

Call for Papers, Special Issue

*Entrepreneurship and Innovation Teaching in Higher Education –
Challenges and Best Practices*

Guest Editors: Marcos Lima, Joëlle Forest

Even though nearly one French in three is aware of entrepreneurial opportunities, only 5% of them create an early stage entrepreneurship project (GEM, 2014). This ratio is not much better elsewhere in Europe. Among the reasons cited for this gap are perceived threats such as economic crises, a hostile environment, fear of failure and lack of entrepreneurial vocation and competencies (Fayolle, 2012). Several authors (Degeorge and Fayolle, 2011; Mueller, 2011) establish a close relationship between the quality of entrepreneurship education and the intent to start a new business among young adults. Similar challenges are faced by education initiatives concerning education programs specifically focusing on innovation.

Questions about the efficiency and efficacy of these programs remain plentiful (Rideout and Gray, 2013). What is the role of experiential learning versus theory-based teaching in entrepreneurship and innovation education (Mojab et al., 2011)? What are the limits of static business plan design in an increasingly dynamic entrepreneurial environment (Tounés, Lassas-Clerc and Fayolle, 2014)? What is the real impact of existing teaching programs on entrepreneurial intent and the innovation spirit (Villette, 2011)? Can entrepreneurship and innovation truly be taught or is it largely an innate capability (Lautenschläger and Haase, 2011)? What pedagogical methods can help develop entrepreneurial intent (Fayolle and Verzat, 2009)?

Furthermore, there seems to be some confusion between entrepreneurship and innovation education. The Ministry of Higher Education and Research in France, for instance, seem to confound the roles of entrepreneurship and innovation education when they called for a mandatory course dedicated to innovation and entrepreneurship in all higher education institutions in that country (MESR, 2012). What are, therefore, the specificities of these two domains of higher education?

In spite of these controversial issues, there seems to be a consensus around the three-fold objectives of entrepreneurship and innovation education: a) to raise awareness, b) to develop competencies and c) to provide support to students wishing to develop an innovative entrepreneurial activity (Albertini et al., 2019; Fayolle, 2012). Yet these initiatives are often

confined within university walls, fragmented and poorly connected with the innovation ecosystem (Raucent et al., 2010). Resistance to innovation and change may come both from the side of teachers and students themselves. Old habits, inertia, fear of the unknown, financial barriers and lack of time to restructure programs are often cited as brakes to pedagogical innovation by the stakeholders involved (Fayolle, 2012).

Among the other factors cited by the literature that may affect the development of entrepreneurial intent are: timing (students closest to graduation seem more concerned with getting a steady job than creating their own activity); initial level of entrepreneurial intent prior to engaging in a higher education program and location (proximity to innovation clusters may favor entrepreneurship attitudes).

The aim of this issue is to enlarge the debate around entrepreneurship teaching in higher education, its limits, opportunities, challenges and best practices. Contributions may include, but not be limited to, the following topics:

1. Raising awareness about entrepreneurship opportunities: entrepreneurship programs have established competitions and challenges to foster the entrepreneurial spirit and to “reveal” unsuspected vocations. Various programs focus on competency validation , junior enterprise associations and inviting inspirational guest lecturers (Chené et al., 2011). What is the impact of these initiatives on raising entrepreneurial awareness?
2. Entrepreneurship versus innovation education: even though there certainly are overlaps between these areas, they are not the same. Noailles-Simeon (2013) and Christensen et al. (2013) point out that the innovator must be distinguished from the entrepreneur because the nature of the innovation is intrinsically different from the purely entrepreneurial act. However, many education programs use both terms simultaneously. What are the risks of such confusion? What are the challenges of redrawing the scope of entrepreneurship and innovation education?
3. Developing skills and competencies: entrepreneurship and innovation programs have experimented with action-based pedagogy, hybrid disciplines with both academic and practitioner approaches, empowering learners with first-hand experiences, collaborative and reflective learning through active teaching through real-world scenarios based on case studies. Advanced programs have tried to adapt contents to student needs, establishing careful metrics of success based on clearly defined learning objectives. Other methods (Aouni, 2011) preconize effectuation approaches (determining possible effects based on the available means) rather than predictive methods (business plans and long-term planning). What are the limits and possibilities of these best practices?
4. Providing support to entrepreneurship and innovation programs: higher education institutions are increasingly creating dedicated facilities to develop start-ups, such as incubators, accelerators, fab-labs and co-working spaces. Nation-wide or region-wide programs are encouraged by local or supra-national governments with

the expectation of encouraging entrepreneurship activity. Venture capital and angel investment programs, as well as crowdfunding platforms, make it easier than ever to obtain early stage funding (Loué et al., 2008). How effective are these mechanisms in promoting entrepreneurship and innovation activities?

5. Entrepreneurship ethics and social responsibility: in a world where data collection and privacy scandals abound, in which inequality and poverty remain real challenges, and in which corruption is sometimes tolerated, how to impregnate a sense of ethics and sustainable development in entrepreneurship and innovation programs? (Fayolle and Toutain, 2013)
6. Strategic enablers of entrepreneurship teaching: the literature (Albertini et al., 2019) suggests practices such as co-construction of programs by engaging the community of stakeholders, establishing advanced teacher training programs, identifying early student vocations and managing their expectations and fears concerning failure and risks. What is the state of development of these best practices in the European Continent and beyond?
7. Interaction with innovation ecosystems: entrepreneurship programs should be highly connected with research centers, companies, investors and living labs. What are some of the ways to create these networks and establish knowledge flows among innovation ecosystem stakeholders surrounding higher education institutions (Laperche et al., 2019)?

This call for papers is open to any contributions (in English or French) about (but not exclusively about) the above topics. The number of words should be kept below 8000. Articles will be selected based on their overall quality and originality, as well as their academic and practitioner relevance.

Bibliographical References

Albertini, T., Fabiani, T., Lameta, N., & Lima, M. (2019). A framework for evaluating the effectiveness of entrepreneurial teaching in higher education. *Marché et organisations*, (1), 159-186.

Aouni, Z. (2011), “Démystification d'une pédagogie émergente : l'approche par les compétences“, *Entreprendre & Innover*, vol 3, n° 11-12, p. 120-126

Chéné, E., Schieb-Bienfait, N., Lavergne, A., Tregret-Bouche, I. (2011), “Une démarche de conception d'un dispositif de sensibilisation à l'entrepreneuriat”, *Annales des Mines - Gérer et comprendre*, n° 103, p. 60-70.

Christensen, C., Dyer, J., Gregersen, H. (2013). *Le gène de l'innovateur : Cinq compétences qui font la différence*, Pearson France, Montreuil sous Bois.

Degeorge, J. M., Fayolle, A. (2011), “Les étudiants français ont-ils la fibre entrepreneuriale ?”, *Entreprendre et Innover*, vol. 1, n° 9-10, p. 21-28.

- Fayolle, A. (2012), *Entrepreneuriat, Apprendre à Entreprendre*, 2^{ème} Ed. Dunod, Paris.
- Fayolle, A., Gailly B. (2009), "Évaluation d'une formation en entrepreneuriat : prédisposition et impact sur l'intention d'entreprendre", *M@n@gement*, vol. 12, n° 3, p. 176-203.
- Fayolle, A., Toutain, O. (2013), "Four Educational Principles to Rethink Ethically Entrepreneurship Education", *Revista de Economia Mundial*, n°35, p. 21-45.
- Fayolle, A., Verzat C. (2009), "Pédagogies actives et entrepreneuriat : Quelle place dans nos enseignements ?", *Revue de l'entrepreneuriat*, vol. 8, n° 2, p. 1-16.
- GEM (2014). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor survey. Available at <http://www.gemconsortium.org/report>
- Laperche, B., Lima, M., Seulliet, E., Trousse, B. (2019) *Les Écosystèmes D'innovation : Regards croisés des acteurs clés*. L'Harmattan.
- Lautenschläger, A., Haase H. (2011), "The myth of entrepreneurship education: seven arguments against teaching business creation at universities", *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, vol.14, p.147-161.
- Loué, C., Laviolette E.M., Bonnafous-Boucher M. (2008), "L'entrepreneur à l'épreuve de ses compétences : Eléments de construction d'un référentiel en situation d'incubation", *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, vol. 7, p.63-83
- MESR (2012). *15 mesures pour augmenter l'impact économique de la recherche*, 2 novembre 2012.
- Mojab, F. Zaefarian, R., Dazian Azizi, A.H. (2011), "Applying competency based approach for entrepreneurship education", *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, n° 12, p. 436-447.
- Mueller S. (2011), "Increasing entrepreneurial intention: effective entrepreneurship course characteristics", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol.13, No.1, p.55-74
- Noailles-Siméon, P. (2013). "De l'entrepreneur à l'innovateur dans une économie dynamique", in Boutiller S., Djellal F., Uzunidis D. (eds), *L'innovation : Analyser, anticiper, agir*, Peter Lang éditions, p. 85-110.
- Raucent, B., Verzat, C., Villeneuve, L. (2010) *Accompagner les étudiants*, Bruxelles : De Boeck, Chapitre 19, L'accompagnement dans les institutions d'enseignement supérieur, p. 501-540.
- Rideout, E. C., Gray, D.O. (2013), "Does entrepreneurship education really work? A review and methodological critique of the empirical literature on the effects of university-based entrepreneurship education", *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 51, n°3, p.329-351.
- Tounés A., Lassas-Clerc N., Fayolle A. (2015), "Effets comparés de deux pédagogies de plans d'affaires sur l'apprentissage entrepreneurial des étudiants, Une approche par les compétences", *La Revue des Sciences de Gestion*, n° 275-276, p.13-21.
- Villette, M., (2011), "Comment répondre à la demande institutionnelle d'enseignement de l'entrepreneuriat ? Compte rendu ethnographique d'une expérience d'enseignement", *Revue Française de Socio-Économie*, vol.1 n° 7, p. 83-101.

Calendar

- 30/06/2020 – deadline for submissions of extended abstracts
- 31/08/2020 – feedback by evaluators
- 30/11/2020 – final draft deadline
- 31/12/2020 – final acceptance
- Spring 2021 – publication

Texts must be submitted to

Marcos Lima (marcos.lima@skema.edu) or Joëlle Forest (joelle.forest@insa-lyon.fr)

Further information on our website:

<https://www.cairn.info/revue-marche-et-organisations.htm>