

Venturethon: A Validation-First, Studio-Templated Pedagogical Model for Entrepreneurship Education

Artūras Jurgelevičius

Faculty of Governance and Business, Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius, Lithuania

a.jurgelevicius@mruni.eu

Abstract: This paper develops a conceptual framework for Venturethon, a sprint-based pedagogical model for entrepreneurship education centered on real-world business model validation. Its novelty is configurational rather than componential. Entrepreneurship education has shifted, over two decades, from lecture-based instruction toward experiential formats, yet a persistent gap remains between pedagogical methods and the authentic processes of new venture creation. Two competition-based formats dominate practice: hackathons, which compress innovation into 24 to 72 hours and rarely enable customer interaction; and business plan competitions, which reward written planning over market evidence. Recent empirical reviews show that lecture-centered teaching persists even where experiential intent is stated, and that participation in assessment-based startup competitions yields no significant entrepreneurial-intention advantage over controls. In parallel, a separate research stream — four randomized controlled trials covering 759 firms and a recent extension in Tanzania — has shown that a hypothesis-driven, theory-based approach to entrepreneurial decision making improves search efficiency and idea quality. The design challenge is therefore not whether validation matters, but how to embed it pedagogically. The Venturethon model rests on three theoretical pillars: experiential learning theory, hypothesis-driven entrepreneurship, and venture studio architecture. The paper specifies nine testable propositions linking program design features to expected learner outcomes and articulates four boundary conditions: deep-tech ventures with multi-year R&D timelines, regulated industries with constrained customer access, pre-undergraduate participants, and prior-MBA participants shown to resist hypothesis-driven methods. No existing format — hackathon, business plan competition, accelerator, I-Corps, or studio — jointly instantiates the translation of venture studio architecture (cohort parallelism, shared infrastructure, systematized process) into educational program design combined with open access, evidence-gated pedagogy, and pre-committed post-sprint pathways. The paper concludes with a quasi-experimental design for empirical evaluation against matched hackathon and business-plan-competition cohorts, inviting independent empirical testing.

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship education has shifted, over two decades, from lecture-based instruction toward experiential and practice-oriented formats (Neck and Greene, 2011). Yet a persistent gap remains between pedagogical methods and the authentic processes of new venture creation. Recent empirical reviews show that the field still lacks consensus on which experiential designs reliably produce entrepreneurial competence, and that lecture-centered teaching persists even where experiential intent is stated (Kim, 2025; Liszt-Rohlf et al, 2026). Two competition-based formats dominate practice: hackathons, which compress innovation into 24 to 72 hours and rarely enable customer interaction (Resch, Freudhofmayer and Martínez-Usarralde, 2025; Sánchez et al, 2025); and business plan competitions, which reward written planning rather than market evidence (Mauer et al, 2021).

Against this backdrop, a parallel research stream has accumulated rigorous evidence — most prominently four randomized controlled trials covering 759 firms (Camuffo et al, 2024) and a recent extension in Tanzania (Agarwal et al, 2025) — that a hypothesis-driven, theory-based approach to entrepreneurial decision making improves search efficiency and idea quality. This evidence suggests that the design challenge for entrepreneurship education is not whether validation matters, but how to embed it pedagogically.

This paper introduces Venturethon as a sprint-based, validation-first model designed to do precisely that. The contribution is conceptual: the paper develops formal propositions linking program design features to learner outcomes and articulates boundary conditions under which the model is and is not expected to apply. Section 2 reviews three relevant literatures: entrepreneurship education pedagogy and competition-based learning; hypothesis-driven entrepreneurship; and venture studio research. Section 3 presents the theoretical framework. Section 4 specifies the Venturethon model and its nine propositions. Section 5 differentiates it from existing formats, including the NSF I-Corps. Section 6 discusses implications and boundary conditions. Section 7 concludes.

Methodologically, this is a conceptual contribution drawing on theory-building from existing literature. Sources were identified through purposive search of Scopus and Web of Science (2020-2026) using the terms "entrepreneurship education", "business model validation", "lean startup", "venture studio", "hackathon", and "I-Corps", supplemented by targeted backward and forward citation tracing of seminal works.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Entrepreneurship Education and Competition-based Learning

Entrepreneurship education in higher education has expanded since the 1990s, but its effectiveness remains contested. Mauer et al (2021) reviewed 159 articles and concluded that entrepreneurship education research relies overwhelmingly on short-term self-report outcomes, frequently fails to specify the pedagogy under test, and that participation in curricular education or assessed startup competitions yields no significant entrepreneurial-intention advantage over controls. Recent work has reinforced these critiques: Kim (2025) finds, in a U.S. mixed-methods study, that lecture-centered pedagogy persists despite stated experiential intent, and Liszt-Rohlf et al (2026), in a systematic review of 1,419 abstracts using the EU EntreComp framework, document the heterogeneity of designs and the under-specification of competence outcomes.

Hackathons have attracted growing scholarly attention. A PRISMA-guided systematic mapping by Sánchez et al (2025) finds limited methodological standardization across student hackathons, with reported outcomes dominated by tangible artefacts and soft skills and long-term impact rarely evaluated. Resch, Freudhofmayer and Martínez-Usarralde (2025) and Rys (2025) confirm benefits for peer learning and problem-solving while flagging a structural mismatch between event duration and validation requirements. Across this literature, a recurring finding is that short-format events generate energy but do not scaffold the validation journey from idea to investable venture (Kohne et al, 2023); follow-through support and structured post-event pathways emerge as decisive moderators of longer-term entrepreneurial outcomes (Jurgelevičius et al, 2025).

2.2 Hypothesis-driven Entrepreneurship and the Scientific Approach

The lean-startup tradition (Ries, 2011; Blank and Dorf, 2012) and its articulation tools — the Business Model Canvas (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010) and Lean Canvas (Maurya, 2012) — propose that entrepreneurs translate ideas into falsifiable hypotheses, test them through minimum viable products, and decide to persevere, pivot, or abandon based on evidence. Until recently the empirical foundation for these prescriptions was thin (Frederiksen and Brem, 2017). The most rigorous evidence now comes from the "scientific approach" research programme of Camuffo and colleagues. Their original randomized controlled trial (Camuffo et al, 2020) showed that training entrepreneurs to formulate and test theory-driven hypotheses raised the rate of pivot and exit decisions and improved revenue. The large-scale replication across 759 firms (Camuffo et al, 2024) confirmed and extended these findings, showing that the scientific approach increases search efficiency and "methodic doubt." A 2025 extension to a Tanzanian sample (Agarwal et al, 2025) demonstrates that adding an explicit "theory of value" component generates further benefits in low-resource contexts. Gambardella et al (2025) further distinguish theory-based from design-based decision making, situating the scientific approach as a predictive complement to constructivist entrepreneurship.

Two implications follow. First, the practitioner-derived "validate before you build" principle (Ries, 2011) now rests on cumulative experimental evidence, not anecdote. Second, this evidence has not yet been systematically translated into entrepreneurship education pedagogy. The Venturethon model, developed below, can be read as one such translation.

2.3 Venture Studios as an Organizational Template

Venture studios — also termed startup studios or company builders — systematically create multiple ventures in parallel through shared resources, expertise, and capital (Sansone et al, 2023). Curran and Ozcan (2025) show that studios break the conventional individual-opportunity nexus by separating opportunity identification from founder recruitment, with implications for how entrepreneurial agency itself is theorized. Belingheri and Lechner (2025) provide a systematic mapping of the venture-builder phenomenon across 350 studios in 34 countries, identifying seven defining features (focus, idea sourcing, service package, volume, funding, governance, output) and noting that peer-reviewed empirical evidence remains thinner than the topic's prominence in practitioner discourse. Industry surveys report higher Series A rates for studio-backed ventures than for traditional pre-seed startups; these figures should be read as suggestive rather than causal, given selection and survivorship biases (Belingheri and Lechner, 2025).

Crucially for this paper, the venture studio model has not, to the author's knowledge, been previously theorized as a pedagogical template. Studios are usually analyzed as organizational forms or financing vehicles. The argument developed below is that their three architectural features — cohort parallelism, shared infrastructure,

and systematized validation process — translate into a coherent pedagogical design, independently of any financing question.

3. Theoretical Framework

The Venturethon model rests on three interconnected pillars: experiential learning theory, hypothesis-driven entrepreneurship, and venture studio architecture. Table 1 maps each pillar onto specific design features of the model and the entrepreneurship education limitation it is intended to address.

Table 1: Three-pillar architecture of the Venturethon model

Theoretical Pillar	Core Mechanism	Design Feature in Venturethon	EE Limitation Addressed
Experiential learning (Kolb, 1984; Neck and Greene, 2011)	Iterative cycle: experience, reflection, conceptualisation, experimentation	Weekly sprint cadence with mandated customer-evidence checkpoints	Hackathon brevity; lecture-centric instruction
Hypothesis-driven entrepreneurship (Ries, 2011; Camuffo et al, 2020, 2024)	Falsifiable hypotheses tested via MVPs and customer interviews	Phase-gated assessment: teams advance only on validated evidence	Document-centric business plan competitions
Venture studio architecture (Sansone et al, 2023; Curran and Ozcan, 2025)	Cohort parallelism, shared infrastructure, systematised process	Synchronous multi-team cohorts, shared toolkits, repeatable five-phase protocol	Absent post-competition pathway; isolated team learning

3.1 Experiential Learning

Kolb's (1984) experiential learning cycle provides the pedagogical architecture. The mechanism by which a one-week sprint instantiates the four stages is empirical, not assumed: each week, teams encounter a concrete set of customer or market data (concrete experience), discuss what the data show in facilitated reflection sessions (reflective observation), revise their business model hypotheses on a shared canvas (abstract conceptualization), and re-enter the field with updated interview protocols and MVP elements (active experimentation). This iterative loop is observable in coded artefacts — interview logs, canvas revisions, MVP versions — that constitute the assessment evidence. Recent entrepreneurship education pedagogy research (Kim, 2025; Mujuru, Hyams-Ssekasi and Mushunje, 2026) emphasizes that experiential intent without scaffolded artefact production typically defaults back to lecture; Venturethon's artefact-centered design is intended to resist that default.

3.2 Hypothesis-driven Entrepreneurship

The lean-startup tradition (Ries, 2011; Blank and Dorf, 2012) supplies the operational logic; the scientific-approach research programme (Camuffo et al, 2020, 2024; Agarwal et al, 2025) supplies the empirical warrant that the logic generates measurable performance gains when properly trained. Venturethon adopts both: the Business Model Canvas (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010) and Lean Canvas (Maurya, 2012) serve as articulation tools, while teams are explicitly trained to formulate falsifiable hypotheses, identify the riskiest assumption, and design minimum-viable tests — the cognitive plus experimental architecture distinguished by Gambardella et al (2025).

3.3 Venture Studio Architecture

Three studio principles transfer to pedagogy. First, cohort parallelism: simultaneous teams generate cross-pollination, peer benchmarking, and a shared learning trajectory absent in solo-team formats (Belingeri and Lechner, 2025). Second, shared infrastructure: a common toolkit (interview templates, validation rubrics, mentor pool) lowers the friction cost of meaningful experimentation, addressing the documented hackathon barrier of insufficient scaffolding (Resch et al, 2025). Third, systematic process: a repeatable five-phase protocol encodes learning-curve advantages across cohorts (Curran and Ozcan, 2025) and supports cumulative program improvement.

4. The Venturethon Model

This is a conceptual contribution and does not present a PRISMA-style systematic review; it follows the integrative literature review approach articulated by Torraco (2016) and Snyder (2019), which is appropriate where the aim is theory synthesis rather than effect-size aggregation. This positioning is made explicit to avoid overclaiming methodological reach.

Sources were identified through structured searches of Scopus and Web of Science between January and March 2026, covering the period 2010–2026, with priority given to 2020–2026 publications to capture the recent maturation of the scientific-approach evidence base (Camuffo et al, 2020, 2024; Agarwal et al, 2025). The following search strings were used, combined with Boolean operators: "entrepreneurship education", "business model validation", "lean startup", "scientific approach to entrepreneurship", "venture studio" OR "startup studio" OR "company builder", "hackathon", and "I-Corps". Inclusion criteria were: (i) peer-reviewed journal articles, systematic reviews, or seminal scholarly books; (ii) direct relevance to one of the three theoretical pillars or to the comparative analysis in Section 5; and (iii) methodological transparency. Exclusion criteria were: (i) practitioner blog posts and non-peer-reviewed grey literature, except where they reported primary data not yet available in peer-reviewed form; (ii) studies focused exclusively on corporate intrapreneurship; and (iii) duplicates and editorials. Backward and forward citation tracing of seminal works was used to capture earlier foundational sources (Kolb, 1984; Ries, 2011) and the most recent 2025–2026 contributions not yet fully indexed.

4.1 Construct Definitions

Three constructs are defined explicitly. Validation evidence denotes documented feedback from at least 15 in-depth customer interviews per team, plus at least one of: a behavioral signal (sign-up, pre-order, letter of intent) or a willingness-to-pay test result. Investment-readiness, in this educational context, is operationalized not as actual fundraising but as the pedagogical state in which a team can articulate a falsifiable value hypothesis, an identified customer segment, evidence of problem-solution fit, and a path-to-revenue logic — the four components on which the program's rubric assesses pitches. Sprint duration is parameterized at four to eight weeks to accommodate institutional calendars; all propositions below specify duration as a moderator rather than a fixed value.

4.2 The Five-phase Sprint

Table 2 summarizes the five sequential phases. Each phase is gated by a deliverable that constitutes evidence rather than intent. Iteration loops between Phase 3 (Solution Hypothesis) and Phase 2 (Problem Definition) are required, not optional: teams that find their problem statement does not survive customer contact return to Phase 2 rather than continuing to Phase 4.

Table 2: The Venturethon five-phase sprint

Phase	Focus	Deliverable	Assessment artefact
1	Segment and ecosystem mapping	Specified customer segment plus actor map	Ecosystem map; segment definition memo
2	Problem definition and framing	Validated problem statement	At least 15 interview transcripts; coded problem themes
3	Solution hypothesis and MVP design	Falsifiable solution hypotheses plus MVP plan	Hypothesis register; MVP test design
4	Market validation and traction	Behavioural and willingness-to-pay evidence	Test logs; signed letters of intent / pre-orders / sign-ups
5	Investor-readiness and pitch	Evidence-based pitch plus venture model	Pitch deck; updated BMC; validation portfolio

4.3 Assessment

Evaluation is rubric-based and evidence-weighted. Four criteria carry equal weight: depth of customer discovery (number, quality, and coding rigour of interviews); specificity of validated problem-solution fit; credibility of traction indicators; and coherence of the business model and clarity of the resulting investment narrative. This rubric aligns with the scientific-method orientation of the Camuffo programme (Camuffo et al, 2024) and resists the common entrepreneurship education failure of rewarding presentation polish over substantive evidence.

4.4 Propositions

Nine testable propositions follow from the framework. Each links a design feature to an expected learner outcome and identifies the relevant moderator or boundary.

P1. Evidence gates → entrepreneurial self-efficacy. Sprint formats that require pre-pitch customer-evidence artefacts (≥ 10 problem interviews, demand signals, or LOIs) will produce higher post-program entrepreneurial self-efficacy and lower overconfidence bias than equivalent-duration formats assessing only pitch quality, controlling for cohort selection and prior founder experience.

P2. Cohort parallelism → evidence-based decision revision. Cohort formats running multiple teams synchronously will produce higher rates of *evidence-based business model revision* (pivots justified by validated learning, not founder intuition) than solo-team formats, mediated by peer benchmarking and inter-team disconfirmation. Effect strength will follow an inverted-U with cohort size, with diminishing returns beyond ~15 teams.

P3. Hypothesis-formulation training → search efficiency. Explicit hypothesis-formulation training (theory-based reasoning, falsifiable predictions, pre-registered tests) will improve idea-search efficiency — measured as time-to-validated-problem and reduction in unproductive directions — replicating the Camuffo et al. (2020, 2024) scientific approach effect within an educational rather than firm-level setting.

P4. Structured post-sprint pathways → venture creation. Structured post-sprint pathways (incubation slots, accelerator fast-track, venture studio integration, or follow-on funding) will increase 12-month venture-creation and 24-month venture-survival rates among program alumni, relative to terminal-event formats such as classical hackathons. Effect will be moderated by pathway *commitment credibility* — pre-committed slots outperform conditional invitations.

P5. Founder experience → competence gains, not absolute outcomes. The model's effects on *learning gains in entrepreneurial competence* will be larger for first-time founders than for experienced founders (ceiling effect), while *absolute venture quality outcomes* will favor experienced founders (Gompers et al, 2010). Programs should therefore be evaluated on value-added, not graduate-level performance. These propositions are presented for empirical testing rather than as established findings; Section 6 sketches a quasi-experimental design.

P6. Mentor structure → venture quality. Mentor *density and diversity* (ratio of active mentors to teams, breadth across functional and industry expertise) will predict venture quality at exit more strongly than mentor *seniority* alone, consistent with Cohen et al.'s findings on accelerator effectiveness. A "directed but plural" mentorship structure (multiple mentors, single accountable lead) outperforms both single-mentor and unstructured-network models.

P7. Pre-committed kill criteria → resource efficiency and learning. Sprint formats incorporating pre-committed *kill criteria* (defined evidence thresholds below which teams formally discontinue) will produce higher resource efficiency and stronger post-program learning outcomes than formats with open-ended continuation, by reducing escalation of commitment.

P8. Founder-problem fit screening → team performance. Venturethon formats that screen for founder-problem fit before team formation (matching participants to problem domains based on prior exposure or motivation) will outperform random or self-selected team formation on both venture progression and team cohesion, with effects strongest for deep-tech and regulated-industry challenges.

P9. Reflection cadence → learning transfer. Structured reflection protocols embedded between sprint phases (not only post-program) will increase learning transfer to subsequent ventures, drawing on Kolb's experiential learning cycle and Argyris's double-loop learning.

5. Differentiation from Existing Formats

Five formats are most directly comparable. Table 3 contrasts them on seven dimensions. Most notably, the closest functional analogue is the U.S. NSF I-Corps program, which has trained more than 2,300 individuals in customer-discovery sprints and is associated with over \$7 billion in follow-on funding (NSF, 2025). I-Corps and Venturethon share the validation-sprint logic and the 100-interview ethic of customer discovery (Leatherbee and Katila, 2020). They differ in two important respects: I-Corps is targeted at deep-tech academic researchers commercializing NSF-funded science, with eligibility tied to research output; Venturethon is targeted at first-time founders and students with no commercialization prerequisite. Second, I-Corps does not adopt the studio template of cohort parallelism plus shared infrastructure plus a structured post-sprint pathway. Venturethon's contribution, therefore, is not to invent the validation sprint — that credit belongs to the lean-startup and I-Corps traditions — but to combine the validation sprint with venture studio architecture and to translate the combination into an entrepreneurship education format accessible at scale.

Table 3 positions Venturethon against four adjacent formats — hackathons, business plan competitions, accelerators and the NSF I-Corps programme — across twelve design dimensions. The dimensions are organised in three layers: theoretical and pedagogical positioning (rows 1–3), structural design (rows 4–7) and process and outcome governance (rows 8–12).

Table 3: Venturethon and adjacent entrepreneurship education / venture-creation formats

Dimension	Hackathon	Business plan competition	Accelerator	NSF I-Corps	Venturethon
Theoretical anchor	None; build-test-learn folk wisdom	Strategic planning tradition	Signaling theory and mentorship	Lean Startup (Blank, Ries)	Scientific approach to entrepreneurship (Camuffo et al, 2020) and discovery-driven planning (McGrath)
Pedagogical method	Ad-hoc; build-fast	Written analysis and forecasting	Mentorship-driven iteration	Customer discovery interviews	Hypothesis-driven testing with evidence gates
Primary focus	Prototype	Written plan	Growth	Customer discovery	Falsifiable hypothesis testing under time compression
Eligibility	Open	Open	Selective	NSF-funded research only	Open (broad access)
Stage	Idea	Idea or early	Post-MVP	Pre-MVP	Pre-MVP
Duration	24–72 hours	Weeks to months	3–6 months	7 weeks	Compressed sprint of 4–8 weeks with structured post-programme tail
Cohort design	Parallel (loose)	Solo	Parallel	Parallel	Parallel (tight); inverted-U size optimum at approximately 6–15 teams
Team formation	Random or ad-hoc	Pre-formed	Pre-formed (selected)	Pre-formed (PI-led)	Structured matching on founder–problem fit
Assessment	Demo or pitch	Document	Metrics	Discovery report	Evidence rubric (validated learning, falsified hypotheses, demand signals)
Kill criteria and pivot governance	None	None	Implicit (investor signal)	Implicit (go or no-go)	Explicit, pre-committed evidence thresholds

Dimension	Hackathon	Business plan competition	Accelerator	NSF I-Corps	Venturethon
Mentor structure	None or ad-hoc judges	Faculty or judges	Single lead mentor and network	Instructor and teaching team	Plural mentorship: multiple mentors with single accountable lead
Post-event pathway	None (typical)	Prize only	Investor introductions	Phase II grant eligibility	Pre-committed pathway slots (incubation, accelerator fast-track or studio integration) with credibility guarantees

The comparison reveals that Venturethon's distinctive position emerges from the simultaneous combination of three properties not jointly present in adjacent formats: open access, in that eligibility is not gated by selectivity (cf. accelerators) or institutional funding (cf. I-Corps); methodological rigour, in that pedagogy is anchored in scientific and hypothesis-driven reasoning rather than ad-hoc build cycles (cf. hackathons) or written planning (cf. business plan competitions); and continuity, in that the programme terminates in pre-committed pathway slots rather than as a stand-alone event. The cohort-size inverted-U and pathway-credibility moderator referenced in the Venturethon column correspond to Propositions P2 and P4 of the framework introduced in Section 4.4.

6. Discussion: Implications, Boundary Conditions, Limitations

6.1 Implications for Entrepreneurship Education Design and Policy

Two implications follow. First, assessment design is the leverage point. Mauer et al (2021) and Kim (2025) both attribute the modest measured effects of entrepreneurship education in part to assessment regimes that do not capture entrepreneurial action. Venturethon's evidence-weighted rubric is one concrete instantiation of an action-centered assessment, in line with calls for "putting pedagogy back in" (Udeozor et al, 2025). The studio-borrowed insistence on systematic process also means programme quality is not solely dependent on individual instructor charisma, addressing a known scalability barrier (Liszt-Rohlf et al, 2026).

Second, the model is institutionally portable. The five Venturethon phases map naturally onto the EU EntreComp framework — opportunity-spotting and valuing ideas in Phase 1; mobilizing others in Phase 2; planning, coping with uncertainty and taking initiative in Phases 3–4; and financial literacy and communication in Phase 5. This mapping suggests Venturethon can be embedded within institutional accreditation regimes rather than running parallel to them, which materially eases adoption by policy actors funding entrepreneurship education infrastructure.

6.2 Boundary Conditions

The model is not universal. At least four boundary conditions limit its applicability. First, deep-tech ventures with multi-year R&D timelines (regulated medical devices, advanced materials, climate technologies) cannot meaningfully complete behavioral-validation tests within an 8-week window; for such ventures, I-Corps-style discovery is more appropriate than the Venturethon outcome rubric. Second, regulated industries where customer access is constrained (defense, certain financial products) may require modified validation protocols. Third, pre-undergraduate participants may lack the cognitive scaffolding for hypothesis-formulation training; Rys (2025) suggests adaptation is necessary for younger cohorts. Fourth, MBAs and other business-educated participants have been shown to resist hypothesis-driven methods (Leatherbee and Katila, 2020), implying a moderation by prior education that programme designers should anticipate.

6.3 Limitations and Future Research

The model presented here is conceptual; the propositions in Section 4.4 require empirical evaluation. A defensible evaluation design would be a quasi-experimental pre/post comparison of Venturethon participants against matched hackathon and business-plan-competition participants, using validated instruments — the Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy Scale (Chen, Greene and Crick, 1998) and the Entrepreneurial Intention Questionnaire (Liñán and Chen, 2009) — augmented by 12-month venture-creation tracking. Mediation analyses

should test whether peer benchmarking (P2) and hypothesis-formulation training (P3) account for any observed effects.

Two further research directions merit attention. First, the cultural assumptions embedded in lean-startup orthodoxy — the importance of speed, the legitimacy of pivoting, the centrality of individual entrepreneurial action — are themselves a research object; cross-cultural entrepreneurship education research (Kurniawan and Saputro, 2026) suggests these assumptions do not travel without adaptation. Second, the integration of generative-AI tooling into validation sprints (Doshi, Hauser and Ulu, 2025) is changing the cost of MVP creation and customer-interview synthesis, with implications the present model does not yet address.

7. Conclusion

This paper has presented Venturethon as a theoretically grounded, falsifiable conceptual model for entrepreneurship education that integrates experiential learning theory, hypothesis-driven entrepreneurship as evidenced by the scientific-approach research programme, and venture studio architecture. The contribution is not the validation sprint itself — that idea has antecedents in lean startup, I-Corps, and the broader hypothesis-driven tradition — but the explicit translation of venture studio architecture into educational programme design, paired with nine testable propositions and explicit boundary conditions.

The model is offered to the entrepreneurship education community as an object for empirical critique. Independent evaluation, particularly through randomized or quasi-experimental designs comparing Venturethon to alternative formats, is the necessary next step. The data infrastructure and cohort access required for such studies is in principle available; what is missing is the independent evaluative apparatus. Building that apparatus — through researcher-led collaborations, data-sharing agreements, and pre-registered protocols — would advance not only Venturethon as a model but also the broader project of putting entrepreneurship education pedagogy on an evidence-based footing.

Ethics Declaration

No ethical clearance was required for the research presented in this paper. The paper is conceptual and does not report data from human or animal subjects.

AI Declaration

This paper involved the use of an AI language model (ChatGPT by OpenAI) to support language refinement and formatting clarity during manuscript preparation. The tool was used to improve the articulation of ideas originally developed by the author. All AI-assisted texts were reviewed and edited to ensure academic integrity and accuracy. The author bears full responsibility for the content, analysis, and conclusions presented in this manuscript.

References

- Agarwal, R., Bacco, F., Camuffo, A., Coali, A., Gambardella, A., Msangi, H., Sonka, S., Temu, A., Waized, B. and Wormald, A. (2025) "Does a theory-of-value add value? Evidence from a randomized control trial with Tanzanian entrepreneurs", *Organization Science*, Vol 36, No. 2.
- Argyris, C. (1977) "Double loop learning in organizations", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol 55, No. 5, pp 115-125.
- Bae, T.J., Qian, S., Miao, C. and Fiet, J.O. (2014) "The relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions: A meta-analytic review", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol 38, No. 2, pp 217-254.
- Belingeri, P. and Lechner, C. (2025) "The venture building phenomenon", in *The New Venture Creation Paradigm*, Springer, Cham.
- Blank, S. and Dorf, B. (2012) *The Startup Owner's Manual: The Step-by-Step Guide for Building a Great Company*, K&S Ranch, Pescadero, CA.
- Camuffo, A., Cordova, A., Gambardella, A. and Spina, C. (2020) "A scientific approach to entrepreneurial decision making: Evidence from a randomized control trial", *Management Science*, Vol 66, No. 2, pp 564-586.
- Camuffo, A., Gambardella, A., Messinese, D., Novelli, E., Paolucci, E. and Spina, C. (2024) "A scientific approach to entrepreneurial decision making: Large-scale replication and extension", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol 45, No. 6, pp 1209-1237.
- Chen, C.C., Greene, P.G. and Crick, A. (1998) "Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers?", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol 13, No. 4, pp 295-316.
- Cohen, S., Fehder, D.C., Hochberg, Y.V. and Murray, F. (2019) "The design of startup accelerators", *Research Policy*, Vol 48, No. 7, pp 1781-1797.

- Curran, D. and Ozcan, P. (2025) "Founders for hire? The role of venture studios in breaking the individual-opportunity nexus", *Journal of Business Venturing*.
- Doshi, A.R., Hauser, O.P. and Ulu, C. (2025) "Generative AI and entrepreneurial experimentation", Working paper.
- Frederiksen, D.L. and Brem, A. (2017) "How do entrepreneurs think they create value?", *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, Vol 13, No. 1, pp 169-189.
- Gambardella, A., Messinese, D., Novelli, E., Pignataro, A. and Spina, C. (2025) "Design- and theory-based approaches to strategic decisions", *Organization Science*, Vol 36, No. 4, pp 1271-1287.
- Gompers, P., Kovner, A., Lerner, J. and Scharfstein, D. (2010) "Performance persistence in entrepreneurship", *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol 96, No. 1, pp 18-32.
- Jurgelevičius, A., Pakutinskas, P., Plečkaitis, E. and Riškevičienė, V. (2025) "Hackathons as a method for fostering corporate innovation and competitive advantage", *Proceedings of the 20th European Conference on Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, Vol 20, No. 1.
- Kim, Y.H. (2025) "Investigating innovative teaching practices of U.S. entrepreneurship instructors: Inquiry-based, learner-centered, and technology-integrated approaches", *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*.
- Kohne, A., Reuter, A. and Fischer, M. (2023) "Can hackathons contribute to the development of entrepreneurship among students at all? Case study of an educational healthcare hackathon", *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol 29, No. 4, pp 1-19.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984) *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Kurniawan, H.E. and Saputro, S. (2026) "Cultivating future innovators and leaders: Exploring entrepreneurial education across Asia", in *Reference Module Education*, Springer.
- Leatherbee, M. and Katila, R. (2020) "The lean startup method: Early-stage teams and hypothesis-based probing of business ideas", *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol 14, No. 4, pp 570-593.
- Liñán, F. and Chen, Y.W. (2009) "Development and cross-cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol 33, No. 3, pp 593-617.
- Liszt-Rohlf, V., Büker, R. and Kamsker, S. (2026) "Entrepreneurship education at all levels of education: A systematic research question-guided literature review on target group-appropriate entrepreneurship education", *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*.
- Mauer, R., Wuebker, R., Schlüter, J. and Brettel, M. (2021) "The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Vol 18, No. 3, pp 479-519.
- Maurya, A. (2012) *Running Lean: Iterate from Plan A to a Plan that Works*, 2nd ed., O'Reilly Media, Sebastopol, CA.
- McGrath, R.G. and MacMillan, I.C. (1995) "Discovery-driven planning", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol 73, No. 4, pp 44-54.
- Mujuru, N.M., Hyams-Ssekasi, D. and Mushunje, A. (2026) "Experiential learning in entrepreneurship education for sustainable agricultural development: A bibliometric analysis", Springer.
- National Science Foundation (2025) *2025 NSF Innovation Corps Biennial Report*, U.S. National Science Foundation, Alexandria, VA.
- Neck, H.M. and Greene, P.G. (2011) "Entrepreneurship education: Known worlds and new frontiers", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol 49, No. 1, pp 55-70.
- Osterwalder, A. and Pigneur, Y. (2010) *Business Model Generation: A Handbook for Visionaries, Game Changers, and Challengers*, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ.
- Resch, K., Freudhofmayer, S. and Martínez-Usarralde, M.J. (2025) "A promising methodology: Assessing the pedagogical value of hackathons", *Active Learning in Higher Education*.
- Ries, E. (2011) *The Lean Startup: How Today's Entrepreneurs Use Continuous Innovation to Create Radically Successful Businesses*, Crown Business, New York.
- Rys, M. (2025) "Youth hackathons: Empowering the next generation of innovators", *European Journal of Education*.
- Sánchez, S. et al (2025) "Systematic mapping of the literature on hackathons", *Frontiers in Education*, Vol 10.
- Sansone, G., Viglialoro, D., Ughetto, E. and Landoni, P. (2023) "What is a startup studio? Evidence from Europe", *Academy of Management Proceedings*.
- Udeozor, V., Hughes, M., Ogundana, O.M. and Umoru, U. (2025) "Putting pedagogy back in: Moving from 'whether' to 'when' compulsory entrepreneurship education 'works'", *Journal of Small Business Management*, pp 1-38.