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Abstract
As entrepreneurship is seen as very important for economic growth the education of entrepreneurship is getting more interest, not only from business oriented schools, but also from non-business schools. It is widely recognized that entrepreneurship education needs other approaches of teaching. To teachers it means that they have to change their education. In 2013 we started an training program for teachers to teach more entrepreneurial. This program is designed around constructivist teaching and action learning.

One of the things we found out during the teachers program, is that non-business teachers and students have other experiences and use other words to describe entrepreneurship. To find the right language and therefore the right teaching program, it is valuable to find out the vocabulary that people use when they describe entrepreneurship.

We developed a scale of different elements of entrepreneurship according to which people can score their view on entrepreneurship. Scoring the different elements of entrepreneurship will clear for example the differences of entrepreneurial view between business and non-business students.

The entrepreneurial view can be used to design the teaching program for entrepreneurial students. That view can also be used to get a better understanding among different (business and non-business) students to help them to learn more from each other. Besides that, the entrepreneurial view can also be used to discuss about that view and develop a more complete and nuanced view of entrepreneurship. With the right vocabulary the model for entrepreneurship education can be tailor-made.
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Introduction
As entrepreneurship is often seen as an important factor of economic growth, a lot of universities and schools are focusing on entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial education (Commission). Educating entrepreneurs needs different methods as the ‘conventional’ way of education, as demonstrated for example by Allen Gibb (1996) and Alain Fayolle (2006).

Theoretical background
Entrepreneurship has a positive influence on the economic growth (Acs and Szerb, 2010, Rocha, 2012, Fritsch, 2011). Entrepreneurial education has a positive influence on the entrepreneurial activity (Raposo and Paco, 2011). That is a reason why politicians are interested in entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial education is seen as an important contribution to economic growth by politicians, researchers and economists (Gibcus et al., 2010, Khan, 2011). The education of entrepreneurs is something that has to follow a different method from the conventional methods of education (Gibb, 1996, Fayolle, 2006, Blenker et al., 2012a). This is visualized by Allen Gibb (2010) where in figure 1 below a conventional model is drawn. A more appropriate model of entrepreneurial teaching according to Gibb is drawn in figure 2.

Figure 1 The dominant model of the entrepreneur being taught
Another way of expressing these differences is the metaphor of the goose and the falcon (Hammer, 2012). Goose are jointly developed in groups and the teachers decides what to learn, when to learn and how much to learn, as the result are goose. Obverse, falcons are being taught to behave more individual and be aware of the opportunities were total different life strategies emerge.

When fostering the teaching process, an apposite model must be appointed. Recent research on entrepreneurship education identify some major aspects to include. For entrepreneurial education, active education methods and practice have a positive influence (Walter and Dohse, 2012, Neck and Greene, 2011). A constructivist teaching method is a results in action-based learning. The students then make their own interactions with the own world (Mathews, 2007). Entrepreneurship also needs other skills or competences (Binks et al., 2006, Groen et al., 2002, Kutzhanova et al., 2009, Leitch et al., 2012). Blenker et al. (2012b) argued that the entrepreneurship education need to be adopted for context, culture and circumstances, down to a personal level. The construction process of education starts most times with an education goal. Then you have to identity the actuality of the learning situation, the student and the culture. After this the teaching process, the curriculum, methods, education activities and education tools can be developed. The teacher is of significant influence of that teaching process. At the end the teaching process should be evaluated
in respect of the reached goals (Berghe et al., 1973, Van Gelder et al., 1972). This leads to the general teaching process as shown in Figure 3 (Koopman et al., 2013).

**Figure 3 The teaching process**

![Diagram of the teaching process](Koopman et al., 2013)

For entrepreneurial education, active education methods and practice have a positive influence (Walter and Dohse, 2012, Neck and Greene, 2011). A constructivist teaching method is a results in action-based learning. The students then make their own interactions with the own world (Mathews, 2007). Entrepreneurship also needs other skills or competences (Binks et al., 2006, Groen et al., 2002, Kutzhanova et al., 2009, Leitch et al., 2012)

**Research project**

Based on the teaching process described in the theoretical part of this paper, a research project started by the Saxion university in cooperation with the University of Twente and Twente Knowledge Park. It was funded by a regional economic development program to valorize the knowledge of universities to the region (2012). Aim of the research project was to integrate principles of entrepreneurship in an entire university learning system. According to the described teaching process (Koopman et al., 2013) a teaching program for entrepreneurial education was designed for all university faculties. The design process used is shown in figure 4.

**Figure 4 Design process**

![Diagram of the design process](Koopman et al., 2013)

The identified gap from the first step of the design process, is the absence of an entrepreneurial teaching program, what is the aim of the research project. The moderators are identified from the teaching process used. These moderators are described below:
• **Culture.** At the university of Twente and Saxion University, each faculty has its own culture from direct vicinity of the field. Since the field is not the subject to change, it was untouched in the project.

• **Competences.** In the last decade many studies on entrepreneurship and enterprising competences are conducted with a wide range of results. For this research project is was agreed that the competences should be in line with the faculty involved. Where specific entrepreneurial or enterprising competences were needed, those as published by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) of United Kingdom (QAA, 2012).


• **Teachers.** The teacher is indicated as an important mediator of the teaching process. When a change is wanted, teachers should also change their contributions (Blenker et al., 2011). How the teachers should change is not well known. This makes that the main focus of the research project is on teaching educators for entrepreneurship education.

For the development of the program to teach the entrepreneurship educators, the same teaching model is used. This leads to Figure 5, where the teaching program for teachers is the focus of the design. In that figure three times the teaching process of Figure 3 is seen.

**Figure 5 Teaching teachers in entrepreneurial teaching**
The classic teaching program, the entrepreneurial teaching program and the program for the educators’ development. The educator’s development program we designed focuses on the development of teachers, to enable them to teach entrepreneurial.

The design and teaching team of the program was formed by an educational specialist and two senior lectures in entrepreneurship. Although the teaching methodology was constructivistic, on forehand an outline was made which is shown in Figure 6

**Figure 6 Course scheme**

Before and after each teaching session with the educators, the design team discussed the meeting involved and adapt the content to the situation emerged during the former session. During the session the outcome of the program tended to be the development of enterprising program in each faculty. We started with the descry of the vision of the different faculties on entrepreneurship. After discussion, bottom-line, the individual visions where in line with the one of the university. After the agreement on the shared vision a fuzzy discussion started on the competences, needed for the entrepreneurial programs. Between two sessions it became clear to the designers team that the form and tongue of what a competence is, was interpreted different over the faculties, although the ones form the QAA (2012) seem very clear to the designers. To find a way to go from the vision to learning activities, it was agreed that the educators would identify ‘aspects’ on what they found it was entrepreneurial. The results of the discussion and the identification of aspects is shown in Figure 7.

**Figure 7 Entrepreneurial aspects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-conscious</th>
<th>Visionary/inspirational</th>
<th>Driven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td>Acting</td>
<td>Risk-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved Committed</td>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Stand up for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious</td>
<td>Actionable</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-creative look and design</td>
<td>Perpetuate (sustain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next sessions, the educators tried to identify where in their existing curriculum, where some entrepreneurial aspects were introduced, the different aspects where visible. They also indicated if and how it was tested by the students. In table 3, some aspects are written down. At
the time of publication, this process was going on and therefore the final result cannot be presented yet. It will be presented during the conference.

Questions
The teachers program as described above started in 2013 with a few groups from different faculties. In this program are also several teachers from non-business schools. The first results of the training program are showing up. At the same time there are several questions that came in front. First of all the teachers of different disciplines used another vocabulary; healthcare teachers for example doesn’t talk about ‘entrepreneurship’ but about ‘innovation’. Also the term ‘risk taking’ is something that in healthcare is not used. ‘We don’t take risk! Because we deal with people we don’t do that’. This vocabulary, which is assumed to be depending on the discipline, makes it difficult to do research on this item, but also makes the use of ‘standard’ entrepreneurial competences and education methods difficult. Third this makes it difficult to get non-business teachers and students interested in entrepreneurial education. That’s why it would be interesting to do research at this topic;

1 What is the vocabulary about enterprise and entrepreneurship that is being used in different disciplines?

To provide some of an answer to the question above, the authors searched for types of classifications of entrepreneurship aspects. GEM-data researcher such as Wennekers (2014 [to be published]), described various classifications of aspects of entrepreneurship, as described in GEM research projects. These classifications, as presented in Figure 8 are used in a survey research in the university.

**Figure 8 Classifications of entrepreneurship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business owner</th>
<th>Corporate entrepreneurship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starter</td>
<td>Incumbents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessity-driven</td>
<td>Opportunity-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without personnel</td>
<td>With personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth ambition</td>
<td>No growth ambition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With others</td>
<td>Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this survey, as shown in appendix 1, the authors want to get some insights in the use of vocabulary by several groups. Whether it is age, witnessed entrepreneurship, experience in several sectors or educational background. The result of this survey should give insights in the use of specific vocabulary among the university. A sub question is, is this a good approach? Are there other approaches, what could help the authors in answering their question one above?

People have different orientations for entrepreneurship. This orientations should be measured to improve teaching methods and curriculum development (Bolton and Lane, 2012). This is also recognized by Brand et al. (2006) when they conclude that non-business students ‘have particular experiences and skills on which the entrepreneurship courses have to build’.
But they also conclude that it could be beneficial to combine business and non-business students in a course. Because the education methods and the competences also make use of that same vocabulary it is important to know;

2 Is changing the vocabulary in the education methods and competences enough to reach non-business teachers and student? Or do teachers need to learn how to cope with the ‘standard’ entrepreneurial vocabulary to change their attitude towards enterprise and entrepreneurship?

To address this question two, the authors are open for all available help and suggestions for an approach for solutions.
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Appendix 1

Vragenlijst Ondernemerschapskenmerken

Algemene vragen
Hoogst genoteerde opleiding afgemaakt: VO / MBO / HBO / WO

Leeftijd: <18 / 18-25 / 26-40 / >40

In onderstaande tabel geven we twee aan twee begrippen die te maken kunnen hebben met ondernemerschap en / of ondernemers. We vragen je aan om je te geven welk van de begrippen jij het meest van toepassing vindt. Dat doe je door het hokje aan te kruisen dat het meest je voorkeur weergeeft. Hoe dichter het hokje bij een begrip, hoe meer je dat begrip van toepassing vindt. Je mag maar één kruisje zetten. Kruis dat aan wat je als eerst te binnen schiet. Geen enkel antwoord is goed of fout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zelfstandig ondernemerschap (voor eigen rekening en risico)</th>
<th>In dienst van een baas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starter</td>
<td>Een bestaand bedrijf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondernemen uit noodzaak</td>
<td>Ondernemen omdat men een kans ziet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replicatief (wat anderen ook doen)</td>
<td>Innovatief (wat nog niet gedaan is)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonder personeel</td>
<td>Met personeel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met groeiambities</td>
<td>Zonder groeiambities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercieel (om geld te verdienen)</td>
<td>Sociaal (om anderen tot dienst te zijn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samen met anderen</td>
<td>Alleen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannelijk</td>
<td>Vrouwelijk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Een aantal persoonlijke vragen:
De cijfers van de postcode waar je woonachtig bent:

Je lengte in centimeters: ….cm

Kleur van je ogen:

Strafblad: ja / nee

Ben je zelf ondernemer? ja / nee

Is een naast familielid ondernemer? ja / nee

Ben jij: man / vrouw

Werkervaring in jaren: 0 / 0-5 / 5-10 / >10