

Reviewer: 1  
Comments to the Author

### Bridging the traditional versus progressive education rift through entrepreneurship

The paper shows some signs of having been revised, and indeed also along the lines suggested in my previous review (knowing this is indeed not the only input to your work). While the main text has become a bit more direct and well-structured, there is an impossibly large appendices section that has grown, which now makes the paper into a too scattered reading. The most important message here, however, is not the fact that the text has swollen, but that the content – in spite of enjoying the support of a fairly clear structure – is still riddled with unclear and imprecise statements.

1. Entrepreneurship, in the narrow sense, is defined using the concept of entrepreneur, which makes it tautological. It makes no sense to say that entrepreneurship is what entrepreneurs do; or, that entrepreneurship is becoming entrepreneur.
2. The wider view (you suggest this is how it should be interpreted) of entrepreneurship is suggested as 'creating value for others', which in perspective of your discussion of definitions, would have to be understood as compatible with your broader definition of entrepreneurship – becoming entrepreneurial. It is, however, unclear what is meant: "wider definition of entrepreneurship, aimed at making people become more entrepreneurial in general..." Is this meant to suggest that your definition of entrepreneurship is 'becoming entrepreneurial'? Or, should we understand 'creating value for others' as your definition of entrepreneurship, in spite of it being described as a suggestion for how entrepreneurship should be interpreted – as creating value for others?
3. The 'entrepreneurial tools' are said to stem from entrepreneurship? Again, this makes no sense. Assuming this is meant as 'entrepreneurship research', there is a debate in entrepreneurship research of how we should best describe, study and analyse entrepreneurship. Sarasvathy has suggested effectuation as one concept that supplements previous ones and, she argues, adds precision to our pursuit of knowledge about entrepreneurship as practice. So, you are assuming the reader to be a Sarasvathy thinker here? The other two tools (and concepts seem more accurate term here) are even less evident. This has not become more clear since the previous version of the paper.
4. You say that analytical methods (in plural) are introduced to better understand the rift (between traditional and progressive education) through five dualisms. What methods are you referring to? The rift is to be understood through five dualisms. Then you suggest the entrepreneurial tools can bridge the rift. Then you suggest that the entrepreneurial tools can bridge 'between the identified five key dualisms'. Alas, bridging the five dualisms, the rift is also bridged. This means the rift is not only possible to understand by the five dualisms, it is constituted by the five dualisms? Bridging them, the rift is bridged.
5. How do dualisms and one-sided perspective relate? How are the concept of rift and dualism related?
6. The choice to dissect the rift between traditional and progressive education into a set of dualisms would need a better explanation. Why apply a dualistic thought style? Are you not cementing an approach which has been productive of the rift, of the objectivist – subjectivist, and so on? Is it not getting beyond dualisms, dualistic thinking itself that is key?
7. How is the framework of dualisms deduced? Deduced from what?
8. Is a dualism resolved by addressing concerns on both sides of the rift? Is resolving dualisms the purpose with bridging? Is this not a paradox, for bridging keeps the dualism in place (without which there would be nothing to bridge), whereas resolving implies that it is settled, fixed, worked out?
9. Five dualisms are derived from literature: which are the principles directing the selection of literature? Which principle(s) are used to limit this to these five dualisms?
10. The dualisms are problematic. E.g. the social is defined as a gathering, a collective of individuals, then the social is not on the other side, it is merely a quantitatively more, dot different. Then individualism is the ruling principle.

11. Also the objectivist and subjectivist seem not clear at times. The subjectivist (epistemological view) is described in terms of knowledge sociology, i.e, how knowledge is constructed. The latter is in line with Berger and Luckmann's knowledge sociology, but forms no clear position in the epistemological debates about objectivism and subjectivism (which Burrell and Morgan, 1979, tied to corresponding ontological positions in realism and nominalism (respectively)).

12. How "a combination of two dualistic positions" can "turn two seemingly competing and incompatible positions into a complementary and reflective discourse." (p. 12) is not clear. Is this, in addition, a description of resolving a dualism; when incompatible positions are turned into a complementary and reflective discourse?

13. It seems problematic and less than proficient for a scholar in a journal like this one to rely on another reader's understanding of Vygotsky (in this case Engeström, 2009) for building a fundamental basis for analysis and interpretation in your framework (p. 13). We would have to read your reading of Vygotsky in order to see how his ideas would be lending themselves to serve your purpose.

14. How, after exemplifying tools that mediate learning with natural and artificial languages, can you claim that "the idea of tools that mediate learning has been largely neglected in Western societies."? This must presuppose having read nothing in educational theory, learning theory, pedagogy or didactics research during the last (at least) three decades.

15. There is a link between Vygotskian requirements that tools need to fulfill – the identification and selection of tools – and tool as serving as bridging the rift between traditional and progressive – and, finally, tools as substantiating the new educational philosophy (learning through creating value for others). This link hinges on these tool criteria: 1) they need to provide a philosophy of their own; 2) need to provide hands-on advice for how to manage a complex environments, social interactions, iterative processes, emotional involvement, and practical creation experiences; and 3) need to provide some novel words, principles and key phrases illustrating the helpfulness of the particular tool(s) in question, thus establishing a social language of its own. This is indeed a demanding set of criteria. How could we understand whether these are fulfilled without knowing Vygostky's theory well?

16. The tools: we learn too little about effectuation as tool for it to be a substantiating part of the new educational philosophy. As it not reads, it describes any form of making-do based practice. You start with what you have. Customer development, more a popular consulting agency concept, is then the other building block/tool of the new educational philosophy. This starts to build into an insult to those who have devoted decades to progressive education research. The note on appreciative inquiry is indeed also puzzling, and ends in a reference to a 4-D cycle, confirming we are in the how-to recommendations literature to consultants here? How, again, is this to form the basis of an educational philosophy in a research journal publication?

17. In section 5.1 you refer to the "iterative and dynamic process of effectual interactions outlined by Sarasvathy and Dew (2005, p.391)" as if this is something the reader should be familiar with?

18. I find little in the Discussion section that adds to the research on the dialogical classroom (based on Bakhtin and Vygotsky, published since 1996, e.g. Dysthe). Since there is no theoretical basis developed in this paper, for substantiating the tools as part of an educational philosophy, it is hard to see why: 1) entrepreneurship needs to be part of it, and 2) why AI and Customer Development is about entrepreneurship (in any deeper sense).

19. If entrepreneurship is creating value for others, and the educational philosophy is learning through creating value for others, the philosophy is learning through entrepreneurship. This is the educational philosophy – learning through entrepreneurship. This is an educational philosophy 'stemming from the field of entrepreneurship'. You can see how this gets a bit thin? Like an educational philosophy stemming from the field of engineering, saying, 'learning through engineering'.

20. Given the discussion on p. 24, I don't think there is an entrepreneurship education on this planet that omits to focus on creation of new or superior customer-value as key. 'What', is not the problem. It is precisely 'HOW' this is done that is at the core of learning entrepreneurship.

21. However, it slides a bit towards another audience for the paper – educators, seemingly outside entrepreneurship education? You state: ‘Another key challenge is whether educators are willing to use these or other entrepreneurial tools. [...] a new audience, such as teachers in this case...’ (p. 25). Had the paper engaged in the work of Vygotsky’s – described as ‘seminal’ – it would have been more realistic to ask the question of whether teachers would accept the tools offered in the paper. It strikes the reader as odd that the two central theoretical inspirations – Vygotsky and Dewey – are treated rather superficially in the paper.

We have not learnt much about their educational theory/philosophy.

In sum, I find that the paper cannot live up to the demands of reflexivity, which I find is justifiably placed on the publishable academic text. It conducts a dualistic conceptualisation and analysis of dualism that it wants to bridge using a set of tools. The dualism inherent in the analytical strategy itself is never overtly discussed. The entrepreneurial tools are not identified using a critical discussion of alternatives. The five dualisms are ‘derived from literature’ without good arguments for why these five and not alternatives. What literature – how is this delimited. What interest, perspective, norm, philosophy has guided the choice of literature? Similar questions can be addressed to the choice of 10 bridging questions. Vygotsky and Dewey are but marginally dealt with in the paper. Given the purpose is to suggest a new educational philosophy, this is puzzling. I cannot see how the paper fulfils the requirements we should place on papers published in an academic journal. The appendixes do not help in our attempt to figure out how the author has thought.