

Cornell University School of Hotel Administration

## The Scholarly Commons

---

Articles and Chapters

School of Hotel Administration Collection

---

9-29-2012

# Entrepreatality: Entrepreneurship Education in the Hospitality Industry

Mona Anita K. Olsen

*Cornell University*, [mao24@cornell.edu](mailto:mao24@cornell.edu)

Reidar J. Mykletun

*University of Stavanger*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.sha.cornell.edu/articles>



Part of the [Hospitality Administration and Management Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Olsen, M. K., & Mykletun, R. J. (2012). *Entrepreatality: Entrepreneurship education in the hospitality industry* [Electronic version]. Retrieved [insert date], from Cornell University, School of Hospitality Administration site: <http://scholarship.sha.cornell.edu/articles/35>

This Article or Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Hotel Administration Collection at The Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles and Chapters by an authorized administrator of The Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [hotellibrary@cornell.edu](mailto:hotellibrary@cornell.edu).

If you have a disability and are having trouble accessing information on this website or need materials in an alternate format, contact [web-accessibility@cornell.edu](mailto:web-accessibility@cornell.edu) for assistance.

---

## Entrepreatality: Entrepreneurship Education in the Hospitality Industry

### Abstract

Entrepreneurship is becoming increasingly important to strategic programmatic initiatives at universities. Entrepreneurship education at the university level is important to building the next generation of leaders for global innovation. The term entrepreneurship varies widely causing confusion when setting plans for entrepreneurship education curriculum development at the university level. This chapter outlines a foundational, working definition of entrepreneurship that combines two goals of entrepreneurship education: new venture creation and value creation. It also provides a high-level overview of the evolution of entrepreneurship education and global entrepreneurship education and research. The new term entrepretality, or entrepreneurship education in the hospitality industry, is defined. Additionally, the basic assumptions of situated learning and hermeneutic phenomenological inquiry are outlined. Examples of situated learning in the hospitality industry, specifically in rural tourism and the culinary arts, are presented. Finally, the chapter discusses implications for the future for entrepretality, highlighting the need to continue to link the academic and the practical.

### Keywords

entrepreneurship education, entrepretality, hospitality

### Disciplines

Hospitality Administration and Management

### Comments

#### Required Publisher Statement

© [Fagbokforlaget](#). Final version published as: Olsen, M. A., & Mykletun, R. J. (2012). Entrepreatality: Entrepreneurship education in the hospitality industry. In T. Furunes, R. J. Mykletun, & E. Marnburg (Eds.), *Current research in hospitality and tourism*. Bergen, Norway: Fagbokforlaget. Reprinted with permission. All rights reserved.

# Entrepreatality: Entrepreneurship Education in the Hospitality Industry

Mona Anita K. Olsen<sup>1,2</sup> & Reidar J. Mykletun<sup>1</sup>

- 1) Norwegian School of Hotel Management, University of Stavanger, Norway
- 2) Graduate School of Education in The College of Education and Human Development, George Mason University, Virginia, United States of America

## Abstract

Entrepreneurship is becoming increasingly important to strategic programmatic initiatives at universities. Entrepreneurship education at the university level is important to building the next generation of leaders for global innovation. The term entrepreneurship varies widely causing confusion when setting plans for entrepreneurship education curriculum development at the university level. This chapter outlines a foundational, working definition of entrepreneurship that combines two goals of entrepreneurship education: new venture creation and value creation. It also provides a high-level overview of the evolution of entrepreneurship education and global entrepreneurship education and research. The new term entrepretality, or entrepreneurship education in the hospitality industry, is defined. Additionally, the basic assumptions of situated learning and hermeneutic phenomenological inquiry are outlined. Examples of situated learning in the hospitality industry, specifically in rural tourism and the culinary arts, are presented. Finally, the chapter discusses implications for the future for entrepretality, highlighting the need to continue to link the academic and the practical.

## What is entrepreneurship?

The term entrepreneurship varies widely across industries and disciplines, causing confusion in both the business and academic domains. Sewell and Pool (2010) define entrepreneurship as “the desire, motivation and skills necessary to start and manage a successful business.” Hansen, Shrader, and Monllor (2011) highlight that the definition of entrepreneurship varies based on how one defines opportunity. Kobia and Sikalieh (2010) note that “that a clear-cut and controversy-free definition is nowhere within reach.” Entrepreneurship is also often confused with innovation—to many these two words are very similar, but to others there is a huge difference between the two. In education, the variety of definitions of entrepreneurship not only causes a problem when talking about entrepreneurship across academic departments, but also within schools and departments that are trying to establish entrepreneurship curricula. Therefore, in this chapter, we use a foundational objective instead of an operational definition as a basis for framing the topic.

A widely accepted foundational objective of entrepreneurship education is to encourage students to create their own businesses and to develop the skills and competencies to be successful in their own ventures (Harkema & Schout, 2008). We propose an enhanced working definition of entrepreneurship education for this chapter. This working definition includes one additional objective and makes entrepreneurship more applicable to the hospitality industry. This additional objective states that students are also encouraged to innovate within already existing ventures to create value. Some might define this additional objective as innovation or corporate entrepreneurship. However, the definition that Burns (2005) provides for corporate entrepreneurship applies only to creating value in existing, large organizations. The objective we propose does not distinguish between the overall size of the organization in which the value is being created. The organization could be large or small. The objective we propose also does not distinguish between the ownership or purpose of the company. For example, the company could be a corporation or a partnership; the company could be for-profit or non-profit. The additional objective aligns with value creation—leveraging available resources to create something of value.

This chapter provides a high-level overview of the evolution of entrepreneurship education at the university level. It also defines entrepreneurship education in the hospitality industry. The chapter outlines the basic assumptions of situated learning and hermeneutic phenomenological inquiry, both of which have ramifications for entrepreneurship education. Examples of the usage of situational learning in practice are outlined in two specific segments of the hospitality industry. Finally, the chapter discusses implications for the future of entrepreneurship education in terms of curriculum development at the university level.

## **How has entrepreneurship education evolved?**

The ongoing question in many universities still remains, can you teach entrepreneurship? Broad definitions of entrepreneurship have been around since long before the industrial revolution (Matlay, 2005). However, entrepreneurship education has been formally recognized in universities since the 1940's. Until recently, entrepreneurship education has not been a primary focus of undergraduate curricula. In the past decade, entrepreneurship education has become a focus in the strategic planning of curriculum planning across programs (Katz, 2003). Sewell and Pool (2010) note that “employability, enterprise, and entrepreneurship are high on the agendas” of institutions of higher education but that due to the lack of clarity in the definition of entrepreneurship, it is difficult to align strategic plans around curriculum development.

Historically, business schools have served as the anchor department for entrepreneurship courses. Business schools are experienced in being able to show and promote the immediate economic significance of their activities to students, alumni, faculty, and local communities (Katz, 2003). The ability for business schools to share the value that their education provides is instrumental to the evolution and continued funding of their programs. The link between entrepreneurship courses and economic value creation has encouraged and supported the creation of entrepreneurship courses in the for-profit space. Recently, administrators have started to take a closer look at where entrepreneurship education should be anchored within a university as they plan out their updated long-term strategic plans to be nationally and globally competitive.

With increasingly competitive global pressures, university administrators and economic development officials emphasize efficiency. The goal is to encourage both profit-driven and social-driven enterprise creation and enhancement through entrepreneurship education. They want to determine the best approach to making entrepreneurship curricula multidisciplinary. The hope is that upcoming entrepreneurship education programs will be set up to most effectively serve a diverse undergraduate student population with multidisciplinary interests across a university.

Critics of entrepreneurship education argue that entrepreneurship programs create profit-driven, commercial enterprises; therefore, disciplines like liberal arts and entrepreneurship end up on opposite sides of the academy despite their common foundations (Godwyn, 2009). Notably, liberal arts studies have been at the head of social entrepreneurship initiatives while business programs have been at the forefront of for-profit entrepreneurial instruction. This focus has highlighted the need to overcome stovepipe mentalities in universities. With an increasing trend to find efficiencies in multi-disciplinary education, there is a trend to encourage both profit-driven and social-driven enterprise creation through entrepreneurship education (Pribadi, 2005). The stovepipe nature of most universities has been a challenge to continuing innovation.

## **Global Entrepreneurship Education and Research**

Entrepreneurship is becoming more of a dominant force around the world. Entrepreneurship generates innovation in the delivery of services and improvement in the creation of our goods. The interest in entrepreneurship education at many levels is increasing within universities. Faculty members are teaching more courses on entrepreneurship. As undergraduates complete their degrees and become alumni, there is a higher likelihood of them creating small businesses or innovating within existing businesses as a result of their exposure to entrepreneurship at the university level. Entrepreneurs are people who build something of perceived value around opportunities that they see and the resources that they have access to in a given location.

Entrepreneurship is not a new topic for research. The term “entrepreneurship education” is always evolving; there are many areas for research that are unexplored. Papers and research studies typically revolve around the idea of whether entrepreneurship education is teachable or not, and if teachable, what type of model should be applied (Kleiman, 2008). The irony of the models and research presented is that they highlight the difficulty in defining “entrepreneurship” due to its inherently evolving nature (Pribadi, 2005).

Pribadi (2005) notes that the integration of entrepreneurship into specific ecosystems, such as individual university departments, needs to be studied before selecting a model to build curriculum development across a university. Institutions and infrastructure play a central role in defining how programs are incentivized in a system (Soskice, 1994). The importance of understanding the culture and background of a university and specific departments within a university is key to successfully incorporating entrepreneurial education into the curriculum; this is due particularly to the fact that the ability to identify and document the value of entrepreneurship education has yet to be fully studied up to this point.

Regardless of the approach taken for entrepreneurship education, it continues to grow globally. In the article by Katz (2003), it is noted that in 1994, 120,000 American students were taking entrepreneurship courses, and at the start of the new millennium the number of entrepreneurship students had increased by 50%. Entrepreneurship education has just gone through one of its periods of greatest growth, growth that was so fast that it might have outstripped the available intellectual resources. Furthermore, Katz (2003) notes that global competition is having a tremendous impact on the ability to bring the best and brightest students to the study at American universities. For American business school entrepreneurship professors, this means that they will face increasing competition for the brightest students, best ideas, and premiere venues for publication not only from entrepreneurship faculty around the world, but also from entrepreneurship faculty members in the office next door.

The difficulty in looking at global and national entrepreneurship education growth lies in the methods of measurement of these programs. According to Lee (2005), the success of entrepreneurship programs cannot be evaluated by the number of students graduated but can be more appropriately measured by the socioeconomic impact they produce in the businesses they create. Measurements such as the number of companies created, the number of jobs created, the types of companies formed and the growth potential of the companies are essential for tracking economic growth.

## **What is entrepretality?**

Entrepretality is a new term that we created that describes the objective of entrepreneurship education in the hospitality industry. The word is a literal blend of the two words “entrepreneurship” and “hospitality.” Entrepretality is the process of using available resources to create value by enhancing the service-value proposition to a customer, client, or other being. The term entrepretality and its focus on the value of a service output starkly contrasts with the most widely recognized view of entrepreneurship in hospitality academia. As Brizek and Khan (2008) note, in hospitality academia “entrepreneurship is considered mostly in terms of individuals who started new ventures.” This definition of entrepreneurship in hospitality academia is limiting because it solely focuses on new venture creation and neglects looking at the basis of hospitality education, creating a service-value proposition to a customer.

Hospitality education is multi-faceted and always has a need to link the academic and the practical (Naipaul & Youcheng, 2009). Therefore, hospitality programs are a natural fit to blend theory in practice in looking at encouraging entrepretality. Entrepretality can be incorporated into nearly every hospitality course. For example, entrepretality can be encouraged in a meal design course or a hotel design course. In both of these courses, a faculty member can stress the importance of an increase in service level. On an industry level, there are also ways to incorporate entrepretality. Established hospitality programs around the world have started to implement entrepreneurship courses, concentrations, and practicums. Hospitality programs also have business plan competitions and business model competitions and encourage mentorship exchange between students and alumni. One example of entrepretality can be found at Cornell University. In 2006, The Leland C. and Mary M. Pillsbury Institute for Hospitality Entrepreneurship was founded. This foundation of this center resulted in several new entrepretality courses being offered within The School of Hotel Administration at Cornell

University. Entreprenality is a particularly compelling addition to consider for a hotel school program, as one typical common theme across hotel schools is the actual context in which the lessons are delivered, otherwise known as situated learning.

## **What is situated learning?**

Situated learning is a theory created by Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger that focuses on the importance of culture and context in a learning function. Situated learning can be expressed as cognitive apprenticeship. Cognitive apprenticeships are when students acquire and develop knowledge via learning from a skilled master. Apprenticeship is a process of social learning that involves learners with an actual context of practice to expand awareness through mentorship.

Situated learning and cognitive apprenticeships are integral to the research process. Situated learning provides insight on what could be done to more effectively provide orientation programs to students entering the workforce. Situated learning focuses on the importance of authentic context—in entreprenality, this would most be easily seen in team work, people interaction, and decision making in creating the service-value proposition. Additionally, teaching decision-making processes in students is the core of cognitive apprenticeships (Chan, Miller, & Monroe, 2009). Hospitality schools are a natural fit for apprenticeships as they offer a business education tailored to a specific industry.

## **Situated Learning in Practice**

Non-US based institutions tend to incorporate situated learning and cognitive apprenticeship into their curriculum more frequently than US-based institutions (Larkin & Neumann, 2009). While school reformers have advocated a shift towards learner-centered approaches, this has been slow to impact US schools (Choo, 2007). For example, in Denmark, apprenticeship programs are abundant and vocational schools incorporate theory and practice into all curricula (Tanggaard, 2007). There is no perceived gap between theory and practice from the student perspective.

Norway also offers a particularly compelling example of the successful integration of apprenticeships into university curricula. The Norwegian Statistics Bureau (SSB) results show some of the highest rates of apprenticeship within the hotel trade. Driven by Norway's Ministry of Education and Research's stance that competence in entrepreneurship is relevant for all areas of working and business life, in both new and established activities and enterprises, Norway has been focused on the blending of theoretical and practical methods in entrepreneurship education.

Situated learning is most commonly utilized in professional schools that are focused on career development and application more than aggregated knowledge. Specifically, career services are not typically intertwined as a base for all university level students entering an institution. However, business schools tend to lead the way with the most incorporated situated learning styles. For example, one curriculum plan required college juniors in a business school to create resumes and professional employment plans as part of their coursework (Pritchard, Potter, Damminger, & Wriggins, 2004).

Situated learning also aligns with university programs that believe in teaching using hermeneutic phenomenological inquiry (HPI). HPI is an evolving contemporary way of knowing that merges two established methods of understanding. Hermeneutics implies that all experiences are interpreted on some level by each individual. Phenomenology is characterized as a qualitative form of inquiry that finds the opportunity to document and articulate how experiences appear. The combination of these two methods, HPI, is often considered a naturalistic way of knowing that effectively articulates the interpretation of personal experience. According to Sandage, Cook, Hill, Strawn, and Reimer (2008), the term hermeneutics comes from the Greek verb *hermeneuein*, which means, to make something clear. The term phenomenology also comes from a Greek verb that means, that which appears or *phainomenon*.

HPI is an expression of experience. Similarly, the hospitality industry is often based around providing experiences to others. As Heidegger stated so simply in his writings, being is time (Heidegger, 1993). According to Sandage et al. (2008), HPI involves five core themes-- interpretation, textual meaning, dialogue, tradition, and pre-understanding. It also assumes that all humans are self-interpreting animals. Additionally, according to Gadamer and Ricoeur, HPI is based on three main convictions (Tengelyi, 2007).

First, truth in experience is based on dynamic events that shape the truth. Specifically, hermeneutics requires difference. Life events force interpreters to re-orient their method of thinking on a continuum (Vessey, 2008). For example, when a child goes to school for the first time, he or she might be exposed to learning about the alphabet or basic words. As the child grows in his or her educational career, the classes change, alphabet lessons no longer exist and basic words turn into complex words. The child is forced to adjust at each stage in the learning process, and with each adjustment, the truth is shaped.

Second, truth in experience cannot be anticipated. Experiences are not fixed. People are constantly changing and evolving as new truths are revealed. The idea of anticipation is presented as a facet of the ability to actualize something. Essentially, it states that in order to expect something, one has to understand it in order to have it in the future. An example of this idea can be easily shown through the concept of death. Heidegger would argue that thinking about the possibility of death establishes death as a being. Once death becomes a being, it can be revealed as a possibility to an individual (Heidegger, 1993). Finally, truth cannot be disclosed in experience if it has not already revealed itself. For example, you cannot learn to serve a three-course meal to a client at an event if you have not experienced serving a dinner to a client. Building up to serving the three-course meal takes effort, experience, and time. Essentially, understanding experience requires building blocks of knowledge that are revealed over a given period of time to an individual.

Another key facet to the understanding of HPI is the hermeneutic circle. HPI is essentially a non-linear approach to thinking and retrospective in practice. This concept contextually links one's own understanding of a concept to experience. HPI argues that no one can fully understand a concept without acknowledging the context in which it is presented. In other words, HPI asserts that every form of human awareness is interpretive. Therefore, it is no surprise that according to Ricoeur, this method of inquiry can take on artistic, literary, and scientific forms (Tengelyvi, 2007).



## **Situated Learning in Rural Tourism**

Many countries see entrepreneurship in practice in the efforts to encourage tourism in rural areas to encourage economic success. Binns (2012) documents the need to develop “tourism as a vehicle for urban revitalization.” For example, in Ireland, the Irish tourism industry set up the Irish Tourism Learning Network (TLN) program. The TLN was setup to encourage a collaborative approach to assisting small business owners in rural areas to be more competitive in the regional tourism space (Kelliher, Foley, & Frampton, 2009). The shared knowledge from the group meetings enables innovation and efficiencies to occur at a more regional level. Additionally, these groups help build the skill sets of the entrepreneurs. While entrepreneurship often focuses on succession planning, family business management, and destination co-operation, the importance of incorporating education on the role of social and personal skills within the context of entrepreneurial growth has been encouraged (Weiermair, Siller, & Mössenlechner, 2006).

## **Situated Learning in Culinary Arts**

Culinary arts programs have been known to have strong vocational foundations. Shih-Ming, Leong, Wei, & Jung-Mao (2005) reviewed the culinary training paths of a practicing chef and noted that training programs including apprenticeship, culinary degree education, and chef certification are the majority in learning institutions. Within culinary arts, there are generally two forms of apprenticeship. One focuses solely on on-the-job training and the other focuses on blending lectures and practical training. As culinary arts programs have become more established in undergraduate programs, curricula have become more blended to encourage both critical thinking and creativity. Advancing this discipline has caused educational leaders to enable students to learn how to learn, to become entrepreneurial and technological innovators (Hegarty, 2011).

## **What are Implications for the Future for Entrepreneurship?**

Entrepreneurship will become more important with an increasingly competitive, shifting, and global economy. “Intensifying global competition, corporate downsizing and de-layering, and rapid technological progress have heightened the need for organizations to become more entrepreneurial to survive and prosper” (Li, Tse, & Zhao, 2009). It will be necessary for university programs to be flexible enough to adjust to the changing needs of the global economy. The continued focus on efficiencies in teaching entrepreneurship across the university will be at the forefront of strategic planning.

The skill sets of graduates will need to adjust to the continually changing needs of the industry. The push towards encouraging employability to affect innovation in the hospitality industry will influence the acceptance of entrepreneurship education (Weiermair, Siller, and Mössenlechner, 2006). This adjustment will be reflected in curriculum development and growth in the number of entrepreneurship courses or courses that stress entrepreneurship instruction. Curriculum content will have more emphasis on self-discovery, critical and creative thinking in order to produce future entrepreneurs, managers and leaders who are intellectually able to think outside of existing

business practices and paradigms (Naipaul & Youcheng, 2009). The link between the academic and the practical will become more and more important and strategic to ensuring future innovation in entrepreneurship. Incorporating models of instruction from disciplines that use situated learning and HPI could be a viable solution. Finally, the push to not only encourage entrepreneurship in starting a new venture but in innovating within an existing venture, regardless of size, will be visible in the growth of multi-disciplinary instruction.

As more entrepreneurship courses are created, more PhD students will pursue their degrees in entrepreneurship. This increase in PhD candidates will cause a direct increase in the quality and volume of research related to entrepreneurship. The real question is whether entrepreneurship will be taught within a hospitality program or if it will be offered at a university level, available to students from a more diverse skill-set and background regardless of academic discipline. Furthermore, entrepreneurship is a key skill set for a successful entrepreneur, regardless of industry. Hotel programs around the world can leverage the necessity of strong hospitality and people skills as a mechanism to not only recruit new candidates but to ensure a strategic place in a university's strategic curriculum in the long-run.

## References

- Binns, K. (2012). Hospitality entrepreneurship the new engine for community revitalization. *Consortium Journal of Hospitality & Tourism*, 17(1), 83-105. Retrieved from [http://www.hospitalityhbcu.org/images/consortium\\_journal\\_17\\_1.pdf](http://www.hospitalityhbcu.org/images/consortium_journal_17_1.pdf).
- Burns, P. (2005). *Corporate Entrepreneurship: Building an Entrepreneurial Organization*. Houndmills, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brizek, M., & Khan, M. (2008). Understanding corporate entrepreneurship theory: A literature review for culinary/food service academic practitioners. *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology*, 6(4), 221-255. doi: 10.1080/15428050802516002
- Chan, P., Miller, R., & Monroe, E. (2009). Cognitive apprenticeship as an instructional strategy for solving corporate training challenges. *TechTrends: Linking Research and Practice to Improve Learning*, 53(6), 35-41. doi: 10.1007/s11528-009-0341-3
- Choo, C. (2007). Activity-based approach to authentic learning in a vocational institute. *Educational Media International*, 44(3), 185-205. doi: 10.1080/09523980701491633
- Cornell University. Taking Hospitality in New Directions. (2012, August 31). <http://www.hotelschool.cornell.edu/industry/centers/pihe/>.
- Godwyn, M. (2009). Can the liberal arts and entrepreneurship work together? *Academe*, 95(1), 36-38. Retrieved from ERIC.
- Hansen, D, Shrader, R., & Monllor, J. (2011). Defragmenting definitions of entrepreneurial opportunity. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(2), 283-304. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-627X.2011.00325.x
- Hegarty, J. (2011). Achieving excellence by means of critical reflection and cultural imagination in culinary arts and gastronomy education. *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology*, 9(2), 55-65. doi:10.1080/15428052.2011.580705
- Heidegger, M. (1993). *Basic Concepts*. Translated by Gary E. Aylesworth. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Harkema, S., & Schout, H. (2008). Incorporating student-centred learning in innovation and entrepreneurship education. *European Journal of Education*, 43(4), 513-526. doi: 10.1111/j.1465-3435.2008.00372.x
- Katz, J. A. (2003). The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education 1876–1999. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(2), 283-300. doi:10.1016/S0883-9026(02)00098-8
- Kelliher, F., Foley, A., & Frampton, A. (2009). Facilitating small firm learning networks in the Irish tourism sector. *Tourism & Hospitality Research*, 9(1), 80-95. doi:10.1057/thr.2008.36

- Kleiman, P. (2008). Towards transformation: Conceptions of creativity in higher education. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 45(3), 209-217. doi: 10.1080/14703290802175966
- Kobia, M., & Sikalieh, D. (2010). Towards a search for the meaning of entrepreneurship. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 34(2), 110-127. doi: 10.1007/BF00389915
- Larkin, J., & Neumann, R. (2009). Older academics and career management: An interdisciplinary discussion. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 18(3), 29-39. Retrieved from <http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=287122121921759;res=IELBUS>.
- Lee, Lena. (2005). Entrepreneurship Education – A Compendium of Related Issues. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). National University of Singapore, Singapore.
- Li, L., Tse, E., & Zhao, J. (2009). An empirical study of corporate entrepreneurship in hospitality companies. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 10(3), 213-231. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15256480903088196>.
- Matlay, H. (2005). Researching entrepreneurship and education. Part 1: What is entrepreneurship and does it matter? *Education & Training*, 47(8-9), 665-677. doi: 10.1108/00400910510633198
- Naipaul, S., & Youcheng, W. (2009). Entrepreneurship and leadership in hospitality: Insight and implications for hospitality and tourism education - Mr Harris Rosen in conversation with Drs Sandra Naipaul and Youcheng Wang. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 21 (6/7), 639-658. doi: 10.1108/09596110910975936
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. Higher Education. Retrieved on August 31, 2012 from <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/kd/Selected-topics/higher-education.html?id=1415>.
- Pribadi, H. (2005). Defining and constructing The Teaching Model of Entrepreneur Education Based On Entrepreneurial Intention Model. *Journal Teknik Industri*, (7)1, 76-82. Retrieved from <http://puslit.petra.ac.id/files/published/journals/IND/IND050701/IND05070108.pdf>.
- Pritchard, R., Potter, G., Damming, J., & Wriggins, B. (2004). Implementing a course-embedded resume and professional employment action plan preparation program for colleges of business juniors. *Journal of Education for Business*, 79(6), 348-353. Retrieved from ERIC.
- Sandage, S., Cook, K., Hill, P., Strawn, B., & Reimer, K. (2008). Hermeneutics and psychology: A review and dialectical model. *Review of General Psychology*, 12(4), 344-364. doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.12.4.344
- Sewell, P., & Pool, L. (2010). Moving from conceptual ambiguity to operational clarity: employability, enterprise and entrepreneurship in higher education. *Education & Training*, 52(1), 89-94. doi: 10.1108/00400911011017708
- Shih-Ming, H., Leong, J., Wei, C., & Jung-Mao, Y. (2005). The impacts of culinary training on healthful food preparation. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 4(2), 83-97. doi: 10.1300/J171v04n02\_05

Soskice, D. (1994). *Reconciling Markets and Institutions: The German Apprenticeship System*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Statistics Norway. Apprentices by Gender and Area of Study. Retrieved on August 31, 2012 from [http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/04/02/30/utlaerling\\_en/tab-2005-03-04-01-en.html](http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/04/02/30/utlaerling_en/tab-2005-03-04-01-en.html).

Tanggaard, L. (2007). Learning at trade vocational school and learning at work: Boundary crossing in apprentices' everyday life. *Journal of Education and Work*, 20(5), 453-466. doi: 10.1080/13639080701814414

Tengelyi, L. (2007). Redescription and refiguration of reality in Ricoeur. *Research in Phenomenology*, 37(2), 160-174. doi:10.1163/156916407X185629

Vessey, D. (2008). Elucidating philosophical hermeneutics. *Research in Phenomenology*, 38(2), 293-302. doi: 10.1163/156916408X287012

Weiermair, K., Siller, H., & Mössenlechner, C. (2006). Entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship in Alpine tourism: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 6(2), 23-40. doi: 10.1300/J172v06n02\_03