrepreneur and the social entrepreneur.

The Social Entrepreneur

There are many types of entrepreneurs, from people who run large multi-national corporations to individuals who run small family businesses or lifestyle businesses. The trend in literature continually refers back to common behaviours and characteristic traits of entrepreneurs. An entrepreneur is defined more by these psychological traits rather than the size or level of success a business or the potential value a venture can create.

Entrepreneurship is not all about the heroic traditional entrepreneur alone, it is also about teams in joint collaborations (Raffo et al, 2000). The social entrepreneur displays similar traits to the 'traditional' entrepreneur, but there is one clear distinction as regards the motivation to create social value rather than personal wealth (Zadek and Thake, 1997). The concept of 'institutional entrepreneurs' came from the role and behaviour of individuals in organisations that were drivers and agents of change (DiMaggio, 1988). DiMaggio (1988) defined institutional entrepreneurs as:

“actors with sufficient resources [institutional entrepreneurs] see in them an opportunity to realize interests that they value highly” (p.14)

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Social entrepreneurship is still an innovative activity but it has a clear social objective of change, enhancement and the role is not limited to charities as social entrepreneurs are present across a wide range of regional and economic based stakeholder organisations such as co-operatives, not-for-profit organisation, mutual and community businesses (Spear, 2006). Social entrepreneurship is also a source of employment especially in more developed economies and contributes between 3.3% and 16.6% towards employment levels (Spear 2006, in citing Ciriec, 2000). Defining social entrepreneurship is as difficult as defining entrepreneurship. For example, Zahra, Gedojlovic, Neubaum, and Shalman (2009) argued that social and economic consideration is necessary in the classification of the social entrepreneur;

“Social entrepreneurship encompasses the activities and processes undertaken to discover, define, and exploit opportunities in order to enhance social wealth by creating new ventures or managing existing organizations in an innovative manner” (p. 519)

Zahra (et al, 2009) further build on the concept and detail three specific types of social entrepreneur namely;

- (1) The social bricoleur who addresses small scale local issues,
- (2) The social constructionist who utilises opportunities and market failures to serve the broader social system,
- (3) The social engineer who focuses on systemic problems via progressive change.

Austin, Steveson, and Hei-Skillern (2006) argued that at a conceptual level the social and commercial entrepreneur may appear the same or very similar but the commercial entrepreneur creates new needs and material desires while, on the other hand, social entrepreneurs address long standing needs and issues within the community. It is also felt that social entrepreneurs are not restricted by rules or market forces quite as severely as the traditional entrepreneur because the social entrepreneur or social organisation can become fixated on the mission or objective of the organisation and therefore do not feel the sting or repercussions of failure, accountability and performance within an organisation (Letts, Grossman and Ryan, 1999). While their survival is not completely driven by market forces

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

such organisations, groups or societies still require management that can utilise resources, secure funding and target the best opportunities (Austin et al. 2006) and ensure the organisation is innovative and as successful as possible which requires entrepreneurial skills, behaviour, thinking and action. The social entrepreneur just like the traditional entrepreneur needs to develop and maintain an extensive array of personal networks along with a strong and trustful reputation. Rodosevich (1995) argued that their success is characterized by the following features;

Table 1 Characteristics of an Innovative Entrepreneur

Technical education	Technical academic education
Familiarity with business and market	Broad knowledge of market Large experience in business Previous entrepreneurial experience Search of market opportunity Immediate previous job in another similar firm
Managerially driven	Preference for managerial tasks Skills and experience to run the firm at the outset
Personal profile	30-40 year old High level of self-confidence
Rapid in turning the idea of business into a new venture	Short time in arrangements and discussing viability Short time in maturation of the entrepreneurial idea
Focused and owner	Not involved in secondary activities Main owner of the firm

(Source: Rodosevich, 1995)

Networking, developing networks and practicing networking is just as important for institutional and voluntary entrepreneurs (Sundin and Tillmar, 2008) along with similar but specific characteristics and skills such as strong political and negotiation skills, utilisation of the media, ability to redesign and re-think the system, effective use of external sources and the ability to gain support from power sources. Bartlett and Dibben (2002) discussed the need for ‘champions’ with political support and will. The champions take two forms, those that are driven by the needs of the public and those driven by a need for change and reform.

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Hayek (1945) suggested that the social entrepreneur is primarily a regional concept due to opportunities that present themselves and accessibility to local knowledge flows as social action often needs to be taken at a local level. Furthermore, Weerawarden and Mort (2008) proposed that the social entrepreneur is driven by responses to the local environment and that it is their strategic decisions and responses to regional needs that set them apart from not-for-profit or voluntary organisations. Therefore organisations in pursuit of profit and corporate responsible firms are quite clearly outside the concept of social entrepreneurship. However, Zahra (et al, 2009) mooted that individuals and entities that disregard economic implications of their activities are also beyond the boundary and concept of social entrepreneurship. On the other hand, the UK government included in their description of social enterprise any entity that re-invested profit into the company and were not solely towards the monetary benefit of shareholders (DTI, 2002).

Governments of regional or national economies that consist of many types of social entrepreneurs working as individuals, or within organisations, and who are in a position to fill gaps in regional needs, have cut spending on social services as a policy to drive this form of entrepreneurial behaviour in their economies (Zahra, et al. 2009; Lasprogata and Connon, 2003). Commercial providers are increasingly attracted to areas which previously were the remit of not-for-profit organisations (Weerawardena and Mort, 2001). The cost of implementing the wide range and sheer variety of social programmes (housing, employment, education, training, health services, etc) has increased but traditional financial support for such activities continues to decline (Wolverton, 2003) which further encourages social entrepreneurs to behave more innovatively. Social entrepreneurship has its critics and raises important questions in the context of ethics and ethical behaviour in certain situations. The blurring of boundaries that incorporate profit and social value is a precarious combination of opposing values.

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

The Social Entrepreneur vs The Traditional Entrepreneur

There is the entrepreneur and there is the innovative entrepreneur and while similar in manner there is a definite distinction between both. Many type of business owners class themselves as, or are considered as, entrepreneurs. However, the innovative entrepreneur is set apart as they generate novel and ground-breaking innovations in products, processes, or services. This is also the case for social entrepreneurs who are socially innovative by employing novel types of resources and combining them in new and unique ways (Seelos and Mair, 2005). Shaw and Garter (2007) proffered that for the social entrepreneur innovation is the key characteristic because an individual can be entrepreneurial without being particularly innovative (Leadbeater, 1997) and that the essence of social entrepreneurs is that they act and behave innovatively. Furthermore, the social innovator is a blending of principles (see Figure 1) concerned with entrepreneurship, innovation and social needs and is often referred to as the social enterprise sub-sector or the third sector (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010).

Fig 1 Key Words Describing Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Social Entrepreneur



Source: Authors' Own

The basis of social entrepreneurship or social innovative entrepreneurship is illustrated in Figure 2; it consists of innovativeness, pro-activeness and risk-taking (Covin and Sleving, 1986) which are also specific key traits of the 'traditional' entrepreneur and entrepreneurship in general.

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Fig. 2 Concept of Social Innovative Entrepreneurship



Source: Weerawarden and Mort (2008, p.32)

However, social entrepreneurs are constrained by their environment. The social entrepreneur tends to have a regional focus and is geared towards changes to the physical environment and social needs. Government, policies and competition all impact on the ability to succeed of social entrepreneurs. The social mission also impacts the entrepreneur and the level of risk is managed in terms of a trade-off between the social mission and maintaining sustainability and or profitability of the organisation. Therefore the locality of social entrepreneurs is very important. Innovative regions tend to breed more innovative entrepreneurs and thus social entrepreneurs. Hence it is important to understand the political, economic and social context and support from national and regional/local government in terms of their policies and practices that support and drive the behaviour and actions of social entrepreneurs.

Innovative Regions

Entrepreneurship and innovation are separate concepts which are both considered as drivers of economic growth. Knowledge, learning and innovation are key to economic development and competitiveness of regions (Tödting and Trippel, 2005). Knowledge is a key resource for innovation (Simmie, 2003) and in the context of the knowledge economy there are many

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

discussions on the value and importance of knowledge, of clusters and regional clusters and of regional innovation systems and innovation in a singular context. The significance of innovation within a regional economy is that there is a direct link between innovation, growth and regional economic performance (Howells, 2005). This direct link is significantly important for less favoured regions within Europe as there continues to be disparity in innovative capacity across Europe regions (Fritsch, 2000; Paci and Usai, 2000; Greenhalgh et al, 2001).

Feldman and Francis (2004) discussed that encouraging the development of innovative entrepreneurs has more chance of success if the environment in which they locate is entrepreneurial in nature. The measuring or ranking of innovative regions tends to be based on technology based metrics such as private and public research funding, scientific and engineering workforce, number of patents issued, higher education research capacity, and science and research parks facilities. The EU publishes the innovation scoreboard report, on a yearly basis, which indicates the innovativeness of EU regions and countries. Many aspects which make regions innovative are not all easily quantifiable such as its history, leadership, networks, appeal and the region's image and so on. Then again, history shows that regions do not need to be all things to all people, and that innovative region's capitalise on regional assets/specialisms and not merely by imitating other regions. Innovative regions are innovative because they perform particularly well at certain activities (regional specialisation). As with the concept of clusters and regional clustering, innovation and regional innovation systems, prevailing governments appreciate the importance of innovative entrepreneurship. However, as with entrepreneurship in general, devising policies, practices, education and training to support innovative entrepreneurship can lack consensus (Sharfif, 2012). Each region has many entities that are involved in regional policy design and implementation of relevant practices. This combination of regional entities and their varying innovation and policy design perspectives can cause confusion, non-conformity in terms of the perspective and approach adopted towards enhancing regional innovative performance (Howells, 2005). The innovation capability of regional stakeholders and the absorptive capacity of regions can differ; therefore each region needs to think about their own needs while also learning from the experiences, successes and failures of others.

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Within Europe many countries have implemented legal structures to support and facilitate social enterprise, social innovations and social innovative entrepreneurship. In 2004, the UK approved a law allowing for the creation of “community interest companies” (DTI, 2002). Finland established the Finnish Act on Social Enterprise in 2003 which addresses work integration, which is a popular policy trend focusing on employment for people with disabilities or the long-term unemployed (Defourny and Nyssens, 2010) or individuals at risk of exclusion. An Act in Poland focuses on similar individuals as well as ex-convicts and former drug and alcohol users. Defourny and Nyssens (2010) discussed that while many European countries may not actively state they pursue social enterprise as a formal policy measure, the concept is quite prevalent in areas of the social employment market. Younhee (2010) suggested that social entrepreneurship can be a key method to support improving government performance in the delivery of key social services. His study supports the concept that the public sector needs to be aligned to stimulate entrepreneurial activities and culture and that employees should be allowed function beyond the remit of their job description as organisation rigidity can prevent entrepreneurial and risk-taking behaviour.

Entrepreneurship Education

The education level of its citizens is the most often used indicator for measuring human capital in an economy. In fact the measure of education and human capital is often used to see how they positively impact on economic growth, total factor productivity (TFP) and technological development (Simeonova-Ganev, 2010). However, entrepreneurship education and training too often focuses on R&D activity, venture capital availability, and seed funds, despite the recognised importance of the individual and the entrepreneurial spirit and drive (Rasmussen and Sørheim, 2006). Furthermore, entrepreneurial education is not just about the individual but it is about society as a whole (Carayannis, Evans and Hanson, 2003). But the concept of teaching and learning entrepreneurship can become problematic as it can be difficult to instil an enterprise culture within a society, a university, college, organisation, voluntary group or club. Universities have attempted instilling this essence by immersing the whole campus and student life into an entrepreneurial culture (Rasmussen and Sørheim, 2006) and not limiting entrepreneurship to the classroom or business based students.

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Traditional approaches to entrepreneurship education have focused on teaching students. However, programmes and initiatives (for all student age groups) are also adopting experiential learning and learning by doing. Table 2 provides an overview of the depth of entrepreneurship education and of the level at which it is taught and applied (Albert and Marion, 1997). Education institutes in particular aim to deliver individuals who are motivated and competent (Rasmussen and Sørheim, 2006), however only about 24% of university students have access to any education on entrepreneurship (Vesa, 2010) but this is improving. Then again, individual programmes often succeed due to the merits of an individual teacher as opposed to a policy or strategy (Carayannis, Evans and Hanson, 2003). In Ireland for example, entrepreneurship programmes based in primary schools (aimed at the very young) include the Junior Entrepreneurship Programme (<http://www.juniorentrepreneur.ie/>) and the Youth Entrepreneurship Strategies (YES) project (<http://www.sera.ie/projects/index.html>).

At university level though, the pedagogical approach to entrepreneurship education deepens, and is slowly seeping through to all, if not most, disciplines. Entrepreneurship is increasingly becoming a core module for the general student body as well as being a core part of specialised entrepreneurial and innovation based degree programmes (Carayannis, Evans and Hanson, 2003).

Table 2 Overview of Entrepreneurship Education:

Action	Level	Objectives	Teaching
Sensitization	Primary, Secondary, University	Develop autonomy and initiative to the question: why should I be an entrepreneur.	Mini-projects, case studies, business simulations, business plan competitions
Specialization	Secondary, University	Understand the diversity of entrepreneurship. Respond to questions like what does it take to be a successful entrepreneur?	Specialized courses, real case studies, Company projects.
Experimentation	Secondary, University	Permit students to work on their own projects or “sleeping” projects in companies	Realization of a project.

Source: Albert and Marion (1997, p28-30)

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Universities in particular are expected to adopt a “third mission” to improve economic development (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 2000) which includes teaching entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship education has become increasingly popular and is also recognised as an important contribution to regional development. Gartner and Vesper (1994) in their review of entrepreneurship programmes in universities concluded that best practice, and which is the common approach, to entrepreneurship education was a balanced technique which consisted of a number of main learning elements such as business plans and planning, exposure to entrepreneurs and university space via incubation, resources and a taught element.

Broadly speaking the entrepreneurship curriculum takes two main approaches which are centred on *learning about* entrepreneurship and *learning for* entrepreneurship. Learning about entrepreneurship is mostly taught in a conventional manner via lectures, coursework and exams while learning for entrepreneurship aims to provide skills and knowledge to perform or prepare students to behave as entrepreneurs (Foster and Lin, 2003). Jamieson (1984) in Henry et al. (2005) discussed the main categories that entrepreneurship education and training should focus on;

1. Education *about* Enterprise: awareness, education, basic aspects of starting and running a business all based on theory.
2. Education *for* Enterprise: Supporting new or potential entrepreneurs with practical skills.
3. Education *in* Enterprise: training for established entrepreneurs e.g. specific marketing or product development.

In terms of adult post education there is a huge variety of short or accelerator programmes that provide training and support to new or hatching entrepreneurs. The key aspect of such programmes is its support to individuals who already display the skills and desire to be an entrepreneur. As such, they do not require tuition or guidance on entrepreneurial spirit or motivation (see Table 3 Learning entrepreneurship in the classroom and in real life).

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Table 3 Learning entrepreneurship in the classroom and real life

University/Business School – Classroom	Entrepreneurial – Real World
Critical judgement after analysis of large amount of information	“Gut feel” decision-making with limited Information
Understanding and recalling the information Itself	Understanding the values of those who transmit and filter information
Assuming goals away	Recognising the widely varied goals of others
Seeking verification of the truth by study of information	Making decisions on the basis of judgement of trust and competence of people
Understanding basic principles of society in the metaphysical sense	Seeking to apply and adjust in practice to basic principles of society
Seeking the correct answer with time to do it	Developing the most appropriate solution under pressure
Learning in the classroom	Learning while and through doing
Gleaning information from experts and authoritative sources	Gleaning information personally from any and everywhere and weighing it up
Evaluation through written assessments	Evaluation by judgement of people and events through direct feedback
Success in learning measured by knowledge-based examination passed	Success in learning by solving problems and learning from failure

Source: Gibb (1987, p.18)

In Ireland the New Frontiers Programme¹ includes significant mentoring and financial support for potential entrepreneurs and many of the Universities and Institutes of Technology have incubator and incubation support facilities for start-ups and early stage entrepreneurs. The following includes a brief selection of higher level institutions and their adopted approach to the delivery of entrepreneurship.

- Nanyang Technopreneurship Centre (NTC) in Singapore (Kangaslahti, 2008) is a four-month post-graduate diploma course called the Technopreneurship and Innovation Programme (TIP). The programme places students in an entrepreneurial environment and adopts an ‘education in enterprise approach’ via the conception of a commercial business plan in the technology area. Students are supported by lectures by local entrepreneurs, study visits and practical hands-on support and advice. Between 2002 and 2005 there were 174 TIP graduates. As of the end of 2005, 64 students had started new ventures, 44 of which were still active by the end of 2007. Of the graduates, 22 % joined newly established companies (Kangaslahti, 2008).

¹ <http://www.enterprise-ireland.com/en/Start-a-Business-in-Ireland/Supports-for-High-Potential-Start-Ups/New-Frontiers-Entrepreneur-Development-Programme.html>

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

- The University of Tasmania's programme focuses on developing psychological skills as the programme addresses recognition of opportunity, dealing with risk and utilizing resources. The approach is student-centred learning which supports the overall need, incentive, and motivation of the students as an entrepreneur (Jones and English, 2004).
- Laurea University of Applied Sciences has entrepreneurial themed courses and international entrepreneurial camps which are based on learning by doing. The students have to develop their own actual and real business plan with support and advice from academic staff and entrepreneurs. The programme requires that all plans are authentic as the overall aim of the programme is to create new businesses from the plans.
- Entrepreneurship boot camps or accelerator programmes are growing in popularity where students get a mix of academic, mentoring, space, and peer-to-peer support. The Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning at the University of Cambridge has created 17 of these programmes. Since 2007, 13 of the business ideas have successfully developed into businesses (Tautila, 2008).

Johannisson (1991) proposed a conceptual classification for entrepreneurship education which should focus on why entrepreneurs act (values, motivation), what entrepreneurs need to do (knowledge), how entrepreneurs will do it (abilities, skills), who do they need to know (social skills, networks) and when is it appropriate to act (experience and intuition). Entrepreneurship education depends on the stage of the entrepreneurial process as the learner will have different needs during the various stages of development and progression from entrepreneurial intent onwards (Henry et al. 2005). Understanding this difference or the type or objective of the audience when it comes to entrepreneurship education should very much dictate the approach and content of the education programme. Gorman, Hanlon, and King (1997) highlighted the importance of sufficient matching between student, curriculum and the pedagogical approach in order to ensure that the learning is effective and applicable.

Politis (2008) stated that stimulating entrepreneurial activities by traditional class room based teaching approaches has limited impact of enhancing entrepreneurial knowledge and that

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

instruction should focus on softer skills that are transferable such as creativity, critical thinking, reflection and enhanced motivation. However, the most frequent curriculum approach for entrepreneurship education addresses the common themes of growing and developing a business, venture creation, financial, law, networks, family business, business plan (Gibb, 2002). Some time is also spent on the development of the entrepreneur as a person and the behaviours entrepreneurs tend to emulate (Bates, 1998). There are many studies that review entrepreneurship education and other common pedagogical approaches include an emphasis on learning from real life situations through shadowing and role play (Levie, 1999) and instruction on how such learning should be delivered such as the use of self-directed learning, an emphasis on the life and behaviour of entrepreneurs (Gibb, 2002). In terms of the impact of universities' and business schools' curricula it can be difficult to fully comprehend the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education. Many institutions provide descriptive lists (Gibb, 2002) but fail to provide sufficient information of the level of success or failure. In comparison the concept of the accelerator programme is to take individual students through an intensive programme that enables them to establish a start-up. The concept works by financially supporting individuals through an intensive start-up accelerator period designed to provide the skills, mentoring and support required by potential entrepreneurs. The success of such programmes can be bluntly measured by the number of start-ups, failures and success.

In terms of the not-for-profit or the voluntary sector, teaching entrepreneurship becomes more complicated because it is not the creation of an entrepreneur but the creation of entrepreneurial spirit that is the desired result. Therefore the key learning deliverable should be the increase of knowledge and confidence of individuals. Cox (1996) mooted that confidence and self-efficacy is vital to creating and enhancing any feelings of entrepreneurial spirit as well as being able to access one's own entrepreneurial skills (Henry, et al. 2005). Thus any entrepreneurship education programme or curriculum for social entrepreneurs, voluntary organisations or public servants must be heavily based on awakening and strengthening these skills. Furthermore, within the social entrepreneurship sphere the entrepreneur does not have to go it alone and there is no reason why individuals cannot become and act entrepreneurial within a group or team environment (Etzkowitz, 2002).

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Programme Suggestions To Be Considered By FIERE

There is a growing body of literature and opinion on entrepreneurship education. What is clear is that the approach depends on the perspective, values and goals of the individual and the environment both professionally and culturally. In terms of FIERE and the combination of European partners and the expected nature of the learners it would be important to evaluate the level of prior knowledge and understanding and how this may have an impact on the acquisition of knowledge during the education programme. Due to the international European nature of the program it may be necessary to incorporate an evaluation of the impact of culture on learning and the perception, belief and opinion of students/participants of entrepreneurship and enterprise education (Foster and Lin, 2003). Understanding the basis of each learner background, experience and goals will help indicate what the curriculum should contain and the learning deliverables and outcomes. Based on the extensive literature review, Table 4 provides an overview of the potential course content, participant selection/criteria and learning environment that may be considered by the FIERE consortium when designing and implementing an entrepreneurship education and training programme for social entrepreneurs, leaders/employees of (and volunteers in) local and community organisations, clubs and societies, and public servants.

Table 4 Potential Course Content, Participant Selection/criteria and Learning Environment

Potential Course Content	Student Selection / Criteria	Learning Environment
The importance of networking and social networks; and the necessity for individuals to be socially embedded in order to position themselves to avail of opportunities (Sundin and Tillmar, 2008) should be addressed.	A re-education phase. Participants need to be confronted with their own preconceived notions of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurs, and the entrepreneurial process. They also need to be encouraged to be different, to be creative and to express their individuality (Carayannis, Evans and Hanson, 2003).	Ensure learning is conducted in an environment that allows for creativity, innovation and independent thinking. Participants should feel “safe and secure” (Carayannis, Evans and Hanson, 2003). This would require small class sizes and competent, knowledgeable facilitators.
The programme needs to be specially designed to meet the needs of learners and to enhance their skills. Consider performing a learning perception, personality and skills audit prior to course commencement.	The training should have a strong and clear focus to increase the number of people who are sufficiently knowledgeable about small business to consider it, at some stage in the future as a career option (Jamieson, 1984), [for themselves possibly, but most importantly that they are able to articulate this to others].	Importance of regional context as regional networks can help secure voluntary resources, such as experienced business people and successful entrepreneurs who are motivated and willing to contribute as mentors, advisors and teachers.
A strong focus on motivation and the entrepreneurial spirit as a general subject (Taatila, 2010).	A screening of participants should be performed prior to their enrolment on the course in order to identify previous experience, knowledge and motivation. Spear (2006) in his case study of social entrepreneurship noted that background such as experience in family business or personal	Eliminate structural and practical barriers to flexibility and prompt actions for innovation, collaboration and cooperation by providing tools and incentives for entrepreneurial projects, and developing an entrepreneurial climate (Younhee, 2010)

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

<p>Opportunity Recognition: The ability to discover and develop business [societal] opportunities is often considered to be among the most important abilities of successful entrepreneurs (Ardichvili, Cardozo, and Ray, 2003; Shane and Venkataraman, 2000).</p> <p>A content approach that encourages participants to bring problems or ideas that they have to the course so that the course is used as a means for them to solve or develop those problems/ideas – just like an accelerator or support programmes for entrepreneurs.</p>	<p>history of small business experience was beneficial for learning and comprehension and thus the effectiveness of the course.</p> <p>Much of the learning that takes place within an entrepreneurial context is experiential. This implies that the complex process by which entrepreneurs learn from past experiences is of great importance to consider if we are to increase our understanding of entrepreneurial learning. This supports identifying prior learning or the experience level of potential participants. Thus the importance of learning by doing or by experience within the programme</p> <p>Students selected need to be in a position of power or influence within the organisation so that they have the ability to influence or encourage organisational change.</p> <p>Participants should be “local, or community, or regional champions” with a strong desire to support economic, or social, or community development, improvement and sustainability.</p>	<p>Organizational structure of programme should be more fluid than mechanic, allowing better communication and cooperation between levels of power; power structure should become flexible and less hierarchical (Younhee, 2010)</p>
---	--	--

Overall the most commonly used teaching methods reported (EC, 2009) are lectures, computer simulations and business games, student companies, project work and group work, and company visits. Less frequently mentioned are coaching and mentoring, role play, discussions and brainstorming and case studies. It is very important that the teaching approach is suitable for the learner and the pedagogical context of the subject matter. One teaching approach that could be adopted is the accelerator programme model (The Entrepreneurs Skills Certificate), where “learners” would come with an innovative/entrepreneurial idea or problem that they would like to address through their learning on the FIERE course. Course content could also address the following skills and learning experiences;

- Develop an idea further into a product or service;
- Learning to deal with problems and to solve them;
- Creating networks with other stakeholders;
- Accepting the implications of their own choices.

This approach would have the direct benefit of achieving learning for the individual along with a specific outcome or goal. The “learner” would learn by doing or enhance their entrepreneurial skills through experienced based learning.

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Conclusion

Entrepreneurs and social or innovative entrepreneurs are very similar in nature and context but with one main distinction - the social entrepreneur's drive and ambition is to address social regional needs and not the acquisition of profit. Just like traditional entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs can benefit from training, education and learning in the theory and practice of entrepreneurship. While the progression and development of social entrepreneurs can be supported by training and education; the region in which potential social entrepreneurs locate is also important as highly innovative regions will encourage greater levels of social entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship skills and behaviours are mainly transversal skills such as critical thinking, problem solving, collaborative work, and initiative behaviour (EU Commission, 2013). Education and training should focus on the development of these skills as the benefits of entrepreneurship education should not be limited to boosting start-ups, innovative ventures and new jobs. Entrepreneurship as a concept should be for everyone and this learning should begin as early as possible in life. There is evidence to suggest that education and life experiences can increase the likelihood of engaging in entrepreneurial activities (often it is start-ups that are referred to in literature, but start-up can mean social or community as much as it means business or enterprise] and venture survival (Wiklund, Dimov, Katz and Shepherd, 2006) and thus education has a positive influence on entrepreneurship levels and the development of entrepreneurial localities, communities and regions.

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Bibliography

Albert, P. and Marion, S., (1997) Ouvrir l'enseignement à l'esprit d'entreprendre, L'art d'Entreprendre, Les Echos, 19, September 1997.

Ardichvili, A., Cardozo, R., Ray, S. (2003) A theory of entrepreneurial opportunity, identification and development, *Journal of business Venturing*, 18 (1), pp105-123.

Curran, J. and Stanworth, J. (1989) Education and training for enterprise: some problems of classification, evaluation, policy and research, *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp.11-23.

Austin, J., Steveson, H., Wei-Skillern, J. (2006) Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different or Both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Jan, pp.10042-2587.

Ajzen, I. (1991) Organizational behaviour and human decision processes, *Theories of Cognitive Self-Regulation*, Vol 50, Issue 2, pp. 179-211

Bartlett, D., and Dibben, P. (2002) Public sector innovation and entrepreneurship—Case studies from local government, *Local Government Studies*, 28(4), 107–121.

Bates, J. (1998) The evaluation of entrepreneurial management. Paper presented at the ISBA Conference at Durham University, November.

Bruyat, C. and Julien, P.A. (2000) Defining the field of research in entrepreneurship, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 165-80.

Bygrave, W.D. (1989) The entrepreneurship paradigm (II): chaos and catastrophes among quantum jumps, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 14 No. 2, p. 30.

Carayannis, G. E., Evans, D., Hanson, M. (2003) A cross-cultural learning strategy for entrepreneurship education: outline key concepts and lessons learned from a comparative study of entrepreneurship students in France and the US, *Technovation*, 23, pp.757-771.

Gartner, W.B. & Vesper, K.H. (1994). Experiments in Entrepreneurship Education: Successes and Failures, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol 9, pp.179-187.

Ciriec (2000) *The Enterprises and Organisations of the Third System*, University of Liege, Ciriec.

Cohen, W.M. and Levinthal, D.A. (1990) Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 35, pp.128–152.

Collins English Dictionary (2014) available online dictionary - Collins English Dictionary, Entrepreneurship [Online] Available At: www.collinsdictionary.com. Accessed date: 30/01/2014.

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Covin, J. G., and Slevin, D. P. (1986) The development and testing of a firm-level entrepreneurship scale. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship*. Boston, MA: Babson College.

Cox, L.W. (1996) The goals and impact of educational interventions in the early stages of entrepreneur career development, *Proceedings of the Internationalising Entrepreneurship Education and Training Conference*.

Davies, L.G. and Gibb, A.A. (1991) Recent research in entrepreneurship, *Proceedings of the 3rd International EIASM Workshop*, Gower, London.

Defourny, J., Nyssens, M. (2010) Social Enterprise in Europe: At the Crossroads of Market, Public Policies and the Third Sector, *Policy and Society*, Vol 29, pp.231-242.

DiMaggio, P. J. (1988) Interest and agency in institutional theory, In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns and organizations: Culture and environment* (pp. 3–22). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger

DTI. (2002) Social enterprise. A strategy for success. London: Department of Trade and Industry. (www.dti.gov.uk/socialenterprise/strategy.htm)

EU Commission (2013) Entrepreneurship Education: A Guide for Educators. Bruxelles.

European Commission (2009) Entrepreneurship in Vocational Education and Training (November 2009).

Etzkowitz, H., Leydesdorff, L. (2000), The dynamics of innovation: from National Systems and 'Mode 2' to a Triple Helix of university-industry-government relations, *Research Policy* 29 (2), pp.109-123.

Etzkowitz, H. (2002) Incubation of incubators: innovation as a triple helix of university-industry-government networks, *Science and Public Policy* 29 (2), 115–128.

Feldman, M. P., and Francis, J. L. (2004) Homegrown solutions: Fostering cluster formation, *Economic Development Quarterly*, 18, 127–137.

Fiet, J.O. (2001) The theoretical side of teaching entrepreneurship, *Journal of Business Venturing* 16 (1), 1–24.

Foster, J., Lin, A. (2003) Individual differences in learning entrepreneurship and their implications for web-based instruction in e-business and e-commerce, *British Journal of Educational Technology*, Vol. 34, No 4, pp.455-465.

Fritsch, M. (2000). 'Interregional Differences in R&D Activities: An Empirical Investigation., *European Planning Studies*, 8, 40-442.

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

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

knowledge, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 4, Issue 3, September, pp. 233-169.

Gibb, A.A. (1987) Enterprise culture – its meaning and implications for education and training, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp.1-38.

Gorman, G., Hanlon, D. and King, W. (1997) Some research perspectives on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education and education for small business management: a ten year literature review, *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 56-78.

Great Britain: DTI/DFEE (2001) *Opportunity for all: a White Paper on enterprise, skills and innovation*, HMSO, London.

Greenhalgh, C., Longland, M., Bosworth, D. (2001) Technological Activity and Employment in a Panel of UK Firms, *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 48, 260-282.

Hayek, F.A (1945) The use of knowledge in society, *American Economic Review*, Vol 35, pp. 519–530.

Hisrich, R, D and Peters, M., P. (1998) *Entrepreneurship*. 4th Edn. Pentice Hall, New York.

Henry, C., Hill, F., Leitch, C. (2005) Entrepreneurship education and training: can entrepreneurship be taught? Part I, *Education and Training*, Vol. 47, No2, pp.98-111.

Howells, J. (2005) Innovation and Regional Economic Development: A Matter of Perspective, *Research Policy*, 34, 1220-1234.

Jamieson, I. (1984) Education for enterprise, in Watts, A.G. and Moran, P. (Eds), CRAC, Ballinger, Cambridge, pp. 19-27.

Johannisson, B. (1991) University training for entrepreneurship: A Swedish approach, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* Vol.3 (1), pp.67–82.

Jones, C. and English, J. (2004) A contemporary approach to entrepreneurship education, *Education and Training*, Vol. 46 No 8/9, pp. 416-23.

Junior Entrepreneurship Programme (2014) *Junior Entrepreneurship Programme*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.juniorentrepreneur.ie/>. Accessed Date: 30/01/2014.

Kolb, D.A. (1984) *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kangaslahti, V. (2008) *Reflections on the Singapore experiment in entrepreneurship education*”, in Ingle, S. and Neuvonen-Rauhala, M. (Eds), *Promoting Entrepreneurship by Universities. The Proceedings of the 2nd International FINPIN 2008 Conference*, Ha`meenlinna, Finland, April 20-22, pp. 307-12.

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Kuratko, F., D. (2005) Emergence of Entrepreneurship Education: Development, Trends and Challenges, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, September 2005, pp.577-597.

Lasprogata, G.A, and Cotton, M.N. (2003) Contemplating enterprise: the business and legal challenges of social entrepreneurship, *American Business Law Journal* 41, pp.67–113.

Laukkanen, M. (2000) Exploring alternative approaches in high-level entrepreneurship education: creating micro-mechanisms for endogenous regional growth, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* Vol. 12, pp.25–47.

Leadbeater, C. (1997) *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur*, Demos, London.

Letts, C., Grossman, A., and Ryan, W. (1999) *High performance non-profit organizations: Managing upstream for greater impact*. New York: Wiley.

Levie, J. (1999) *Enterprising Education in Higher Education in England*. London: Department for Education and Employment, p. 40.

Low, M. and McMillan, I. (1988) Entrepreneurship: past research and future challenges, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 32, pp. 139-61.

Malecki, E.J. (1997). Entrepreneurs, networks, and economic development: a review of recent research. In: Katz, J.A., Borckhaus, R. (Eds.), *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth*. JAI Press, Greenwich.

Paci, R., Usai, S. (2000) Technological Enclaves and Industrial Districts: An Analysis of the Regional Distribution of Innovative Activity in Europe. *Regional Studies*, Vol 34, pp.98-115.

Politis, D. (2008) Does prior start-up experience matter for entrepreneurs' learning? A comparison between novice and habitual entrepreneurs, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 472-89.

Politis, D. (2005) The Process of Entrepreneurial Learning: A Conceptual Framework, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, pp. 399-424.

Radosevich, R. (1995) A model for entrepreneurial spin-offs from public technology sources. *International Journal of Technology Management*, Vol. 10, no 7/8: 879-893.

Raffo, C., Lovatt, A., Banks, M and O' Connor, J. (2000) Teaching and learning entrepreneurship for micro and small businesses in the cultural industries sector, *Training and Education*, Vol. 42, No 6, pp.356-365.

Rasmussen, A., E., Sørheim, R. (2006) Action-based entrepreneurship education, *Technovation*, 2, pp.185–194

Schumpeter, J.A. (1926), *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*, Duncker and Humblot, Leipzig.

Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe (FIERE) Literature Review

Seelos, C., Mair, J (2005) Social entrepreneurs: creating new business models to serve the poor, *Business Horizons*, Vol 48, pp241-246.

Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S. (2000) The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research, *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226.

Shapiro, A., and Sokol, L (1982) The Social Dimensions of Entrepreneurship (1982). Encyclopaedia of Entrepreneurship, pp.72-90. [Online Available] SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1497759>

Sharif, N. (2012) Facilitating and prompting innovative entrepreneurs in Hong Kong: Theory and Practice, *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, vol 29, pp 139-153.

Shaw, E., and Garter, S. (2007) Social Entrepreneurship, theoretical antecedents and empirical analysis of entrepreneurial processes and outcomes, *Journal of Small business Enterprise Development*, Vol 14, No 3, pp.418-434.

Simeonova-Ganeva, R. (2010), Human Capital in Economic Growth: A Review of Theory and Empirics, *Economic Thought, Institute of Economics, BAS*, Issue 7/2010, pp.131-149.

Simme, J. (2003) Innovation and Urban Regions as National and International nodes for the Transfer and Sharing of Knowledge, *Regional Studies*, 37, (6, 7), 607-620.

South East Regional Authority (2014) *Projects and Initiatives*. [Online] Available At: <http://www.sera.ie/projects/index.html>. Accessed Date: 30/01/2014.

Spear, R. (2006) Social entrepreneurship: A different model? *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 33, No 5/6, pp.399-410.

Stevenson, H.H., Jarillo, J.C., (1990) A paradigm of entrepreneurship: entrepreneurial management, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 11, pp.17–27.

Sundin, E., and Tillmar, M. (2008) A Nurse and a Civil Servant, changing institutions: Entrepreneurial processes in different public sector organizations, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 24, pp.113-124.

Taatila, P. V. (2010) Learning entrepreneurship in higher education, *Education and Training*, Vol. 52, No1, pp.48-61.

Taatila, V. (2008) *Innovation and entrepreneurship from international co-operation*, in Ingle, S. and Neuvonen-Rauhala, M. (Eds), *Promoting Entrepreneurship by Universities. The Proceedings of the 2nd International FINPIN 2008 Conference*, Ha`meenlinna, Finland, April 20-22, pp. 359-66.

Timmons, J.A, Muzyka, D.F., Stevenson, H.H., and Bygrave, W.D., (1987) Opportunity recognition: The core of entrepreneurship, *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Babson, p.409-424

*Furthering Innovative Entrepreneurial Regions of Europe
(FIERE)
Literature Review*

Timmons, J., Spinelli, R., (1994) *New Venture Creation*, 4th ed. Irwin.

Tödting, F and Trippel, M. (2005) One Size Fits All? Towards a Differentiated regional Innovation Policy Approach. *Research Policy*, 34, 1203-1219.

Vesa P., T. (2010) Learning entrepreneurship in higher education, *Education and Training*, Vol. 52 (1), pp.48-61.

Weerawardena, J and Mort, S., G (2008) Investigating social entrepreneurship: a multidimensional model, *Journal of World Business*, vol 41, pp21-35.

Weerawardena, J and Mort, S., G. (2001) Learning, innovation and competitive advantage in not-for-profit aged care marketing: A conceptual model and research propositions, *Journal of non-Profit and Public Sector Marketing*, Vol 9, (3), pp 53-73.

Wickham, P.A. (2004) *Strategic Entrepreneurship*, 3rd ed., Pearson Education Limited, Harlow.

Wolverton, B (2003) Surviving Tough Times, *Chronicle on Philanthropy*, October 30.

Wiklund, J.M., Dimov, J and Shephard, D. (2006) Europe and Entrepreneurship Research, in Johan Wiklund, Dimo Dimov, Jerome A. Katz, Dean A. Shepherd (ed.) *Entrepreneurship: Frameworks And Empirical Investigations From Forthcoming Leaders Of European Research (Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth, Volume 9)*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.1-8

Younhee, K. (2010) Stimulating Entrepreneurial Practices in the Public Sector: The Roles of Organizational Characteristics, *Administration and Society*, August, 4, 2010.

Zahra, A., S., Gedojlovic, E., Neubaum, O., D., Shalman, M., J. (2009) A typology of Social Entrepreneurs Motives, Search Processes and Ethical Challenges, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol 24, pp.519-532.

Zadek, S. and Thake, S. (1997, June 20). Send in the social entrepreneurs. *New Statesman*, 26, 31.