Using a Small Business Development Project to Teach Core Business Courses: A Case Study of an Integrated Class

Shauna M. Basile
The University of Montana Western

Margareta Smith Knopik
The University of Montana Western

To improve retention of business administration subjects and foster an appreciation and excitement of entrepreneurship, our faculty offered a cohort course encompassing the principles of management, marketing, finance, and operations within a business plan development structure. The students were tested on knowledge retention both at the end of the course and again prior to graduation. The course was assessed using qualitative and quantitative measures comparing student perceptions and experiences to those of a similar case study at Pennsylvania State University. The standardized testing indicated improved retention by the cohort students and the comparative testing enabled faculty to obtain valuable feedback.

INTRODUCTION

At a macroeconomic level, the United States depends on innovation and creativity at all levels of the economy to maintain a competitive advantage in global markets (Henderson & Abraham, 2004). From a microeconomic perspective, constant upgrades in technology and shifting educational expectations challenge companies and government agencies alike to assess and react quickly to changing environments (Carrier, 1996).

Business administration faculty often struggle to provide students educational experiences that combine critical core knowledge with an understanding of attitudes and skills that will serve graduates well in such a fast-moving world. Business programs have both the position and the tools to introduce and teach the skills and strategies necessary to manage change and the most powerful of those tools may reside within the curricular boundaries of entrepreneurship. However, those boundaries are fuzzy and the content often fragmented and subject-driven, causing both faculty and students to miss the opportunity of tapping into the creative energy and embracing the vision that entrepreneurship represents. As Doria, Rozanski, and Cohen (2003) wrote in their article, What Business Needs from Business Schools, "Cookie-cutter programs are producing look-alike MBSs. Contemporary companies want creative, collaborative thinkers and leaders" (p. 39).

This paper describes an attempt on the part of business faculty at the University of Montana Western (UMW) to tie core business administration courses together for students within the context of an enjoyable entrepreneurial experience. Envisioned as a course delivered in an integrated manner, similar to the blended learning model proposed by Purnima Valiathan for American Society of Training and

Development (ASTD) (retrieved 2/9/2009), initially the primary results expected included improved retention of material as measured by standardized exam (PBL) prior to graduation and, secondarily, enhanced student understanding of overlapping subjects through an entrepreneurial experience. After the term had begun, an article written by Okudan and Rzasa (2006) documenting a similar course taught at The Pennsylvania State University (PSU) was found. Consequently, the faculty were also expecting positive overall student perceptions as compared to those experienced by the students at PSU and, a guide for improving the experience if the primary goal of improved knowledge retention appeared positive. Hindsight is often 20/20 and in addition to examining the results, this case study showcases the "good," explains the "bad," and lays bare the "ugly" of this experimental course in an attempt to examine the experience for purposes of designing a comprehensive course that will meet the intended objectives.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The fall 2006 semester marked the beginning of a radical course scheduling and delivery system at the University of Montana Western, a small rural university located in southwestern Montana. At that time, the university made the change to block scheduling, known as Experience One, which meant that students would take one class at a time, each class lasting 18 days. Over the course of the semester, full time students could successfully complete 15-18 credits—the same number of credits they could attempt under traditional university scheduling. Defined by campus committee (2004) and driven by faculty initiative, the vision for the change to block scheduling was based on five principles:

- Experiential learning is doing what professionals in the field do.
- Learning is not restricted to the classroom or to a specially designated 50-minute period.
- An integral part of learning is teaching others.
- The best learning occurs through a close collaboration of student and faculty.
- The best learning occurs through concentration on one subject at a time (immersion).

Concurrent with the move to block scheduling, the business and technology department at UMW put a formalized outcomes assessment plan in place and made a decision to alter the standard four-credit course model, keeping core courses at 3-credit hours to provide students with extra opportunities for electives and enable easier transition to graduate schools. This meant that many business students not only took a course every one of the four blocks during the semester, but also took an extended course (one night per week for the entire semester), known as a "stringer". Faculty contracts required business faculty to teach a minimum of 12 hours per semester, which meant that when teaching 3-credit hour courses, faculty were committed to the classroom all four blocks. This proved to be a tremendous disadvantage to the planning and administration of the case study course and will be addressed later in this paper. Through the assessment process, the business faculty realized that students were not demonstrating an ability to roll knowledge from one class to the next. The idea of a four-faculty team teaching a cohort class over one semester was suggested with the intent of covering management, marketing, finance, and operations in an integrated manner. Students would attend the classes in the block format (three hours per day), but the content would be integrated among the four core courses selected for inclusion in the experiment. The course was put on the schedule for Spring 2008 and a 24-member cohort class registered. Some of the students had volunteered and some were recruited, but they all were aware of the concept of the class and all committed to the 12-hour course. With the exception of three sophomore students, all were juniors and/or seniors who had completed the prerequisite courses.

COURSE PLANNING

The intent of the course was that each of the four faculty members would have 18 days at their disposal to adequately cover their respective topical area. An extended integrated project was considered critical to the success of the course, which meant that the topic delivery would be asynchronous depending on how it best fit with the project progress. The project chosen was a group-based business

plan with actual development and startup of the planned business. Each of the faculty understood he/she would be expected to step in multiple times during the course to deliver relevant information as the students reached milestones in the development of their respective businesses.

During the semester, the three full-time faculty members were scheduled to teach other courses in three of the blocks in the semester. This meant that each taught a block class in the morning and then came to the cohort class in the afternoon. The fourth faculty member was an adjunct who would not get paid for work outside his scheduled block, which should have limited the time he committed to this project.

EXECUTION

The 24 participant students enrolled for 12 credit hours to accommodate the four courses; however, many were also enrolled in stringer courses to maximize their financial aid. This had not been considered by the faculty during planning and it restricted team interaction somewhat.

A tremendous improvement in planning would have been to designate a lead faculty member and to develop a common, integrated syllabus. In hindsight, these two actions seem obvious; however, at the time they did not seem critical. UMW uses WebCT as the online course support platform and it could not be adjusted to accommodate four faculty on one course site, thus the ability to consistently post additional reading materials, administer testing, and communicating schedule changes was hampered. So, each of the four courses appeared as stand-alone classes on WebCT. At times, this caused confusion for both students and faculty and made certain coordination and communications difficult.

Mid-semester, an article by Okudan and Rzasa (2006) was discovered documenting a similar course offered at PSU. There was enough time to make some adjustments to the UMW class and the assessment tools used for the PSU class evaluation were duplicated for the UMW cohort course (Table 1). As a side note, the UMW faculty wanted to see how the UMW student experience compared to that at PSU. The PSU class was offered as an entrepreneurial leadership class for the engineering majors while UMW's, taught in the business department, was intended to provide a cohesive core business experience using an entrepreneurial context. However, the faculty believed that the approach and structure of the two courses were similar enough to provide some valid comparisons.

The material was introduced and initially reinforced using case studies for practice and mid-semester teams were created and tasked with designing, starting and operating a business for the remainder of the semester (approximately six weeks). Twice a week, in addition to attending class, each team met with the "board of directors" (the four faculty members) who asked very specific questions related to their discipline and, as the project progressed, added additional problems for each team to solve. For example, one team who chose to make bracelets was given an order that tripled their capacity. At the end of the semester, each team made a formal presentation that addressed each of the core discipline areas in addition to a summary of their business—what worked and what didn't.

TABLE 1
COURSE DESIGN COMPARISON

Penn State	UMW
24 students enrolled in course (1 information science student, remaining were engineering students, different branches). Sophomores, juniors, seniors Mostly male	24 students (cohort group) (all business students, different options). Afternoon course time 12 credit hours Some students had to take "stringers" Sophomores, juniors, seniors Split men/women
Topics: First half of course: leadership, management, social leadership, values and ethics, human behavior, teams and team development, organizations, nature of entrepreneurial work, organizational behavior, and leadership development. Second half of course: Students placed into 3-4 person teams Each team tasked with writing business plan Focus placed on product innovation and improvement	Topics: First half of course: principles of marketing, business finance, operations management, and principles of management Second half of course: Students placed into 3-4 person teams Each team tasked with writing business plan Each team tasked with actually running business for short period of time Focus placed on business development and problem solving
Text and materials: Leadership text, handouts on Entrepreneurship, and product dissection project	Text and materials: Strategic planning/management text, business finance text, various case studies and in-class exercises
Business project: All teams tasked with developing vision, production process, and marketing plan for electric toothbrushes. Project included data collection and redesign for competitive advantage.	Business project: Each team tasked to develop their own business vision (something they could actually implement, based on team talents and interests). Project included data collection (product and market research) and managing problems presented along the way.
Fourth assignment required each team to compete for seed money to build and sell product. (Leadership concepts were graded.)	Teams started and ran company, competing for highest return on investment. (Application of business concepts were graded.)

THE EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING PROCESS

There has been a plethora of recent research focusing on how entrepreneurs learn and apply knowledge from which business administration faculty can also learn for purposes of enriching business programs. The focus of adding an entrepreneurial project to the core business disciplines was an attempt to expose students to the realities of small business management and to stimulate their entrepreneurial spirit. Research appears to imply that business education inhibits entrepreneurial development in students (Kovereid & Moen, 1997; Whitlock & Masters, 1996) and this cohort class experiment was implemented in part to add an entrepreneurial dimension to the enhanced core discipline courses.

Constructivist Learning Theory

It may be helpful at this point to review constructivist learning theory and the work done by Kolb in 1984, which resulted in Kolb's learning cycle, one of the most well-known and well-used models of management education (Vince, 1998). In a paper presented at the International Committee of Museum Educators, George E. Hein (1991) summarized constructivism: The term refers to the idea that learners construct knowledge for themselves, that each learner individually and socially constructs meaning as he or she learns. Constructing meaning is learning: there is no other kind. The dramatic consequences for educators are twofold. (1) We have to focus on the learner in thinking about learning rather than on the subject/lesson to be taught, and (2) There is no knowledge independent of the meaning attributed to experience constructed by the learner or community of learners (Hein, p.1).

Kolb's work was built on the premise that "learning is the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience" (Vince, 1998, p. 305). According to Vince, if learning is perceived to be a cycle, it can be based on six propositions leading to transformation of experience:

1. Learning is best conceived as a process, not in terms of outcomes.
2. Learning is a continuous process grounded in experience.
3. The process of learning requires the resolution of conflicts between dialectically opposed modes of adaptation to the world.
4. Learning is an holistic process of adaptation to the world.
5. Learning involves transactions between the person and the environment.
6. Learning is the process of creating knowledge.

Harper (2002) explored these concepts specifically as they applied to entrepreneurial learning and how entrepreneurs learn "in the light of experience and feedback from the market" (p.6). In this context, knowledge is a "dynamic, evolving system rather than a static or stationary structure" (Harper, p. 7) and that a theory which characterizes entrepreneurial learning must describe a process of discovery rather than as a procedure of imitation or of inductive instruction through repetition (p. 7). Such a theory "must depict the growth of knowledge as a series of revolutions which overturn old ideas, rather than as an incremental, cumulative process of improvement" (Harper, p. 7). (This is similar to Schumpeter's concept of "creative destruction" whereby innovations conceived of and introduced by entrepreneurs destroy those that came before.) Harper goes on to say that an adequate theory of learning cannot exclude either luck or human fallibility which can manifest itself in entrepreneurial errors, losses and failure—all learning opportunities. Henley (2005) agrees that "transition to entrepreneurship is a dynamic process" (p. 1) but one which is an "intentional activity" (p. 22), albeit often hastily conceived (p. 22). This observation points to the need for business support services (including formal education programs) to address important issues of translating entrepreneurial aspirations into more intentional activities of planning and preparation (Henley, p. 22).

Entrepreneurship Education

Kogan (2005) pointed out that, "half a century ago, college was viewed as the place to train students to become effective members of the workforce…that it is creative capital, not traditional economic comparative advantages that will provide the basis of future economic growth in America" (p. 2). Likewise, Rasmussen and Sorheim (2006) observed that entrepreneurship education has traditionally focused on teaching individuals, but many initiatives are increasingly becoming more action-oriented, emphasizing learning by doing and that universities must increase the motivation and competence of their graduates to become key people in innovative and entrepreneurial activities (p. 186).

In an article published in 2005, Kuratko reminded us that, "traditionally, entrepreneurship education covered the entire scope of business administration, and as such was the closest approach to the original concept of management education available in universities at that time" (p. 582). He suggested that, given the current and increasing fragmentation of business education into narrow specializations, business administration programs (as well as the students) have lost sight of the big picture. He posited that a field of study that takes a broad, integrative, pragmatic, and rational approach to business would find itself increasingly popular with those who aspire to be entrepreneurs, managers, and top executives (p. 582).

Young organizations often experience problems coordinating accounting, finance, marketing, and management (Sandberg, 2001) and comprehensive entrepreneurship programs could, perhaps, close those gaps.

In fact, according to an article written by Jones and English (2004), "the recent rise of entrepreneurial education programs has been fueled by unprecedented student demand as students look for a style of business education that will provide them with the transferable skills needed to succeed in an increasingly divergent business environment" (p. 417). Likewise, Brown and Duguid (1991) argued that working, learning and innovating are interrelated skills that are often inadvertently separated within organizations by disregarding the more informal communities of practice that also enhance team building and communication.

Robinson (1994) wrote that both John Maynard Keynes and Joseph Schumpeter recognized "the impulse to fight…to succeed for the sake, not of the fruits of success but of success itself" (p. N/A). He further observed that "most of the business school curriculum suggested that business is actually quite boring, just a matter of techniques and numbers. Of the disservices that business schools perform, this is probably the worst." Robinson concludes with the observation that "numbers, techniques, and analyses are all side matters. What is central to business is the joy of creating."

To summarize the intent of this course, this discipline and project integration in a daily three-hour delivery context was the experience the faculty at UMW hoped to give to the 24 students who offered to take part in the experimental course. Ideally, the students would maintain or improve standardized test scores and also develop a unique insight toward developing, planning and running an entrepreneurial endeavor. The course content and project would provide a link between theory and practice, as addressed by James Fiet in his article, The Pedagogical Side of Entrepreneurship Theory (2000, pp. 101-117) where emphasis is given to assigning student-based learning activities, engaging the students and giving them the opportunity to practice theoretical principles.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA COLLECTION

A mixture of both qualitative and quantitative data was obtained from the cohort group as a means of assessing the learning process. In addition to administering a standardized national exam (ETS business major test), data collection was designed to match that described in the PSU article. Identical surveys were distributed to the 24 students and qualitative data was obtained through focus group interviews. Each of the teams comprised a focus group and the interviews were conducted at the end of the semester, moderated by three independent faculty members, external to both the course and the department of business and technology. All students participated in the focus groups. For comparative purposes, questions followed the same format as those used in the previous entrepreneurial leadership class assessed at PSU in 2004. The following assessment questions were asked:

A. How was the course environment and structure different relative to your block classroom experiences?
B. What specific benefits do you see from this type of class regarding the learning experience that occurred outside of textbook information?
C. Did this learning environment provide a better understanding of what it takes to start a business and become an entrepreneur?

As part of the focus groups, students were also asked for thoughts and recommendations toward the improvement of the experimental course cohort. The focus group interactions were recorded and later transcribed for evaluation, with no individual students specifically identified.

Additionally the departmental standardized exam (PBL) had been in place for several years prior to timing of the cohort group and was given to all graduating seniors. This instrument gave the department a more longitudinal method of assessing information retention, allowing a comparison between those students who were a part of the cohort and those who were not.

Findings

On a Likert scale of zero (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree) students responses aligned quantitatively with their qualitative focus group interviews (Question A). Overall, the students ranked the course environment and structure at 4.5; with a low ranking (3.8) for the helpfulness of the textbooks (see Table 2). The structure of the learning experience that added to the textbook information (Question B) was ranked at 4.2 and also aligned with the focus group feedback.

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF SURVEY RESPONSES

Is the class operating in an environment of affective socialization? (affective socialization)	
I better understand what it takes to become a small business owner.	4.36 (PSU) 4.5 (UMW)
I better understand what starting my own company will be like.	4.32 (PSU) 4.4 (UMW)
I have a better understanding of what a small business owner does.	4.36 (PSU) 4.3 (UMW)
I now believe that it is possible for me to be a small business owner.	4.00 (PSU) 3.8 (UMW)
I can better see myself starting my own business or company.	3.73 (PSU) 3.7 (UMW)
Does the classroom provide an environment favorable to the entrepreneurial spirit by allowing students to develop an independence from external sources of information?(independence)	
I can more easily make decisions independently.	3.86 (PSU) 4.1 (UMW)
I am more likely to rely on my gut feelings and instincts than on advice from others.	3.38 (PSU) 3.4 (UMW)
I developed a trusting relationship with my team.	4.09 (PSU) 4.1 (UMW)
Is the classroom operating in an environment of active experimentation? (active experimentation)	
I enjoyed the active learning style used in this class.	4.64 (PSU) 3.8 (UMW)
The teaching style used in this class matches my preferred learning style better than most classes.	4.32 (PSU) 3.1 (UMW)
Does the class impact key entrepreneurial processes such as autonomy, innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, and competitive aggressiveness? (autonomy)	
My team was able to complete the projects independently.	4.05 (PSU) 3.6 (UMW)
I hope to continue to work on the ideas/projects that originated in this class.	3.82 (PSU) 3.3 (UMW)
Innovation	
I am a more creative thinker.	3.68 (PSU) 3.9 (UMW)
I often have ideas for new products or services.	3.91 (PSU) 3.8 (UMW)

Leadership, teamwork, and communications	
This class improved my leadership abilities.	4.45 (PSU) 3.9 (UMW)
This class improved my ability to work in teams.	4.23 (PSU) 3.9 (UMW)
My communications skills have improved as a result of this class.	4.18 (PSU) 3.9 (UMW)

Further research should be done to explain the differences between responses in the areas of active experimentation, autonomy, and leadership, teamwork, and communications. While it is likely that differences are due to the students' majors (engineering vs. business), that UMW students are already familiar with immersion-type courses, or the fact that the PSU course was designed to enhance leadership, teamwork, and communications (rather than discipline-specific concepts), a closer examination could better inform future course design.

On a ranking scale of zero (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree) students responded primarily in agreement to questions associated with entrepreneurial risk, innovation and understanding (Question C). The average scores for these questions resulted in a 3.96 rating and are compared, by individual question, to the PSU case in Table 2. These results correspond with the favorable comments of the focus groups when asked in question C about their depth of understanding in starting their own business. Every focus group interview included strong student statements regarding the value the students placed on the group project of business planning, design and development. Some students were encouraged and excited by the process and some were completely uninterested in pursuing entrepreneurship due to the stress and necessary coordination and communication of the project. These qualitative responses support research indicating that successful entrepreneurs are a mix of both inherent personality traits and learned theories and application (Carland, Carland, & Stewart, 1996).

Overall, the focus groups reinforced the concerns of the faculty in dealing with the unplanned time commitment and availability for the students. However, the students also confirmed positive feedback related to the overall learning experience. A summary of the UMW focus group responses follow and they are very similar to those reported in the PSU article.

A. *How was the course environment and structure different relative to your block classroom experiences?*
- This experience actually got us out in the field and let us experience things through a business; making a plan, managing a team, the whole bit. The management, operations, finance and marketing courses tied into each other.
- I really liked the group work throughout the semester. Also, working together over the extended period (rather than the 15 days of a block) gave us a chance to get to know each other better and work through typical group dynamics.
- The group work in this class was better. Learning to work with others, coordinate schedules, deal with personality differences and work ethics were all real.
- As the professors intended, the business plan tied everything together. It added to everything and let you take your own experiences and made everything we'd learned in the past all come together and make sense.

B. *What specific benefits do you see from this type of class regarding the learning experience that occurred outside of textbook information?*
- We went on two fieldtrips that brought us out into the real world and added to the course.
- This was a very intense business project, it was a ton of work and we learned all the way through it.

- Actually doing a plan and watching the business happen rather than just taking words right out of a book, was wonderful. I learned more from running this business than I have from any other class here.
- I think this was the best hands on experience I've had in the business program.
- Every group that presented their business plan completely understood everything with their business. Nothing seemed thrown together; everyone really knew what they were doing.
- Business ethics was totally integrated into these classes and we used that when dealing with others and making the right decisions. Ethics were integrated into our projects. This was a better way to learn and practice ethics; by doing it instead of taking a class for it.
- It's a fact that we learned more this semester than in any other semester.
- It was a tremendous benefit for the students to learn the subjects and how they all tied together because that is how it is in the real world.
- Almost every day they had us doing some case study or real world business review or attending a meeting. That added to the learning.

C. *Did this learning environment provide a better understanding of what it takes to start a business and become an entrepreneur?*
- As far as starting a business, this was a good way to learn. They set you up to develop a business plan with all the steps and how to go about it properly rather than just jumping into it.
- If I had to sit down today and write out a plan for my business, I could get a good start on one.
- The project made us realize the difficulties of owning your own business and all kinds of problems.
- The project opened your eyes to what you would have in store for you in owning your own business.
- Building our businesses enables us to see the connections between the classes.
- Developing the business plan helped a lot. When I eventually start my own business, knowing where to start, what to do, where to go and everything. The actual business project was an awesome thing to do.
- I definitely have a better understanding of what it takes to start and run a business and I plan on becoming a business owner.

In conclusion, both the survey results and the focus group data support the cohort goal of expanding and emphasizing students' entrepreneurial learning process and the application of such knowledge. Students felt vested in the development and start-up business projects and experienced the integration and application of core business principles in a real-life plan. As mentioned earlier, some students embraced the possibilities of entrepreneurship while others learned they would rather work for someone else or be a member of a larger organization. Both resulting viewpoints indicate unique insights concerning entrepreneurial opportunities. Survey responses in Table 2 (p. 21) further support this conclusion.

Longer-Term Retention

The results of the standardized test administered just prior to graduation for the cohort group closely matched those of UMW students outside of the cohort group; however, the cohort group demonstrated a 2% improvement over the other UMW business students in overall scores. The faculty members were encouraged with the testing scores approximating, and slightly exceeding, those of the non-cohort students, especially considering the unplanned complexity of the cohort experience and the difficulties encountered with scheduling and coordination between the faculty members.

Summary and Recommendations

Both the survey results and the focus group data support the cohort goal of expanding and emphasizing student's entrepreneurial learning process and the application of such knowledge. Students felt vested in the development and start-up business projects and experienced the integration and application of core business principles in a real-life plan.

Student Comments

Student responses to the course textbooks were mixed. Several especially liked the management and marketing textbooks and several responded negatively to the finance and operations textbooks, due to a combination of content and the way the individual faculty members used their chosen texts.

The students generally had positive comments related to the business plan and project. However, their complaints fell into two major categories. The first complaint related to the timing of the assignment. Students felt they were not given adequate time to completely develop and operate their businesses. As a recommendation, students suggested spreading the business project out over the entire semester, rather than apply their business principles to the project over the later part of the semester.

The second complaint related to the time constraints experienced by the four professors. Students were well aware of the lack of time the professors had available to commit to the cohort class over the semester. While one faculty was assigned solely to the cohort at any given time, the others were also teaching block classes. Students did not feel all the professors were available as needed. The students felt the stress and demands that the professors were also feeling. Some students expressed negative feedback at switching between subjects while others expressed negative feedback in concentrating on one subject over an extended time period. Clearly, the students expected a more specific syllabus and detailed daily plan from the start of the cohort. While the intention of the professors was to allow the students to develop their core business concepts in a somewhat flexible manner, not having a detailed plan resulted in additional stress for the students. Also, complexities and stress of workload distracted the professors from the additional and continual coordination necessary for the cohort.

Recommendations for Improvement

Based on the feedback from the students, it became clear that many of the recommended changes involved planning and logistics on the parts of the faculty members. For example, a detailed syllabus and project outline would have been helpful. Beginning the group project earlier in the semester would have allowed the nascent businesses to experience more of a track record. Having a lead faculty member and specific faculty office hours dedicated to the cohort members would have been helpful. Finally, the workload was more reflective of 15 credit hours rather than 12, leading to a suggestion that a fifth course, such as small business development, would be appropriate.

Feedback from the faculty indicated a need for a collaborative online platform for consistent and timely communications as well as teaching assignment schedules that would work more effectively with the cohort concept. As with the students, designation of a lead faculty member would have reduced some of the scheduling and ego-driven issues.

CONCLUSION

Given the primary objective of the course which was to improve the long term retention of the material and also to provide overlap between courses using an entrepreneurial process, it would appear there is merit in offering a similar cohort class in the future. Course scheduling is an issue that would perhaps require reducing the number of faculty members who could then have teaching responsibilities for two or more of the cohort classes, reducing block course obligations. With fewer faculty members involved, the course planning should become less complex and if an online platform could be found that enabled collaboration, the communications between and among the course participants would be enhanced.

The experience reinforced the need for faculty having very clear course objectives, forcing them to take a look at courses from the perspectives of the students and a reminder for students that simulating life after college can be somewhat disconcerting and overwhelming.

REFERENCES

Brown, J. S., Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organization Science*, 2, 1, February 1991, 40-57.

Carland, J.C., Carland, J.W., & Stewart, W.H. (1996). Seeing what's not there: The enigma of entrepreneurship. Paper presented at the 1996 Small Business Institute Director's Association meeting. Paper retrieved 6/8/2005 from http://C:\Windows\Desktop\1996\SBIDA\96sbi003.htm

Carrier, C. (Fall 1996). Intrapreneurship in small businesses: An exploratory study. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 5-20.

Doria, J., Rozanski, H., & Cohen, E. (Fall 2003). What business needs from business schools. *Strategy + Business*, 32, 38-45.

Fiet, J. O. (2001). The pedagogical side of entrepreneurship theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 2, 101-117.

Harper, D.A. (2002). Entrepreneurship and the market process: An enquiry into the growth of Knowledge, Taylor & Francis e-Library ed. London; New York: Routledge. Retrieved through http://www.niclc.org.

Henderson, J., Abraham, B. (2004). Can rural America support a knowledge economy? Economic Review: Third Quarter 2004, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, 71-95.

Henley, A. (2005). From entrepreneurial aspiration to business start-up: Evidence from British Longitudinal data. (Working Paper SBE 2005/2), School of Business and Economics, Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP, UK.

Jones, C., English, J. (2004). A contemporary approach to entrepreneurship education. *Education + Training*, 46, 8/9, 2004, 416-423.

Kogan, V. (2005). Entrepreneurship education's new frontier. Financial Times Ltd., Dec. 16 2005. Retrieved from The America's Intelligence Wire 4/6/2006.

Kolvereid, L., Moen, O. (1997). Entrepreneurship among business graduates: Does a major in entrepreneurship make a difference? *European Industrial Training*, 21, 4, 154-160.

Kuratko, D. (September 2005). The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 577-597.

Okudan, G.E. and Rzasa, S., (February 2006), A project-based approach to entrepreneurship education, *The International Journal of Technological Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 26, 2, pp. 195-210.

Rasmussen, E.A., Sorheim, R. (2006). Action-based entreprenurship education. *Technovation*, 26, 2, 185-194.

Robinson, P. (1994). Five ways to make business schools into useful institutions (excerpt from Snapshots from hell: The making of an MBA). Retrieved 3/1/2006 from http://www.redherring.com/mag/issue10/five.html.

Sandberg, K.W. (2003). An exploratory study of women in micro enterprises: Gender-related differences. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 10, 4, 408-417.

Valiathan, P. (2/9/2009). Blended learning models. Retrieved through http://www.ASTD.org.

Vince, R. (1998). Behind and beyond Kolb's learning cycle. *Journal of Management Education*, 22, 3, 304-319.

Whitlock, D.W., Masters, R.J. (1996). Influences on business students' decisions to pursue Entrepreneurial opportunities or traditional career paths. Paper retrieved 5/24/04 from C:\Windows\Desktop\1996\SBIDA\07.htm.