The Golden Window: Entrepreneurial Venture Creation as a Superior Mode of University Learning

Dr. Sudha Singh

Department of Fashion Technology. National Institute of Fashion Technology, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10190006

Received: 13 January 2026; Accepted: 21 January 2026; Published: 13 February 2026

ABSTRACT

This conceptual paper argues that entrepreneurial venture creation undertaken during university years generates learning outcomes that are deeper, more durable, and more labour-market relevant than traditional classroom education alone, even when ventures fail commercially. Drawing on experiential learning theory, constructivist pedagogy, entrepreneurial learning research, and labour-market signalling theory, the paper develops a bounded conceptual framework—the *Golden Window*—to explain why the university period constitutes a uniquely effective context for high-intensity experiential learning through venture creation. The framework identifies specific learning mechanisms (integrated problem-solving, rapid feedback, emotional engagement, metacognitive development, and judgement under uncertainty) and articulates testable propositions linking these mechanisms to employability and career outcomes. The paper contributes to entrepreneurship education and higher-education research by reframing student entrepreneurship as an educational investment rather than a career gamble, and by clarifying why learning benefits accrue independently of venture success.

Keywords: experiential learning, entrepreneurial learning, entrepreneurship, employability, higher education

INTRODUCTION

Universities are increasingly criticised for producing graduates who possess formal credentials but lack practical judgement, adaptability, and work-ready skills. Empirical research documents limited learning gains during university, weak transfer of classroom knowledge to practice, and persistent employer dissatisfaction with graduate preparedness (Arum & Roksa, 2011; Hart Research Associates, 2015). These critiques raise a fundamental question: what forms of learning generate durable human capital under contemporary labourmarket conditions?

Positioning explicitly as a **theory-building and conceptual contribution**, this paper advances the claim that entrepreneurial venture creation during university years constitutes a superior mode of learning compared to traditional classroom instruction alone. Drawing on and integrating multiple established theoretical traditions, the paper develops a bounded conceptual framework—the *Golden Window*—intended to clarify mechanisms, boundary conditions, and testable propositions rather than to offer prescriptive advocacy.

Crucially, the learning benefits of venture creation are argued to accrue even when ventures fail commercially. Students who attempt to build real products, engage real users, and operate under real constraints develop forms of understanding, judgement, and adaptability that classroom environments struggle to replicate.

The paper reframes student entrepreneurship as a complementary educational modality embedded within a protected institutional context, rather than as a substitute for formal education. Figure 1 (conceptual framework) schematically summarises the Golden Window framework, linking institutional conditions, learning mechanisms, and downstream educational and employability outcomes.

The paper addresses three research questions:

Through what learning mechanisms does entrepreneurial venture creation generate superior educational outcomes?

Why do these learning benefits persist independent of venture success or failure?

Why are university years a uniquely effective temporal window for entrepreneurial experiential learning?

Theoretical Foundations

Experiential and Constructivist Learning

Experiential learning theory posits that durable learning emerges through iterative cycles of concrete experience, reflection, abstraction, and experimentation (Kolb, 1984). Classroom education typically privileges abstraction while attenuating experience, resulting in knowledge that is inert and weakly transferable

(Whitehead, 1929; Sawyer, 2006). Constructivist theories similarly emphasise that knowledge is actively built through engagement with authentic problems rather than passively received (Piaget, 1954).

Entrepreneurial venture creation operationalises these principles by placing students in environments where action precedes explanation. Students must formulate hypotheses about markets, test them through action, and revise mental models based on feedback, thereby completing full experiential learning cycles (Dewey, 1938; Cope, 2005).

Entrepreneurial Learning and Learning-by-Doing

Research on entrepreneurial learning demonstrates that venture creation produces distinctive forms of learning unavailable through vicarious instruction (Politis, 2005; Cope, 2011). Learning-by-doing theory further suggests that early iterations generate disproportionately steep learning curves (Arrow, 1962; Argote, 2011). University students, by virtue of time availability and institutional support, are positioned to exploit these early high-return learning phases.

Labour-Market Signalling

Labour-market signalling theory explains how observable experiences communicate latent qualities to employers (Spence, 1973). Entrepreneurial attempts signal initiative, tolerance for ambiguity, learning agility, and problem-solving capacity—attributes increasingly valued across occupations (Sullivan & Meek, 2012; World Economic Forum, 2020). Importantly, these signals persist even when ventures fail, provided learning can be articulated and demonstrated (Levie & Gimmon, 2008).

Core Learning Mechanisms of Entrepreneurial Venture Creation

Integrated Problem-Solving

Venture creation requires simultaneous engagement with marketing, finance, operations, strategy, and team leadership. Unlike coursework organised into disciplinary silos, ventures force integration under constraint. This integration deepens understanding and enhances transferability (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989; Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Proposition 1: Entrepreneurial venture creation during university produces deeper integrative understanding than equivalent time spent in discipline-segmented coursework.

Rapid Feedback Loops

Markets provide immediate feedback on value propositions, pricing, usability, and coordination. Such high-frequency feedback accelerates experimentation and learning velocity relative to semester-length academic feedback cycles (Kolb, 1984).

Proposition 2: Rapid feedback inherent in venture creation accelerates learning cycles relative to traditional instructional environments.

Emotional Engagement and Memory Consolidation

Neuroscientific research demonstrates that emotional arousal enhances memory consolidation (McGaugh, 2004). Entrepreneurial action generates emotional intensity—excitement, anxiety, disappointment—that strengthens encoding and recall, producing learning that is more durable than affect-neutral classroom instruction.

Proposition 3: Emotionally engaged learning experiences during venture creation yield more durable knowledge retention than affect-neutral instruction.

Metacognitive Development

Ill-structured entrepreneurial problems require students to identify knowledge gaps, seek resources, monitor understanding, and revise strategies. These processes cultivate learning-to-learn capabilities essential for long-term career adaptability (Cope, 2005).

Proposition 4: Entrepreneurial venture creation enhances metacognitive capability more effectively than well-structured academic problem solving.

Judgement Under Uncertainty

Entrepreneurship entails repeated consequential decisions under incomplete information. Repeated exposure to such decisions builds practical judgement that cannot be taught abstractly (Schön, 1983; Schwartz & Sharpe, 2010).

Proposition 5: Sustained decision-making under uncertainty during venture creation develops practical judgement beyond that achievable through classroom simulation.

Learning from Failure

Contrary to traditional educational models that treat failure as evidence of learning deficit, entrepreneurial research demonstrates that failure often deepens learning (Sitkin, 1992; Shepherd, 2003). Failure compels reflection, exposes faulty assumptions, and strengthens causal reasoning (Ucbasaran et al., 2013).

Failure as a Learning Accelerator

Unsuccessful ventures force students to interrogate beliefs, analyse causation, and generate alternatives—processes that successful outcomes may short-circuit.

Proposition 6: Venture failure under bounded conditions produces deeper reflective learning than comparable venture success.

Psychological and Employability Effects

Processing failure builds resilience, self-knowledge, and adaptability. Empirical studies indicate that individuals with entrepreneurial failure experience often achieve superior subsequent employment outcomes (Levie & Gimmon, 2008; Politis, 2008).

Proposition 7: Learning derived from entrepreneurial failure positively moderates employability outcomes independent of venture performance.

The Golden Window: University as an Optimal Learning Context

The learning mechanisms described above operate most effectively within a specific institutional and temporal context. University years uniquely combine:

- **Protected failure space:** Social and institutional tolerance for experimentation (Turner, 1969)
- **Temporal flexibility:** Discretionary time unavailable in later life stages (Baker & Powell, 2019)

- **Resource concentration:** Access to peers, faculty, infrastructure, and legitimacy
- **Cognitive openness:** Developmental readiness for exploration and identity formation (Obschonka et al., 2013)

These conditions jointly define the *Golden Window*—a bounded period during which entrepreneurial learning yields unusually high returns with limited downside risk.

The Golden Window Framework

The Table 1 presents the Golden Window framework, summarising the key components, mechanisms, and boundary conditions.

Table 1: The Golden Window Framework

Framework Component	Key Elements	Proposed Mechanisms	Boundary Conditions
Contextual Enablers	Protected failure space Temporal flexibility Resource concentration Cognitive openness	Reduces fear of failure Enables extended experimentation Lowers resource barriers Enhances receptivity to learning	Requires institutional support Varies by discipline and program Depends on peer culture Individual differences in openness
Learning Mechanisms	Integrated problem-solving Rapid feedback loops Emotional engagement Metacognitive development Judgement under uncertainty	Connects disparate knowledge Accelerates iteration cycles Strengthens memory encoding Builds learning capacity Develops practical wisdom	Venture complexity required Feedback must be interpretable Moderate stress optimal Requires reflective scaffolding Needs calibration opportunities
Learning Outcomes	Integrative understanding Adaptability Resilience Self-knowledge Employability signals	Transfer across domains Navigate uncertainty Recover from setbacks Clarify strengths/interests Demonstrate initiative	Quality depends on reflection Requires articulation skills Needs attribution accuracy Contingent on narrative coherence Context-dependent valuation
Failure Processing	Bounded stakes Institutional legitimacy Peer support Narrative construction	Limits downside risk Normalizes experimentation Provides emotional buffer Enables meaning-making	Failure must be "intelligent" Support systems required Depends on peer culture Requires reflection capability

Proposition 8: The educational returns to entrepreneurial venture creation are significantly higher during university years than in post-graduate contexts

Implications

Implications for Theory

The framework extends experiential learning theory by specifying venture creation as a high-intensity instantiation, and refines entrepreneurial learning theory by decoupling learning value from commercial success.

Implications for Higher Education Practice

Universities should recognise documented entrepreneurial learning as legitimate educational output, integrate credit-bearing experiential pathways, and normalise intelligent failure.

Implications for Future Research

The propositions advanced in this paper lend themselves to empirical examination through several established research designs. Longitudinal studies could track cohorts of students who engage in venture creation during university relative to matched peers who follow traditional educational pathways, examining learning outcomes, career trajectories, and employability over time. Quasi-experimental designs, including matched samples or programme-based comparisons, could help isolate the learning effects of venture creation from selfselection biases. Mixed-method approaches combining survey instruments with qualitative process tracing would be particularly well suited to examining metacognitive development and judgement formation.

Such empirical efforts would allow future research to validate, refine, or boundary-condition the Golden Window framework, strengthening its contribution to entrepreneurship education and higher-education scholarship (Pittaway & Cope, 2007; Nabi et al., 2017)..

CONCLUSION

Entrepreneurial venture creation during university represents an educational investment with learning dividends that persist regardless of commercial outcomes. By exploiting the Golden Window, students can acquire integrative understanding, metacognitive capability, and practical judgement that traditional instruction alone rarely delivers. Reframing student entrepreneurship as learning rather than risk clarifies its central role in contemporary higher education.

REFERENCES

1. Argote, L. (2011). Organizational learning: Creating, retaining and transferring knowledge. Springer.
2. Aristotle. (350 BCE/2009). Nicomachean ethics (D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
3. Arrow, K. J. (1962). The economic implications of learning by doing. Review of Economic Studies, 29(3), 155–173.
4. Arum, R., & Roksa, J. (2011). Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses. University of Chicago Press.
5. Bacon, D. R. (2004). An examination of the long-term retention of knowledge learned in principles-ofmarketing courses. Journal of Education for Business, 79(3), 156–160.
6. Baker, T., & Powell, E. E. (2019). Entrepreneurship as a new liberal art. Small Business Economics, 52(2), 405–418.
7. Brown, A. L., & Adler, R. (2008). Minds on fire: Open education, the long tail, and learning 2.0. Educause Review, 43(1), 16–32.
8. Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. Educational Researcher, 18(1), 32–42.
9. Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. American Journal of Sociology, 94, S95–S120.
10. Cope, J. (2005). Toward a dynamic learning perspective of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 29(4), 373–397.
11. Cope, J. (2011). Entrepreneurial learning from failure: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. Journal of Business Venturing, 26(6), 604–623.
12. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. Plenum.
13. Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. Macmillan.
14. Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2008). From craft to science: Teaching models and learning processes in entrepreneurship education. Journal of European Industrial Training, 32(7), 569–593.

15. Hake, R. R. (1998). Interactive-engagement versus traditional methods: A six-thousand-student survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics courses. American Journal of Physics, 66(1), 64–74.
16. Hart Research Associates. (2015). Falling short? College learning and career success. Association of American Colleges and Universities.
17. Hmieleski, K. M., & Carr, J. C. (2008). The relationship between entrepreneur psychological capital and new venture performance. Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research, 28(4), Article 1.
18. Ibarra, H., & Barbulescu, R. (2010). Identity as narrative: Prevalence, effectiveness, and consequences of narrative identity work in macro work role transitions. Academy of Management Review, 35(1), 135–154.
19. Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice Hall.
20. Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press.
21. Levie, J., & Gimmon, E. (2008). Mixed signals: Why investors may misjudge first-time high technology venture founders. Venture Capital, 10(3), 233–256.
22. Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (2000). High potentials as high learners. Human Resource Management, 39(4), 321–329.
23. McGaugh, J. L. (2004). The amygdala modulates the consolidation of memories of emotionally arousing experiences. Annual Review of Neuroscience, 27, 1–28.
24. Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., & Walmsley, A. (2017). The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 16(2), 277–299.
25. Obschonka, M., Silbereisen, R. K., & Schmitt-Rodermund, E. (2013). Explaining entrepreneurial behavior. Career Development Quarterly, 61(1), 67–83.
26. Piaget, J. (1954). The construction of reality in the child. Basic Books.
27. Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). Entrepreneurship education: A systematic review of the evidence. International Small Business Journal, 25(5), 479–510.
28. Politis, D. (2005). The process of entrepreneurial learning: A conceptual framework. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 29(4), 399–424.
29. Politis, D. (2008). Does prior start-up experience matter for entrepreneurs' learning? Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 15(3), 472–489.
30. Sawyer, R. K. (2006). Educating for innovation. Thinking Skills and Creativity, 1(1), 41–48.
31. Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner. Basic Books.
32. Schwartz, B., & Sharpe, K. E. (2010). Practical wisdom. Riverhead Books.
33. Shepherd, D. A. (2003). Learning from business failure. Academy of Management Review, 28(2), 318–328.
34. Sitkin, S. B. (1992). Learning through failure: The strategy of small losses. Research in Organizational Behavior, 14, 231–266.
35. Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 87(3), 355–374.
36. Sullivan, R., & Meek, W. R. (2012). Gender and entrepreneurship. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 27(5), 428–458.
37. Turner, V. (1969). The ritual process. Cornell University Press.
38. Ucbasaran, D., Shepherd, D. A., Lockett, A., & Lyon, S. J. (2013). Life after business failure. Journal of Management, 39(1), 163–202.
39. Whitehead, A. N. (1929). The aims of education. Macmillan.
40. World Economic Forum. (2020). The future of jobs report 2020. World Economic Forum.