Cultivating Butterflies: Reframing Global Entrepreneurship Education for Transformation Rather Than Standardization

by
Eugene Fregetto

Entrepreneurship education has undergone a remarkable transformation since the mid-twentieth century. What once occupied a marginal position within universities has become a global educational phenomenon spanning higher education, vocational training, government programs, incubators, accelerators, and community-based initiatives. Yet the success of entrepreneurship education in gaining legitimacy and spreading worldwide has created a new problem: the field has become increasingly proficient at codifying, standardizing, and disseminating entrepreneurial knowledge without resolving the deeper question of how entrepreneurial capability develops across different people, cultures, and institutional settings.

The central argument is that the next stage of entrepreneurship education requires a shift from an industrial model of producing entrepreneurs to an ecological model of cultivating entrepreneurial development. Rather than treating venture creation as a predictable sequence of standardized activities, Global Entrepreneurship Education (GEE) should recognize entrepreneurship as a developmental, contextual, nonlinear, and system-embedded phenomenon.

This argument builds on the published article "*GEE's Future: Cultivate Butterflies—Beyond Basics, Nurture Transformation,"*which proposes the metaphor of cultivating butterflies as an alternative framework for understanding the purposes and processes of entrepreneurship education.

From Tacit Practice to Codified Knowledge

One of the major achievements of entrepreneurship scholarship has been converting tacit entrepreneurial knowledge into explicit frameworks. Rules of thumb, mental models, heuristics, narratives, and experiential know-how have increasingly been translated into competencies, canvases, decision frameworks, curricula, and policy instruments. This codification has enabled entrepreneurship to be taught at scale and has provided educators and policymakers with a shared vocabulary for discussing entrepreneurial processes.

But codification also creates limitations. What can be standardized tends to receive disproportionate attention, while dimensions of entrepreneurship that are harder to formalize remain less visible. These include informal-sector knowledge, Indigenous business practices, culturally specific norms, responses to failure, identity development, improvisation, and the deeply contextual judgments required under uncertainty. The published article uses the iceberg analogy: the codified frameworks visible above the surface represent only part of entrepreneurial knowledge. In contrast, substantial tacit and contextual knowledge remains beneath it.

The challenge, then, is not to abandon codification but to recognize its boundaries. Entrepreneurship education needs structure, but structure cannot become a substitute for entrepreneurial development.

Global Entrepreneurship Education Must Be Contextual

This issue becomes especially consequential as entrepreneurship education globalizes. Programs originating largely in the United States and Western Europe now operate in markedly different cultural, institutional, and economic settings. Yet entrepreneurial competencies do not necessarily manifest the same way across contexts.

The original article illustrates this point by comparing opportunity recognition, creativity, ethical thinking, self-efficacy, initiative, management style, uncertainty coping, and collaboration across broad cultural clusters. Its conclusion is not that common entrepreneurial competencies are meaningless, but that their expression depends on context. A model emphasizing individual experimentation, rapid decision-making, and disruption may fit some settings better than others. In other environments, entrepreneurial action may depend more heavily on family legitimacy, community relationships, established hierarchies, informal networks, religious values, or collective decision-making.

Global Entrepreneurship Education therefore cannot simply become the international distribution of Western syllabi. It must combine transferable knowledge with local interpretation. The article defines GEE as the development of knowledge, skills, mindsets, and networks that allow

individuals to create economic and social value in ways that are simultaneously locally grounded and globally informed.

That formulation has important theoretical implications. Context should not be treated as a secondary moderator added after entrepreneurial competencies have already been defined. Context helps shape what entrepreneurial competence means.

From Manufacturing Entrepreneurs to Cultivating Them

The "cultivate butterflies" metaphor provides a way to conceptualize this alternative pedagogy.

Much entrepreneurship education implicitly follows an industrial logic. Venture development is decomposed into modules: opportunity identification, customer discovery, business modeling, prototyping, financing, pitching, and scaling. Students advance through sequential stages with standardized deliverables and measurable milestones. This approach offers substantial advantages, including scalability, consistency, efficiency, and comparability.

Its weakness is that entrepreneurial development rarely proceeds so predictably.

The article contrasts this industrial model with a cultivation model in which educators act more like gardeners than production supervisors. Nascent ideas are treated as fragile and evolving possibilities. Different ventures require different resources at different moments. Students can experiment, make intelligent mistakes, reflect, pivot, abandon weak ideas, and discover opportunities not visible at the start of the educational process.

The article summarizes the distinction in four contrasts: uniformity versus individuality, control versus autonomy, efficiency versus emergence, and metric-driven versus narrative-driven development. Importantly, the article does not reject the industrial approach outright. Structured instruction remains valuable for teaching foundational knowledge.
The more compelling model combines standardized instruction in basic competencies with protected spaces for exploration, uncertainty, and learner-driven discovery.
The pedagogical issue is therefore not structure or freedom. It is where structure is appropriate and where emergence must be allowed.

An Ecological Architecture for Entrepreneurship Education

The ecological framework proposed in the article expands entrepreneurship education beyond the individual student. It identifies seven nested levels of development: organism, population, community, ecosystem, biome, biosphere, and metamorphosis.

At the organism level, the emphasis is on entrepreneurial identity, self-efficacy, opportunity recognition, and personal development.

At the population level, attention shifts to teams and firms: collaboration, role definition, experimentation, and resilience.

At the community level, learners engage customers, suppliers, competitors, mentors, and other local stakeholders.

The ecosystem level introduces capital, institutions, culture, policy, and entrepreneurship-support organizations.

The biome level addresses regional specialization, historical development, and geographic path dependence.

The biosphere level incorporates global markets, sustainability, trade, technological change, and international innovation flows.

Finally, metamorphosis integrates these levels through entrepreneurial agency and action.

This framework changes what entrepreneurship educators should measure. If entrepreneurship is developmental and ecological, immediate venture creation becomes an incomplete indicator of educational effectiveness. Outcomes should also include development of entrepreneurial identity, judgment, network capability, resilience, contextual intelligence, systems understanding, and adaptive capacity.

That argument addresses one of entrepreneurship education's enduring weaknesses: the lack of common measures that can demonstrate effects at individual, institutional, social, and economic levels. Existing measures—including intentions, orientation, venture counts, and short-term startup outcomes—capture only portions of the phenomenon.

Rethinking Failure and Educational Success

The ecological perspective also changes how we understand failure.

Traditional entrepreneurship programs may implicitly treat venture survival as success and venture abandonment as failure. Yet entrepreneurial learning can persist after an idea disappears. Students who terminate a weak concept after careful experimentation may have demonstrated stronger entrepreneurial judgment than students who persist simply because a course requires them to complete a venture project.

The cultivate-butterflies model therefore treats entrepreneurship as a sequence of developmental experiences rather than a single venture outcome. Ideas can pivot, perish, recombine, or stimulate other opportunities. The educational value lies partly in what survives within the learner. The article proposes measures such as idea biodiversity, network diversity, and "pollination"—the extent to which projects generate new ventures, relationships, courses, or broader institutional effects.

This suggests a more demanding definition of entrepreneurship education. The objective is not merely to increase the number of startups created during or immediately after a course. It is to develop individuals who can repeatedly recognize, interpret, and act on uncertain opportunities across their working lives.

Implications for Research and Practice

Several implications follow.

First, scholarship should move beyond asking whether entrepreneurship education "works" in the aggregate. The more meaningful questions concern what works, for whom, at what developmental stage, within which cultural and institutional context, and through what mechanisms.

Second, entrepreneurship education requires multilevel evaluation. Researchers should examine individual learning, team development, network formation, ecosystem engagement, regional context, and longer-term entrepreneurial agency jointly rather than as separate outcomes.

Third, universities must reconsider organizational arrangements that isolate entrepreneurship within disciplinary silos. The article identifies shortages of qualified faculty, Western-centric curricula, fragmented expertise, policy disconnects, short-term metrics, and limited resources as continuing constraints on GEE.

Finally, global entrepreneurship education should seek principled adaptability rather than universal standardization. Common competencies and rigorous knowledge remain necessary, but their pedagogical expression must respond to local institutions, cultures, communities, and forms of enterprise.

Conclusion

Entrepreneurship education has become global. Its next challenge is to become genuinely developmental.

The cultivate-butterflies framework reframes the educator's responsibility. The task is no longer to transmit entrepreneurial tools or move students through a standardized venture-development sequence. It is to create environments in which entrepreneurial capability can emerge, mature, connect with other actors, respond intelligently to context, and eventually generate value.

The central paradox of entrepreneurship education remains the need to combine disciplined analysis with imaginative action under uncertainty. The original article characterizes this tension as the coexistence of structure with the "magnanimity of disorder." That paradox should not be eliminated. It should become the pedagogy's organizing principle.

Entrepreneurs cannot be manufactured with the predictability of standardized products. They can, however, be cultivated through environments that provide knowledge without imposing uniformity, structure without suppressing emergence, and global perspective without erasing local context.

The future of Global Entrepreneurship Education may therefore depend less on perfecting the educational assembly line and more on learning how to cultivate the conditions under which transformation becomes possible.

*Source article:*Fregetto E, GEE's Future: Cultivate Butterflies Beyond Basics, Nurture Transformation, *SCIREA Journal of Education*. Volume 10, Issue 5, October 2025 | PP. 226-269. 10.54647/education880627