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ABSTRACT

The contemporary focus on extracurricular activities, here the educational incubator environment, accentuates a need to understand what we offer students in terms of the curricular and extracurricular learning environments when situated in the same higher education institution. Current research points toward breaking down the invisible barriers and silo thinking. In this conceptual study, we apply the Didaktik triangle as a theoretical and conceptual framing to make comparisons of structurally based conditions for curricular and extracurricular entrepreneurship education. We present a framework that helps bridge the “what”, “why”, and “how” questions in the two different learning spaces and, thereby, conjoin educators and consultants in possible pedagogical discussions on how they work with the students. The suggested bridge frames a wider “why” and adds a more holistic and cohesive view of the two different types of settings. Our study contributes to the literature on how to bridge the blurred lines between curricular and extracurricular activities and break down the silos. The framework can act as an inspiration for entrepreneurship educators and practitioners who wish to provide more suitable and sustainable structures and develop a holistic learning environment.
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Introduction

Extracurricular activities have gained widespread traction in higher education entrepreneurship programmes throughout the past decade (Preedy, Jones, Maas, & Duckett, 2020). There is an increased awareness of their value in terms of practical activities in direct and indirect relationships with curricular courses (Bartkus, Nemelka, Nemelka, & Gardner, 2012). However, the rise in both activity levels and attention from partners outside of universities has come at a cost, namely the lack of pedagogical development. Contrary to classroom-related Entrepreneurship Education (EE) and entrepreneurial learning (Higgins & Elliott, 2011; Macpherson, Anderson, Trehan, & Jayawarna, 2022) discussions about pedagogical antecedents (Hägg & Gabrielsson, 2019), this seems to be missing in the literature on extracurricular activities. This accentuates a need to discuss potential barriers in terms of what we are offering students in the two different learning spaces under the same roof in higher education institution (HEIs). Further, deeper learning is also challenged by extracurricular activities that do not necessarily lead to reflective practice among students, and, therefore, there is a need to investigate this gap concerning the value of extracurricular activities (Preedy et al., 2020). For example, a study from the UK and Australia (Jackson & Tomlinson, 2021) showed how less than 50% of university students participated in employability-related extracurricular activities, as these were mainly viewed as purely social activities, rather than as activities connected to their future careers.

Thus far, comparison studies that discuss different pedagogical methods have been rare in the field (Nabi, Liñán, Fayolle, Krueger, & Walmsley, 2017), and, moreover, previous research has called for further studies with a pedagogical approach in order to develop and better understand educational perspectives in the EE field (Byrne, Fayolle, & Toutain, 2014; Fayolle, 2013; Gabrielsson, Landström, Politis, & Hägg, 2018; Gabrielsson, Hägg, Landström, & Politis, 2020; Kyро, 2015; Thrane, Blenker, Korsgaard, & Neergaard, 2016).
Extracurricular activities and the development of entrepreneurship knowledge, skills, and capabilities take various forms, for instance, competitions, networking events, incubation, and an awareness of career options (Jackson & Tomlinson, 2022). To understand one element of extracurricular activities, we focus on incubators as an important service for students (Yasin & Majid Gilani, 2022). Our purpose is to bridge the blurred lines between the curricular and extracurricular learning environments to improve the value of the entrepreneurial learning of the two with the student as the common denominator. To understand the two different learning environments, this chapter turns to educational science and explores pedagogical perspectives in curricular and extracurricular activities and investigates and problematizes the differences in terms of Didaktik (i.e. a sub-discipline in pedagogy). Hereby, we contribute to the ongoing discussion on how to understand the entrepreneurship effects of extracurricular and curricular activities in EE (Arranz, Ubierna, Arroyabe, Perez, & Fdez. de Arroyabe, 2017) with a conceptual view of how Didaktik can contribute to bridging what risk being silos of the two entrepreneurial learning spaces. The chapter starts with an introduction of curricular and extracurricular, and a discussion on extracurricular incubator contexts. Adding another layer to our theoretical foundation, we present Didaktik and the Didaktik triangle to make a conceptual analysis of the two learning environments. Finally, we discuss theories on entrepreneurial learning. Based on our findings, we present a framework and suggestions regarding questions to be asked to erase the blurred lines. Our findings reposition the current understanding of what extracurricular entails. The chapter ends with a presentation of theoretical and practical contributions, including suggestions on how to take our findings further to develop this particular research field within EE.
The Curricular Versus the Extracurricular Perspective

The first step toward constructing our conceptual framework involves obtaining a deeper understanding of what curricular and extracurricular mean. The adjective form *curricular* with its noun *curriculum* concern the courses offered by an educational institution (Bartkus et al., 2012) and are, therefore, linked to formal learning with its goal-oriented nature (Williams-Middleton, Padilla-Melendez, Lockett, Quesada-Pallarès, & Jack, 2019). The prefix *extra* indicates something outside of the regular curriculum based on non-graded and voluntary activities (Bartkus et al., 2012), potentially akin to non-formal and informal learning (Williams-Middleton et al., 2019). Extracurricular activities should “broaden the educational experience” (Bartkus et al., 2012, p. 697) which is why we encourage reflection on what is in and out in relation to the entrepreneurial curricular and extracurricular context and areas where synergies exist between the two. We do this by taking a closer look at an incubator as a learning space for extracurricular learning in the context of universities. The development of incubators is part of what previously has been described as universities’ third mission, where universities are expected to deliver knowledge and candidates that contribute to utility and economic development in society (Ollila & Williams-Middleton, 2011).

*Incubation*, from the Latin *incubatio*, refers to a development process, while *incubator space* or *incubator* refers to the physical and structural settings. While incubation is often linked to the promotion of entrepreneurship and start-ups, the concept is *polysemic* (Aernoudt, 2002) and covers private incubators, whose aim is the revitalization of production, regional economic development, and competitiveness through the development of new technology-based firms, which also stimulates collaboration with universities and research and the emergence of incubators in this context (Aernoudt, 2002). With this chapter, we conceptually address the incubator as a place where students can develop start-ups as part of their study time.
Historically speaking, the development of an entrepreneurial university (Etzkowitz, 2013) also entails an increase in the development of entrepreneurial education with a main focus on venture creation (Ollila & Williams-Middleton, 2011). In this development, we see the genesis of a contradiction. Venture creation can be a way to learn entrepreneurship (Ollila & Williams-Middleton, 2011), considering the incubator setting as a teaching laboratory where classroom teaching has been moved to practical, action-oriented, experience-based work, learning, and testing in the incubator (Kirby, 2004). However, these two kinds of settings also build on different philosophical starting points, and it becomes a challenge to bridge them, with the classroom representing the idea of “traditional academic learning, as strongly connected with problem-oriented thinking processes”, and the incubator oriented toward “materialistic pursuits” and “commercial interests” (Ollila & Williams-Middleton, 2011, p. 165).

Another challenge is the very understanding of the notion of extracurricular relative to that of incubation. A common delimitation in extracurricular entrepreneurial learning is to describe this in terms of activities (Preedy et al., 2020). In a venture-creation-oriented incubation environment, this relates to activities of starting up and running a business with a certain interest in for instance technology or social driven purposes. In contrast, using the categorical approach, we can arrange extracurricular activities in general as pro-social activities, performance activities, team sports, school involvement, and academic clubs (Eccles et al., 2003 in Bartkus et al., 2012). Relative to venture-creation-oriented incubation, this categorization includes performance activities, such as competitions, pitching, investor meetings, sales, and the like, while pro-social activities can be part of community events and network gatherings arranged for students and often embedded in performance-oriented programmes, inspirational talks, and presentations by entrepreneurs, business owners, and investors. In addition, we see how blurred lines exist between what is extracurricular and co-
curricular, the latter pointing to activities that students participate in “for meeting a curricular requirement” (Bartkus et al., 2012, p. 699). In the incubation context, an example of a co-curricular activity is students who are doing an internship in their own company as part of their education, but whose activities are outside the ordinary curriculum. It is therefore relevant to distinguish between the two on a continuum ranging from direct to indirect with the following definition: A direct extracurricular activity is one that is more closely associated with the student’s major curriculum. An indirect extracurricular activity is one that is relatively unrelated to the student’s major curriculum (Bartkus et al., 2012).

This distinction clarifies how extracurricular entrepreneurial learning in an incubation environment can be indirect for some students, such as if they meet a commercial philosophy while being part of a non-business study area. On the other hand, entrepreneurial learning can be more direct with regard to other students’ curricular courses when, for instance, a business student becomes part of a commercial logic and commercial-oriented activities in an incubation environment. We see this as an argument for deeper discussions of “what”, “how”, and “why” learning takes place, which we turn to in the next section, where we elaborate on Didaktik in relation to entrepreneurial learning in curricular and extracurricular entrepreneurial settings.

A Question of Didaktik

In the next step toward creating our conceptual framework and elaborating on “what”, “why”, and “how” curricular and extracurricular activities are used in educational settings, we adopt and unfold Didaktik as a theoretical lens. Didaktik stems from the Greek concept didáskein, meaning to teach, educate, analyze, and prove. In German and Nordic education research, Didaktik has developed as a profession science in the pedagogical field that “aims at being a vehicle or a tool for thinking about or for reflecting education” (Uljens & Ylimaki, 2017, p. 24). Didaktik is based in the Bildung-tradition as “the initial task of the Didaktiker is
to seek the character-forming significance of the knowledge and skills that a culture has at its disposal” (Künzli, 2000, p. 46). Didaktik covers the development, examination, and evaluation of theoretically based models for education. It is for example used to explore an educational subject “beyond its definition as an academic subject” (Wickman, 2012, p. 485). Significant for Didaktik is that it combines and explore the following questions as intertwined:

- **what do we teach?** (that is, the content aspect, e.g., the selected learning objectives stated in the syllabus),
- **why do we teach?** (which can be understood as the goals of the curricula, as well as what the students aim for in relation to the subject), and
- **how do we teach?** (that is, the mediation aspect, e.g., the teaching methods and instructions) (Künzli, 2000).

It is worth noting that the English term “didactics” is another concept that designates teaching instructions (how), and is as such not considered as a pedagogical sub-discipline (Hopmann & Gundem, 1998). The potential for using Didaktik as a theoretical and methodological approach, have been underutilized in EE research (Blenker, Dreisler, Færgeman, & Kjeldsen, 2006; Ellborg, 2023; Fayolle, 2013; Kyrö, 2008). However, contemporary research shows that there is a growing interest in extended use of educational science in the EE field or, as Tiberius and Weyland (2023, p. 145) express, “in EE research, the emphasis is not on ‘education’ yet”.

Our conceptual approach is based on one of the most fundamental frameworks in educational science: the Didaktik triangle (e.g. Künzli, 1998) (see Figure 1). The triangle covers the interdependent relationships between the three vertices of the triangle—the educator, the students, and the subject—while at the same time emphasizing the questions of content, aims and method stated above.
The double-sided arrow on the educator–subject axis illustrates the educator’s relationship to the subject and how the teacher chooses to represent the content. The double-sided arrow on the student-subject axis, on the other hand, represents the students’ experience of entrepreneurship and in what ways the content is perceived as relevant. The double-sided arrow on the educator-student axis concerns the interaction between the teacher and the students and how the education is organized. We apply the triangle (Figure 1) as a theoretical framework to make comparisons of structurally based conditions for curricular and extracurricular EE.

In curricular EE, the triangle can be drawn as a subject-specific figure in which “entrepreneurship” constitutes the upper angle of the triangle (i.e., entrepreneurship is the learning subject). For university incubators, a separate triangle can be constructed in order to explore roles, relations, and objectives of and motivational grounds for extracurricular activities in the incubator setting. In this alternative triangle, we assume that the common objective is not the subject, but rather the start-up or venture creation (Al-Mubaraki & Busler, 2013; Hassan, 2020; Secundo, Mele, Passiante, & Albergo, 2021), and the educator is replaced by an incubator manager, that is, a consultant (Kiani Mavi, Gheibdoust, Khanfar, & Kiani Mavi, 2019).

By placing the two context-specific triangles side by side (see Figure 2), we get a visual overview of the relationship between the two different learning spaces. As Figure 2 shows, the students seem to constitute the main common node between the curricular and extracurricular environments. That is, in the current understanding, the students are key in connecting the two learning spaces/silos within the same HEI.
Before we explore this relationship further by using the logic of the Didaktik triangle and the related “what”, “why”, and “how” questions (Klafki, 2000) to review how activities take place in the two different triangles/spaces, we turn to the concept of entrepreneurial learning to assist in creating a bridge between the two learning spaces.

**Entrepreneurial Learning**

The last step in our theory building process involves taking a closer look at the contemporary concept of entrepreneurial learning, regarding which Minniti and Bygrave (2001) pinpoint that “entrepreneurship is a process of learning, and a theory of entrepreneurship requires a theory of learning” (p. 7). The debates have however since shifted toward an action-based and experiential view (Wang & Chugh, 2014), where students, through courses and workshops, are offered the opportunity to experience entrepreneurship by engaging in entrepreneurial work forms or by being entrepreneurs, rather than just learning about the topic (Haneberg & Aadland, 2020). Prior research on entrepreneurial learning has focused on aspects of simulation (Pittaway & Cope, 2007), the entrepreneurial process (Neck & Corbett, 2018), and narrative approaches (Rae, 2000). However, Cope (2005) proposed a dynamic learning perspective to understand three distinctive, interrelated elements of entrepreneurial learning: dynamic temporal phases, interrelated processes, and overarching characteristics. This accentuated the importance of a “learning lens” and its relevance for general entrepreneurship research and EE. Interestingly, Cope (2003) further highlighted critical reflection and critical learning events as triggers for what he called “higher-level” learning. It is open to discussion whether incubator settings and extracurricular activities result in a more open approach to these critical learning events and, as a result, have more room to manoeuvre and to expand and
challenge the traditional learning spaces found in curricular EE (Cooper, Bottomley, & Gordon, 2004).

As mentioned, Preedy et al. (2020) evidenced how it can be difficult to perform deeper reflection in an extracurricular learning space. Aadland and Aaboen (2018) organized learning approaches into three distinct classes of student involvement: passive, participative (input/output focused), and self-driving (method focused). The latter method includes a student focus, making students capable of performing entrepreneurship in different contexts and situations (Aadland & Aaboen, 2018), which resonates with the well-established about, for, and through approach to EE (Hannon, 2005). As such, incubator environments can present an opportunity for students to explore their entrepreneurial learning and to validate their experiences (Kickul & Fayolle, 2007), but, depending on their involvement, the processes and outcomes can be very different.

This new knowledge highlights the need for developing the pedagogical perspectives in extracurricular activities and a discussion on the “blurred” lines of learning between the curricular and extracurricular context. In the following, we use Figure 2 as a foundation for a comparative analysis of the curricular and extracurricular learning spaces from Didaktik as a theoretical lens.

**Analysis and Framework Development: Comparative Didaktik Purposes**

Table 1 presents our comparative analysis of Didaktik in the curricular and extracurricular learning spaces. The first column in the table introduces the questions that characterize the respective continuum in the Didaktik triangle and the considerations that constitute a Didaktik analysis for every learning space (Klafki, 2000). The questions outlined are then addressed in the curricular and extracurricular columns with examples of how the contexts have been described in previous research. The examples discuss EE and incubator
activities in general, and the table can hence be elaborated on in more detail depending on what kind of education or incubation settings are being examined.

-------------------
TABLE 1 HERE
-------------------

The Didaktik review in Table 1 shows that the curricular and extracurricular spaces mainly consist of separate “whats”, “whys”, and “hows”. From the what perspective, for example, educators in curricular education are responsible for teaching entrepreneurship based on different roles and approaches (Wraae et al., 2021), such as a theory-based understanding of entrepreneurship (Nabi et al., 2017), while incubation managers mainly act as consultants based on their own business experience (Kiani Mavi et al., 2019). EE aims to increase knowledge and has a stated learning focus (Hahn et al., 2017), while incubation activities are purpose driven and primarily aimed at creating ventures (Hassan, 2020) and networks (Secundo et al., 2021; Wachira et al., 2016).

From the why perspective, curricular EE offers mandatory activities through which students can learn about and reflect on entrepreneurship in order to develop entrepreneurial competences, abilities (European Commission, 2008), and intentions (Nabi et al., 2017). Grades and knowledge development are presented as a major motivator in education (Bartkus et al., 2012). In a vocational incubator (Bartkus et al., 2012), on the other hand, the students become self-selected entrepreneurs in the sense that they work with their own business development and, thus, practise entrepreneurship (Gielen et al., 2015) within the context of non-formal or informal learning (Williams-Middleton et al., 2019).

Differences in the two settings can also be seen from the how perspective. When teacher-led processes (Piperopoulos & Dimov, 2015) with one-way knowledge acquisition (Nabi et al., 2017) are more common in educational spaces, the relationships between the
incubator managers and students are of a more consultative nature (Kiani Mavi et al., 2019). These differences are further accented by the physical environment, where traditional classroom settings are common in EE and lounge-like areas (Ali et al., 2020) and co-working spaces (Secundo et al., 2021) in incubators. Methods such as lecturing, seminars, workshops (Hahn et al., 2017), exams, and mandatory group assignments are characteristic ways to enhance learning in EE. In the incubator setting, counselling with business plans and prototypes (Secundo et al., 2021) to develop students’ own ideas (Kiani Mavi et al., 2019) and guest lectures for inspiration and networking (Wachira et al., 2016) are, on the other hand, more frequently used.

The differences outlined above highlight why silo thinking emerges not only in theory but also in practice. However, Didaktik constitutes a framework for exploring the similarities and differences. Thus, Table 1 represents a foundation for creating a further dialogue between the two learning environments with the goal of erasing if not all then at least some of the blurred lines. Based on the answers that emerge in the table, we suggest a dialogue based on the following questions in order to develop a bridging discussion:

1. How do we create synergy between the practices in our two learning environments?
2. How do we support the students’ transition between our two learning environments?
3. How do we create progression for the students?
4. What can we as educators from the two settings learn from each other? How do we create transferability for both students and educators/consultants?

Table 1, together with the overall Didaktik questions, constitutes, in turn, the foundation of the construction of a new double-sided arrow that connects the EE subject with the incubator’s aims, as illustrated in Figure 3.
Establishing a relationship based on Didaktik between the triangles, as presented in Figure 3, helps bridge the “whats” in the two different spaces and, thereby, conjoin educators and consultants in a possible discussion on “how” they work with the students. In addition, the suggested bridge frames a wider “why” and applies a more holistic and cohesive view of the two different types of activities that are outlined in the table above.

**Conceptual Discussion**

The aim of this chapter was to analyse and discuss the Didaktik behind entrepreneurial learning to be able to bridge the curricular and extracurricular incubator learning environments with the underlying purpose of improving the value and learning of the two interwoven learning spaces. We hereby confront notions of what is inside and outside of what are defined as core and peripheral curricular and extracurricular incubator activities. Didaktik establishes an awareness of the possibilities of bridging the blurred lines and develops a path to explore how the two learning environments can learn from each other. Here, dialogue questions can help bring the two learning environments closer together and break down silo thinking (Preedy et al., 2020). The questions represent an opportunity to lay the grounds for closer cooperation between the two. They open a dialogue about the value of learning. Moreover, such a dialogue relates to the role perceptions of the entrepreneurship educator, the consultant, and, last but not least, the student. As showed in Figure 2, the common ground is the student, which opens up a discussion on how educational thinking, here represented by the educator, can be brought into the extracurricular environment, represented by the consultant, and vice versa, introducing less bounded thinking into the entrepreneurial classroom. Together, these individuals can develop
a new way of thinking regarding the core elements of entrepreneurial learning and bridge said learning to benefit the student’s education and establish a prepared transition between the two learning environments.

By proposing such a dialogue, we are not suggesting a total alignment of the differences between the two spaces, but rather a more careful investigation of the “what”, “how”, and “why”, which might also lead to more difficult discussions, especially regarding the “why”. This can be an opportunity to rearticulate important discussions concerning the EE field and questions we care about (Blenker, Korsgaard, Neergaard, & Thrane, 2011) and observe these in relation to actual discussions about the need for the more deliberate use of reflection (“how”) in extracurricular learning (Preedy et al., 2020; Preedy & Jones, 2015) or start-up logic/commercial logic in relation to sustainability challenges and green transition (“what”). Based on the above reasoning, the extra arrow in Figure 3 becomes a bridging continuum for direct extracurricular versus indirect extracurricular activities (Bartkus et al., 2012). We interpret the new arrow as an example of an entrepreneurial learning approach that enables students to relate learning about with their own practice.

**Theoretical Implications**

We have introduced Didaktik as a theoretical framework from the education field (Byrne et al., 2014; Fayolle, 2013; Gabrielsson et al., 2018, 2020; Kyro, 2015; Thrane et al., 2016) to explore the blurred lines between curricular end extracurricular entrepreneurship activities. In the extended Didaktik model, the students’ own work can be transformed into an experience to learn from (Hahn et al., 2017; Haneberg & Aadland, 2020). Transferring value from one context to the other (Preedy et al., 2020) and, thereby, adding meaning to both settings, is a way of increasing students’ interest in taking part in existing extracurricular...
activities (Jackson & Tomlinson, 2022). The new relationship contributes to a more interrelated process (Cope, 2005), with an opportunity to integrate the “whats”, “whys”, and “hows” from the two Didaktik settings. Thus, in a higher-level learning sense (Cope, 2003), reflection is invited in action and action in reflection (Preedy et al., 2020). In doing so, this chapter contributes to the discussions on how the current views of educational settings can be broken down and transformed into holistic learning experiences despite a potential silo thinking mentality (Preedy et al., 2020). We offer theoretical answers that target the invisible barriers between the silos.

The pedagogical awareness of the two different settings can contribute to new ways of understanding the role of university incubators (Wachira et al., 2016). The question of how to define extracurricular activities and their role in relation to curricular EE is still open to debate, but we believe that we have taken the first tentative step toward such a definition.

Our conceptual approach has the drawback that it is only based on chosen theoretical and singular perspectives. Nevertheless, the contribution of this chapter opens up various possibilities for further studies, such as testing the framework empirically. One way could be to observe a dialogue based on the proposed question to understand commonalities and differences in understanding the learning purposes, for instance, by investigating the discourse and language used in the curricular and extracurricular learning environments. Another research direction could explore the roles in the Didaktik triangle, how the educational versus incubator environments recruit new staff, and how the two environments “recruit” students.

**Practice Note**

The proposed framework proposes a practice-based approach to creating a dialogue between entrepreneurship educators and consultants to enable a mutually beneficial learning environment for students. The proposals can act as an inspiration for entrepreneurship
educators and practitioners who wish to provide more suitable and sustainable structures and develop a holistic learning space that benefits students situated in both learning environments. Further, the questions can start a conversation on how to progress learning, implying that facilitators and entrepreneurship educators from the two different environments need to rethink who they are to be able to provide the right education to students.

**Conclusion**

This chapter argues for a need for innovative thinking within which the educational system leaves behind its taken-for-granted structures and dares to explore and exploit a new paradigm for entrepreneurial learning that, likewise, offers students a new learning experience. Such a bold but necessary move demands not only changes in structures and thinking but also implicit adjustments to role perception. Using the Didaktik triangle can be a first step on the way to creating a necessary and valuable dialogue. We believe that our framework can act as inspiration to investigate an underresearched area in the EE field.
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FIGURES AND TABLE

Figure 1: Our illustration of the traditional Didaktik triangle (inspired by for instance Künzli, 2000).

Figure 2: The two different triangles as illustrations of parallel learning spaces, i.e. silo thinking.
Figure 3: An extended Didaktik model bridging the two triangles.

Table 1: Comparative analysis of the two different learning spaces based on the Didaktik triangle logic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT?</th>
<th>Curricular EE</th>
<th>Extra-curricular EE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The educator–subject relationship/continuum</td>
<td>Educators in curricular activities are academics and are, therefore, supposed to have a broad knowledge of the subject (Wraae, Brush, &amp; Nikou, 2021).</td>
<td>Incubation managers act as consultants based on their own education and/or business experience (Kiani Mavi et al., 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What relationship does the teacher have with the content?</td>
<td>The content is theory based and is mainly presented through lectures and literature. The content is predefined in a syllabus and usually also includes critical perspectives (Nabi et al., 2017).</td>
<td>The content is practice driven and mainly presented as tools for economic development (Ollila &amp; Williams-Middleton, 2011) and job creation (Al-Mubaraki &amp; Busler, 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What content is represented and how is it framed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the aim of the activities?</td>
<td>The activities have a learning focus as they are goal driven and aim to increase knowledge (Hahn, Minola, Van Gils, &amp; Huybrechts, 2017).</td>
<td>The activities have a results focus as they are purpose driven and aimed at start-ups (Hassan, 2020) and networks (Secundo et al., 2021; Wachira, Ngugi, &amp; Otieno, 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHY?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student–subject relationship/continuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the students’ relationships with the subject?</td>
<td>They are formal students who learn about entrepreneurship in order to develop entrepreneurial competences, abilities (European Commission, 2008), and intentions (Nabi et al., 2017).</td>
<td>The feeling of not being a student but rather of becoming an entrepreneur and acting entrepreneurial (Gielnik et al., 2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the incentives and purposes to participate?</td>
<td>The activities are mandatory and intended to enhance reflection and competence development (Hahn et al., 2017), that is, formal learning (Williams-Middleton et al., 2019).</td>
<td>The activities are vocational (Bartkus et al., 2012) and intended to enhance business development. Knowledge development is based on informal learning (Williams-Middleton et al., 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What motivates students?</td>
<td>Grades and knowledge (Bartkus et al., 2012).</td>
<td>Preparing for a business career (Bartkus et al., 2012) and success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The educator–student relationship/continuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What roles and responsibilities are at play?</td>
<td>In the curricular setting, educators are responsible for providing teaching, and, hence, teacher-led processes are common (Piperopulos &amp; Dimov, 2015).</td>
<td>Participation in extracurricular activities is optional (Bartkus et al., 2012); hence, the students are not there as students but as participants. Incubator managers act as consultants and coaches (Kiani Mavi et al., 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the learning space designed?</td>
<td>The majority of the activities take place in traditional classroom settings and are, hence, based on one-way knowledge acquisition (Nabi et al., 2017).</td>
<td>The majority of the activities take place in office- and lounge-like areas (Ali, Irfan &amp; Salman, 2020), that is, co-working spaces (Secundo et al., 2021) set up for consultancy work and communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What methods are used and why?</td>
<td>Conventional lectures, seminars, workshops (Hahn et al., 2017), exams, and mandatory group assignments are common. Guest lectures and workshops are a way to enhance learning.</td>
<td>Counselling with business plans and prototypes (Secundo et al., 2021) is conducted in order to develop students’ own ideas (Kiani Mavi et al., 2019). Guest lectures and workshops are arranged for inspiration and networking (Wachira et al., 2016).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>