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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to document the current provision of public post-secondary undergraduate entrepreneurship courses and programs in British Columbia through curriculum analysis and interviews with educators, in order to explore the possibilities and challenges of an integrated approach. An integrated approach to entrepreneurship education involves elements of what is valued from both a liberal and vocational context. Two key questions guided this study: What is the state of undergraduate entrepreneurship education in public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia? What needs to happen in order to bring an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education?

Entrepreneurship curriculum documents were reviewed through content analysis to achieve a broad mapping of the undergraduate post-secondary entrepreneurship education environment in British Columbia. By conducting 12 semi-structured, in-depth interviews with educators working in the entrepreneurship field, these materials were brought to life by the people who actually developed and used them in their educational practice.

Four major findings emerged from the study. Entrepreneurship is not yet well established in the public post-secondary context in British Columbia, as evidenced by the programming offered at the undergraduate level. There is diversity in philosophies of entrepreneurship education, from technical, skill-based approaches, to broader and more expanded approaches. Educators do identify entrepreneurship as its own field of education, distinct from closely related areas such as management and small business. They also recognize there are challenges in their practice that exist at the market, institutional, collegial, and student level, which influence the development of the field and how it is supported and positioned in the public post-secondary context in British Columbia. These issues have created dilemmas and pedagogical challenges for educators including student expectations and demands, lack of resources, institutional
limitations, teaching frustrations, time constraints and the inadequate treatment of ethics, and a lack of faculty willing to work in the entrepreneurship area.

The study concludes with strategies for educators, and outlines several recommendations to support an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education.
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CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH STUDY

The purpose of this study was to document the current provision of public post-secondary undergraduate entrepreneurship courses and programs in British Columbia through curriculum analysis and interviews with educators, in order to explore the possibilities and challenges of an integrated approach. An integrated approach to entrepreneurship education involves elements of what is valued from both a liberal and vocational context. This includes instruction on the skills, values, attributes, and knowledge to run a business or be entrepreneurial in a career, while also providing the foundations of ethical and moral reasoning as it relates to business, and the recognition of the responsibilities individuals will face as business leaders in the community. The purpose is to foster competitiveness, while also cultivating a caring value system and responsible citizenship. Entrepreneurship education in this study has been broadly defined to include an instructional process that focuses on an "entrepreneurial" method to problem-solving and the development of attributes such as personal initiative, creativity, and innovativeness, without limiting this process to a narrow context or field of activity. These definitions, and others used frequently throughout the study, are detailed and expanded upon under the "conceptual language" section in Chapter Two.

The Debate

Entrepreneurship education was not introduced at the post-secondary level until the mid-1900's and demand for its programming was not significant until the later part of that century (Newton & Menricks, 2003; Vesper & Gartner, 1997). The field has now grown to include more than 400 American and international schools offering courses in entrepreneurship (Finkle & Deeds, 2001, p. 616). However, the notion that entrepreneurship education is well established is challenged in the literature, and by the experiences of those in the field. For example, Vesper and
Gartner (1997) argue “the evolution of entrepreneurship programs in colleges and universities is still in its infancy” (p. 420).

As a new field struggling to define itself, entrepreneurship education has faced common obstacles associated with growth and development including recognition, credibility, support, and participation. “It is a discipline that remains particularly fragmented, often isolated, and surprisingly unsure of itself, its history, its accomplishments, its strengths, and its future” (Katz, 1991, p. 85). For the educator, the lack of standardization and a recognized and coherent theory and knowledge base has posed real challenges in the implementation of this teaching in practice. While adopted mainly by the business discipline, Gibb (1996) argues that there is little evidence of entrepreneurship receiving full acceptance or becoming mainstream even in business schools. “Ten years ago entrepreneurship faculty were often treated as lepers by their business school colleagues (or so the parable goes)” (Katz, 1991, p. 101).

The first major issue of the study centres on the state of entrepreneurship education in British Columbia, how well established it is as a field, what the struggles are for educators, and how they believe the field should develop. In order to engage with the issue of an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education, it is important to also reflect upon and understand the second issue, which centres on the aims of public education. Specifically, this broader conversation is concerned with discussing what is worth knowing, or what knowledge is of most worth, and who determines what knowledge is considered most valid. That is, whose values are embedded in the curriculum choices which determine the subject matter that a student is exposed to and taught.

This second part of the debate can broadly be divided into two camps: liberal theorists and vocational theorists, of which entrepreneurship education falls under the latter. Proponents on the liberal end of a liberal - vocational continuum (see, for example, Ball, 1999; Barlow & Robertson, 1994; Corson, 2000; Cronon, 1999; D’Innocenzo, 1999; Langiulli, 2000; Peters,
1973; Stunkel, 1999; Vaz, 2000) maintain that the role of education is to teach students about their responsibilities as citizens and about values such as morality, equality, and liberty. They dismiss vocational aims on the basis that educational institutions should not be pre-employment centres that prepare students primarily with skills that satisfy business or changing economic needs. They believe that vocational objectives are embedded within a capitalist or marketplace model that espouses values which contravene the purpose of public education. Education, they argue, is not about preparing students for a certain occupation or job, but rather about cultivating a value system that will enable them to function as informed citizens who can contribute in meaningful ways to their community and society.

Vocational theorists situated on the other end of the continuum (see, for example, Blawatt, 1998; Caird, 1990; Fleming, 1999; French & Puchner, 1999; Hynes, 1996; Ries, 2000; Sage, 1993; Warwick, 1998) see subjects like entrepreneurship having a significant and relevant role in school curriculum because they feel that education’s role is to prepare students for the world of work and the changing needs of the economy. Entrepreneurship is recognized as a valuable subject of study because it is seen to foster skills such as enterprise, creativity, and flexibility; skills that are deemed essential for succeeding in the current and future marketplace. Exposure to entrepreneurial curriculum material is also seen to maximize career options for students and provide enhanced employment prospects.

In order to speak to my knowledge and understanding in the area of entrepreneurship education and how this informs my perspective on the purpose of education, I have listed and described key assumptions regarding this area.

**My Assumptions**

As a result of my practice as an entrepreneurship educator, in addition to other subject areas such as marketing and management, I recognize that I bring with me assumptions about this subject that influence the research I perform and the conclusions I draw. “Especially in
applied fields, such as management, nursing, community development, education, and clinical psychology, a strong biographical element often drives the research interest" (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 28). Creswell (1998) also states that when designing a qualitative study, the researcher, whether explicitly or implicitly, will use an array of concepts that will guide the research (p. 19). Marshall and Rossman (1999) argue, however, that researchers must contain these assumptions because it is “the qualitative researcher’s challenge to demonstrate that this personal interest will not bias the study” (p. 28). In contrast, I chose to make my assumptions transparent and to demonstrate how my research is closely linked to my work with the objective that these findings are applied to and benefit my own practice. This approach reflects the orientation of the EdD in Educational Leadership and Policy. “The [EdD] program is designed primarily for people who are currently working and relies on the workplace as an important source of program content and as a site for carrying out the research project” (University of British Columbia, para. 2). Moreover, Creswell (1998) believes that outlining these assumptions helps to illuminate the researcher’s understanding of knowledge:

Knowledge is within the meanings people make of it; knowledge is gained through people talking about their meanings; knowledge is laced with personal biases and values; knowledge is written in a personal, up-close way; and knowledge evolves, emerges, and is inextricably tied to the context in which it is studied. (p. 19)

In general, I believe there is value in teaching students entrepreneurship and I feel this learning process does have a positive impact on future entrepreneurial success. I support a broader notion of entrepreneurship education that encompasses more than the business start-up stage. This entrepreneurial approach has applicability in multiple disciplines and numerous settings, and shares characteristics with liberal and vocational educational perspectives. I also believe educators need to be entrepreneurial in their teaching of this subject area, and that using a variety of styles and approaches will help facilitate an optimal learning environment. In what follows, I expand on several key beliefs that inform my approach to this study.
Entrepreneurship can be Taught

As an educator who teaches entrepreneurship to young people, many of whom lack previous entrepreneurial experience, I do believe strongly in the value of this practice. There continues to be debate in the literature about this issue, focusing in part on the notion of whether entrepreneurs are viewed as having inherent or learned skills:

Entrepreneurs are born, not made. That was the general belief during past decades when little work was done to try to develop entrepreneurs. Indeed, even today, many programs at the post-secondary level struggle for recognition and status because of lingering doubts about the effectiveness of entrepreneurship education and training. (Working Group on Youth Entrepreneurship, 1996, p. 36)

Dollinger (1999) also believes that the concept of what an entrepreneur is has changed over the years. In the past, entrepreneurs would often start up and run a business venture without the support of education, training, or business experts. Some researchers believe it is a certain mindset or openness to learning that defines the position. Entrepreneurship, Blawatt (1998) contends, is a subject that can be learned by, taught to, or applied by any individual who cares to take on the function (p. 126). Similarly, McGuckin (1998) feels that entrepreneurial skills can be acquired and improved by concluding that "you may not have developed all of these skills, but like most things in life, you can learn by reading, practice and determination" (p. 9). Good (2002) refers to a "state of mind" when defining entrepreneurship:

The missing element may be a necessary entrepreneurial mind-set: a single-mindedness and dedication to the achievement of a set of goals and objectives; confidence in your intuitive and rational capabilities; a capacity to think and plan in both tactical and strategic terms; and an attitude that reflects a penchant for action, frequently in situations in which information is inadequate. (p. 4)

Many researchers, such as Drucker (1985), believe there is not a "typical" profile of the entrepreneur nor are there certain innate skills that are a prerequisite for success:

Entrepreneurship is thus a distinct feature whether of an individual or of an institution. It is not a personality trait; in thirty years I have seen the most diverse personalities and temperaments perform well in entrepreneurial challenges...
Everyone who can face up to decision making can learn to be an entrepreneur and behave entrepreneurially. (pp. 25-26)

Other researchers such as Stevenson and Gumpert (1985) point to contextual issues as reasons for entrepreneurial success, such as access to resources and environmental conditions, which support these types of behaviour. “Rejecting the notion that entrepreneurship is an all-or-nothing character trait of certain individuals or groups, the authors look specifically at how entrepreneurs capitalize on change, identify opportunity, and marshal resources” (p. 85). For example, the rise in the numbers of educational institutions teaching entrepreneurship courses as demonstrated by Jack and Anderson (1999, p. 114) is providing accessible educational opportunities, and fostering an environment of acceptance and encouragement for this career path. Environmental factors, including the downsizing of corporations, globalization, and the increase in entrepreneurial studies at educational institutions, have altered Dollinger’s (1999) claims about who typical entrepreneurs tend to be. For example, today he sees a different category which he calls “professional entrepreneurs” because they rely on knowledge and technology as well as gut instinct (like before) to operate their business ventures (pp. 9-11). Rushing (1990) believes the entrepreneur develops from an interaction between what the individual acquired at birth, their education, and their experience:

> The family and environment play an important role in forming the attitudes of the entrepreneur. Role models are important. The entrepreneur emerges from an interplay of genetic transferal, environmental influences, individual learning, and life’s experiences to become a force for change through entrepreneurship. (p. 38)

There is evidence building from various empirical studies conducted which indicates that entrepreneurship can be taught and that education can be viewed as an important intervention; since this role can be culturally and experientially acquired, education and training can therefore enhance and influence entrepreneurship (see, for example, Falkang & Alberti, 2000, p. 102; Hynes, 1996, p. 11). Ronstadt (1990) argues, “strong indications exist that an entrepreneurial
education will produce more and better entrepreneurs than were produced in the past” (p. 69). Yet, there remains disparate perspectives about “what” constitutes entrepreneurship education. **Entrepreneurship Education is about More than Just Starting a Business**

Philosophies of what constitutes entrepreneurship education impact other areas, including teaching styles, assessment methods, and outcomes. Although most of the entrepreneurial programming I have been involved with at the curriculum development and instructional stage has concentrated almost entirely on the technical practice of starting up and running a business, I have, through reflection on my practice, come to view this as only part of the picture.

When I reviewed the literature on how the subject of entrepreneurship should best be taught, some limited viewpoints emerged. For example, if the philosophy is that entrepreneurship is mainly about learning to operate a business, then it becomes clear that the classroom operates as an artificial setting, arguing in effect against formal/institutional education. This is exemplified by Dollinger (1999) who claims that “the true tests of your entrepreneurial potential is in the marketplace, not in the classroom” (p. 19). By supporting this line of thinking that learning about entrepreneurship is accomplished best by “doing business,” there becomes no need for the inclusion of entrepreneurship subject matter in an academic environment, a setting which claims to teach skills and knowledge as well as attitudes, competencies, and values:

A final argument that the more conservative academics pursued in putting down the need for entrepreneurial studies was that, since a new venture cannot really be created in a classroom, the concept of entrepreneurship cannot be taught; that the concept of “starting one’s own business” does not really require academic treatment and is a trivial application of good management principles. (Blawatt, 1998, p. 52)

If entrepreneurship is only seen to be relevant to the “business” community, then it becomes apparent why academics and liberal theorists would argue against its inclusion in the

---

1 Part of the discussion around this point includes the debate as to whether there is a difference between small business management and entrepreneurship, which I clearly feel there is. The background on this debate is covered in the section under “conceptual language” in chapter 2.
public educational system. Ashmore (1996), for example, uses a purely business framework which excludes the notions of the citizenship or a greater societal context in which the entrepreneur operates. “Entrepreneurship is about applying new and different ideas to an area of expertise to serve the needs of consumers” (p. 36). Additionally, “community” usually refers to a business community, excluding the social, cultural, environmental, or political context. This perspective also reinforces the notion of entrepreneurship merely being about the creation of businesses, rather than more broadly viewed as creating community, or working on social problems. This is exemplified by Jack and Anderson (1999) who in recognizing how difficult it is to teach skills that are acquired experientially ensure their students are involved in numerous activities which link them to the practices and experiences of only the “business” community such as mentoring, visiting entrepreneurs, and networking events (p. 119).

The wider community, however, has a critical role to play in entrepreneurship education. It is important, I believe, that this learning be linked to community capacity, opportunity identification, and application to social problems, in addition to business problems. Rabbior (1990) identifies “community integration” as a key feature in the design of an effective entrepreneurship education program:

No area of instructional activity has more of a need – or a more positive potential – for community integration than entrepreneurship education. Entrepreneurs are hunters in their environment. They learn about their environment: They study it, examine it, turn it upside down, and look for what is wrong, what is needed, and what can be done. In short they are constantly on the hunt for opportunities. Students in entrepreneurship programs can learn from entrepreneurs in their community. They can see what has been done well, and can identify community needs, problems and solutions. Students can observe changes and identify opportunities. Bridges of all sorts can be built between the school and the community. Not only can the community be a fertile learning ground, students can also make a contribution to the community through their research, discoveries and activities. (p. 58)

Although it appears as if he is referring in this document to the broader community, I believe that “learning from entrepreneurs” is too limiting and should rather be expanded to “learning from leaders in the community.”
Rabbior also argues that entrepreneurship programs should have a broader focus beyond small
diagram business start-ups. By studying the entrepreneurial process and how to apply it to various
diagram situations and opportunities, he states that students can work in different environments including
corporations, government, schools, community service, and small business. Furthermore,
Rabbior claims that even if students do not start up their own business, “many, however, will
apply their skills, attitudes and knowledge to entrepreneurial endeavors in other forms of
initiative” (p. 60).

**Entrepreneurship Education can be Both Liberal and Vocational**

Although Jack and Anderson (1999) advocate for strong links with the business
diagram community when teaching entrepreneurship, they also discuss the difficulty and tension in
teaching a subject that is unpredictable, dynamic, unique, complex, and intangible. “Thus we see
the limitations of the science of management education in dealing with the unknowability of
entrepreneurship” (p. 112). They illustrate the difficulty in having entrepreneurship taught only
under a business education format:

Hence it is about using resources in a different, a Schumpertian, way. 
Furthermore, it has to be an inductive process in conditions of uncertainty. It is a
process of becoming, not the stasis of being. Consequently it cannot be
predictable; its generic form is unstructurable; it is unknowable and hence
unpredictable. Hence our principal dilemma in teaching entrepreneurship is that
enterprise is idiosyncratic, and therefore closer to an art than a science;
instrumental knowledge of managerialism alone is insufficient. (p. 113)

It is this “art” component of entrepreneurship education which demonstrates the rationale
for also incorporating a liberal education framework, as well as the need to recognize that
entrepreneurship education encompasses a much broader notion than vocational preparation.
Fleming (1999) talks of how entrepreneurial education is being widely introduced into higher
education institutions because of the awareness of the benefits of enterprising skills. “Enterprise
demands imagination, lateral thinking, flexibility and energy. Preparation and cultivation of these
attributes are occurring in the higher education system" (p. 405). Leon (2000) laments that the United Kingdom is far behind its counterparts, such as the United States, in offering entrepreneurial education because, in his view, a British mindset does not encourage innovation, or recognize the growing interest in these types of courses. He claims there is bias and ignorance regarding what entrepreneurial courses can teach and offer students:

Entrepreneurship touches on issues such as lifelong learning, what motivates individuals and collectives to succeed and to improve social and economic well-being. It is about developing the intellectual capability, skills and competencies to manage risk, innovate constantly and infuse new values in society. (p. 37)

Additionally, Fleming (1999) continues to refine entrepreneurship course structures at her institution, with “the aim to produce graduates who are capable of being innovative and who can recognize and create opportunities, take risks, make decisions, analyse and solve problems, and communicate clearly and effectively” (p. 405).

Jamieson (1984) has identified three categories of enterprise education: education for enterprise, education about enterprise, and education through enterprise. Johnson (1988) describes the distinction across the three categories:

With entrepreneurship education the process can be content-laden (education about enterprise), process driven (education through enterprise) or occupationally oriented (education for enterprise) and the products respectively will be people better informed about business, more enterprising people, and better prepared potential entrepreneurs. (p. 62)

Education for enterprise is the most developed format and instruction is primarily concerned with the start-up and development of small businesses, focusing primarily on the application of practical skills. The problems is courses of this nature (see, for example, House, 1995; Kent, 1990b; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1989\(^3\)) are void of any academic or theoretical content or relevance to the broader social and environmental context in which an entrepreneur operates:

\(^3\) Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, which will be referred to throughout this paper as OECD.
Nevertheless, one generalization can be made [learning for enterprise]: emphasis is on the acquisition of practical skills that may be applied rather than on theoretical or contextual knowledge that would critically examine the entrepreneur’s role and responsibilities in society. (House, 1995, pp. 130-131)

In contrast to this purely vocational format, the objective of education through enterprise is to teach life skills through enterprise activities, and as House (1995) claims, is a form of education that attempts to integrate both liberal and vocational education. “It is intended to develop enterprising competencies deemed ‘life skills’ that will enable people to cope with change or to create change itself – in ways compliant with social norms and traditions” (p. 131).

Hyslop-Margison (2001) argues in his doctoral dissertation that career preparedness programs can incorporate both liberal and vocational learning ideals into its teachings, and hence bridge this traditional divide. Using an Aristotelian intellectual virtue framework, he states that it is not incompatible to conceive of trained technicians who are also morally articulate democratic citizens (p. 19). In fact, his study suggests that career preparedness programs when properly developed using his framework can contain a genuine component of liberal education. “The choice is not the traditional bifurcated one between liberal and career education, but between career education that is liberal and that which is not” (p. 23). Entrepreneurship education that is liberal is my notion of an integrated approach.

**Entrepreneurship Educators Should be Entrepreneurial**

The successful entrepreneurship program should not only enable the teacher to be entrepreneurial – it should expect the teacher to be entrepreneurial. Students are encouraged to pursue entrepreneurship via effective role models. There is no more available and effective role model than the educator. Not only is it important that information be conveyed to students in an entrepreneurial way, the teacher can serve as one of the most important role models by providing examples of new and innovative ideas. (Rabbior, 1990, p. 63)

At first glance this may appear to be a narrow view of what qualifies as sufficient expertise to teach in the area of entrepreneurship. Since I have an expanded definition of entrepreneurship education beyond learning about business start-up, I do not argue that educators need to have a
specific self-employment background. Given that I do believe entrepreneurship education teaches skills, knowledge, and attitudes such as enterprise, creativity, flexibility, analytical decision-making, and problem-solving, the educator should be able to demonstrate and articulate these competencies and values to the learners. I also believe the educator needs to be committed to teaching this subject, provided with the flexibility in the learning environment to achieve its objectives, and have the support of the institution. Ashmore (1996) emphasizes the need for teacher training and resources if this discipline is to be supported. “Entrepreneurship can become part of the educational structure just as it has in entrepreneurial families if we follow three steps: train the teachers, give them materials, and convince the administrators that entrepreneurship is important” (p. 36).

At the Youth Entrepreneurial Development Focus Session held on November 5, 1997 in Kelowna, British Columbia, four key initiatives were put forward. One of the ideas discussed was the need for “training the teachers” in labour market information and awareness of the subject of entrepreneurship in order to promote its inclusion in school curriculum. Short-term goals determined at the sessions included developing educational materials for use in the classrooms in the school district and in-service training for existing teachers for Professional Development Days. Long-range plans consisted of introducing entrepreneurship education into the university degree programs. However, training educators primarily in labour market information is a very limited perspective on what this subject area includes. Instead, I argue that educators need to be trained in how to develop and teach an entrepreneurial approach, so students can learn to apply these skills, knowledge, and values to business ventures, as well as to other issues such as social problems, environmental concerns, and non-profit initiatives.

---

4 A partnership effort between Community Futures Development Corporation of Central Okanagan, the Business Development Bank of Canada, and School District 23 Career Programs Branch.
The Working Group on Youth Entrepreneurship (1996) contends that the process pertaining to entrepreneurship development is as critical, if not more critical, than the content that is being imparted (p. 42). Their youth entrepreneurship framework has key components which, they argue, must be considered in order to effect change through entrepreneurship education and training. The features of the instructor/trainer include being a role model and even a mentor in the classroom; self-selecting to teach this subject and being committed to the participants; networking the learners with resources, expertise, opportunities and counsel; relinquishing some control over parts of the learning environment; competency in how to handle divergence and creativity by encouraging the students to challenge existing practices; and the demonstration of risk-taking behaviour:

This is related to the need to change the learning environment from past traditions, to use new resources and methods, to challenge systems and bureaucracies, to challenge participants continually, to use methods they have never used before, to take on challenges they have never taken on before, and so forth. (p. 41)

I also believe that it is much more difficult and ineffectual to teach an entrepreneurial approach to learners if the educator is unable to demonstrate expertise in the skills, values, attitudes, and knowledge associated with entrepreneurship.

**Entrepreneurship Education Needs to be Taught Using a Multiplicity of Styles and Approaches**

Due to the applied nature of entrepreneurship, I believe utilizing only traditional or didactic styles will prove ineffectual in teaching this subject area. Rabbior (1990) concurs:

An effective program in entrepreneurship education will have to employ a variety of teaching styles and techniques in order to reach students who learn differently, to expose them to variety and change, to lead them by creative example, and to keep their minds from encountering a rut. (p. 59)

The Working Group on Youth Entrepreneurship (1996) argues for a mix of the methodologies as “educators and trainers will need to try to shake up the way participants view the world” (p. 38).

Garavan and O’Cinneide (1994b), in their review on entrepreneurship education and training
programs stress that strong facilitation is a key feature in successful entrepreneurial programs and that often the educator takes on numerous roles such as counselor, coach, mentor, role model, consultant, and guide (p. 17).

Black and Mendehall (see Blawatt, 1998) use a teaching format that demonstrates factual, analytic, and experiential methodology that proceeds in stages from verbal to observational to participative to behavioural (pp. 57-58). The lowest form of learning is achieved from lectures, self-instruction, and the reading of textbooks and written material. Presentations are a useful observational technique for having students see how concepts are talked about in practice. One of the most effective techniques, Blawatt contends, is mentoring whereby the teacher and students take on a participative focus as the teacher tries to guide the student through their learning process. Aside from a purely experiential focus where students start their own ventures or operate a simulation, it is class projects which provide for high learning opportunities:

Lectures, discussions, cases and working on assignments are all consistent with the manner in which students are encouraged to learn the discipline and are encouraged to experience the principles. However, the most productive learning experience (and the emphasis is on self-discovery as a component of that) is by having students take on a project in the subject. (p. 58)

The idea of discovery methods is also incorporated into Hynes’s (1996) process model of entrepreneurship education (see Appendix D) which utilizes what he refers to as formal and informal teaching methods. Formally, this is accomplished by teaching theory and concepts through didactic methods such as readings and seminars with an “expert” educator who facilitates the process and assesses the learning of knowledge through formal methods. This learning is combined with informal teaching practices that emphasize development of proficiencies, attribute development, and behavioural change through skill building and discovery methods (pp. 10-11). Skill building activities include case studies, group discussions, and brainstorming sessions, while discovery methods encourage learning by doing or
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experiential learning. For example, students may problem solve real world situations or work as consultants for small firms in the business sector.

Hynes also believes that an integrated approach must be adopted that encourages interdisciplinary teams and project work (p. 17). This interdisciplinary approach signals that this subject should not just be offered only in the business or vocational or career preparedness area of instruction, but rather should complement liberal teachings, and be offered to students across all disciplines. It was an aim of this study to develop principles or tenets of an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education that would appeal to a broad spectrum of learners and educators.

**Introduction to the Research Problem**

One part of the debate concerns the state of undergraduate entrepreneurship education in British Columbia. Specifically, how established is the field, how should it develop, and what are the challenges for educators who work in this area? The other part of the debate looks more broadly at what is the purpose of education and whose interests or needs are being served. One way to consider this discussion is to focus on the extreme ends of the continuum, which sets up a dualism between the liberal perspective which focuses on the pursuit of knowledge and intellectual excellence, and the vocational and entrepreneurial perspective which argues for the pursuit of competence or practical utility.

Is the only solution for educational institutions that continue to struggle with the true aim or purpose of public education to choose one set of principles over the other? Are these two positions mutually exclusive? A problem with this “assumed” dualism is that it sets up a narrow view of what each tenet supports by claiming that liberal education is only an intellectual exercise with no practical utility and that vocational education, while being practically useful, has no intellectual foundation. When one position of public education is supported over another, it is seen to be done at the expense of what the other perspective offers. Could these principles be
incorporated and integrated to provide the learner with a broader exposure to these traditions and principles? Pring (1995) argues that the goals of education are more complex and extensive than what one tradition is able to address, and claims that a reconceptualization is required:

Surely if we focus on what it means to become fully a person, and to render personal that which so often arrives in an impersonal form – if, in other words, we respect both the learner and those cultural resources upon which that learning must draw – then there seems no reason why the liberal should not be conceived as something vocationally useful and why the vocationally useful should not be taught in an educational and liberating way. (p. 183)

Pring believes that the debate reinforces a false divide – a dichotomy between theory and practice – and emphasizes a dualism between education and training. Such approaches position these ideas as oppositional, rather than seeing the value and complementarity of these concepts.

This problem of a dualism or incompatibility between the two traditions is manifest in the discussion about why entrepreneurship education should be offered at educational institutions. For if entrepreneurship education is conceived of as only being concerned with teaching skills and knowledge that are practically useful, and which fulfill the needs of the employers and the larger marketplace, then it becomes apparent why liberal, and other theorists, are opposed to, or concerned with its inclusion in the curriculum. This is a narrow view that needs to be challenged.

This supposed bifurcation is too limiting a view of what entrepreneurship education offers. Learning about entrepreneurship requires the development of specific skills and knowledge in areas such as operations, marketing and finance. However, it also requires the fostering of cognitive competencies such as critical thinking and analysis, tactical and strategic decision making, goal setting, and planning, often without prescribed methods and paths to follow. In addition, entrepreneurs must work with and collaborate with numerous individuals and need to know and learn about dispositions, and the importance of respect and cooperation, teambuilding, negotiation, and leadership.
Further still, entrepreneurial education confronts notions of values and attitudes by discussing issues of personal values and measurements of success, and concepts of fairness and equity, ethics, and the notion of social and community responsibility. It is these principles that liberal theorists claim to teach which need to be, and can be, integrated into entrepreneurial education. Without exposure to these principles, students are taught about business ownership in a vacuum without recognition of how their role interacts with, and is a part of the broader society:

Among the numerous suggestions for ways enterprise education may be improved, several have called for it to be integrated into a liberal education which would cultivate innovation competencies, attitudes of social responsibility and the norms and behaviours of the common culture to ensure innovation progresses in ways that will not destabilize the social order. (House, 1995, p. 153)

Therefore, in this study I am making a case for an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education. As mentioned in the introduction, this approach teaches the skills and knowledge required to engage in entrepreneurship, as well as discusses the social, historical, political and cultural context in which entrepreneurs operate, and the ethical and moral decisions these individuals may face as business leaders in the community. An integrated approach to entrepreneurship education is a worthy goal to struggle for because it recognizes the importance of developing characteristics such as innovation, creativity, imagination and initiative, which are being sought in the marketplace, and it develops skills that enhance employment opportunities. This learning is also important because it promotes democracy and community, so that individuals learn about how to make a living, while also being taught how to live cooperatively with others, recognizing ways in which they can contribute to the broader community through the work that they do.
Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to map public, post-secondary entrepreneurship education in British Columbia to learn about the state and progression of the field, as well as to uncover the meanings and understandings educators involved in its development have about this subject area. Reflecting on their views, together with the wider literature, moved the discussion forward regarding what an integrated approach would look like, and the challenges for educators of implementing this in practice. Given these issues, the research questions that guided this research were:

- What is the state of undergraduate entrepreneurship education in public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia?
  - How established is entrepreneurship education?
  - What kinds of entrepreneurship education are currently being offered?
  - What are the explicit and implicit goals of these offerings?
  - What liberal and/or vocational goals/values are evident in the curriculum under study?
- What needs to happen in order to bring an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education?
  - What form/shape should this take?
  - How can such an approach be implemented?
  - What are the challenges for educators?

Situating My Practice

For the last eight years, my practice has been grounded in the area of youth entrepreneurship. When I moved to the community of Kelowna, British Columbia, I had taken on a job where the duties and responsibilities focused on youth entrepreneurship. Over time, my knowledge and relationships in this area increased in addition to my interest and involvement, and I began to develop a real passion for working with youth entrepreneurs.
My career path has evolved over the last several years (from banker, to entrepreneur, to professor) as I sought out the best avenue to contribute in this area, while making a living for myself. A large proportion of my work with self-employed youth is also voluntary through various committees, speaking engagements, and mentoring; I was recognized for this commitment and support to youth entrepreneurship in my region with an award in the year 2000. As I reflect on these career choices, I realize that I left the banker position and started my own business training company to seek the youth entrepreneurship training component that my organization was no longer pursuing. As I investigated and tested out the public post-secondary environment, I realized I was looking to this position as a way to participate in the longer-term education and follow-up for youth entrepreneurs that was not a component of the short-term training programs in my own business.

I have chronicled my involvement with youth entrepreneurship initiatives in Appendix A to help the reader understand my experience in this area. I consider myself one of the many champions for youth entrepreneurship in my community, and believe we have developed a culture that stands as a model for the rest of our province:

In some communities, service providers have begun a collaborative process to coordinate the local youth entrepreneurship system of service delivery. For example, service providers in the Kelowna area have formed a team and see themselves as having successfully completed the “first lap of the race.” Communities such as these could share their experiences and provide guidance elsewhere in the province. (Malatest & Associates Ltd., 2000, p. 15)

I continued in my role of Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Business at Okanagan University College with the responsibility of overseeing the entrepreneurship programming in our department. However, I recognized that I was not satisfied with the education that we were providing our students. This continual reflection is borne out of the EdD program which has encouraged me to ask questions and challenge the assumptions of the work I do, while searching for new ways of looking at, and doing my practice:
The purpose of the program [EdD] is to engage students in the advanced study of educational leadership and policy in order that they can both critique and improve their own practice. It is this focus on practice - studying practice, trying to understand practice, being constructively critical of practice, improving one's practice - that primarily distinguishes the program from more traditional doctoral programs whose aim is to prepare people for scholarship and the extension of knowledge. (University of British Columbia, para. 1)

I feel that at my institution (and in previous training courses I have taught for youth entrepreneurs) we have offered a technical view of entrepreneurship focusing mainly on the mechanics of starting a business. This is due in part, I believe, to the lack of space in our business curriculum to accommodate an expanded approach, a result of external factors or what I refer to as the "politics of curriculum." In addition, the educators who teach entrepreneurship at my institution have yet to formally identify and articulate a philosophy of entrepreneurship with a framework which could be used to guide the development and growth of this area, ensuring the curricula is based upon sound outcomes, assessment techniques, and teaching practices. The difficulty in developing a philosophy of entrepreneurship is further confounded by the newness of the field. "Entrepreneurs have only lately become the subject of serious research in the public media, even though some academics have been studying the topics for decades" (Blawatt 1998, p. 1). This is because, Blawatt suggests, much of the writing, thinking and education in the 1950s, 60s and 70s focused on big government, big business, and big labour to the exclusion of small business and the entrepreneur (p. 3). Finally, this area of programming at my institution had been taught by the same educator for the last ten years; the department was looking for a new "champion," someone with fresh eyes, a new perspective, and the energy and enthusiasm to investigate innovative new practices of entrepreneurship education. It was the aim of this study to be those "fresh eyes."
Significance of the Study

There has been tremendous growth in the demand for entrepreneurship education in the last two to three decades, accompanied by a large surge in the offering of entrepreneurial programs and courses by educational institutions and entrepreneurial agencies (see Blawatt, 1998; Falkang & Alberti, 2000; Finkle & Deeds, 2001; Garavan & O’Cinneide, 1994a; Hynes, 1996; Jack & Anderson, 1999; Katz, 2003; Kent, 1990b; Menzies & Gasse, 1999; Vesper & Gartner, 1997). Many researchers and practitioners, such as Hynes (1996), believe that with the changing economic and business structures, and the shift to non-traditional employment, entrepreneurship will become cemented as its own field of study:

Essentially we see the emergence of an SME [small and medium-sized enterprises] economy, which leads to the need to prepare and educate potential entrepreneurs to identify opportunities in the environment, and provide them with the knowledge and skills necessary to capitalize and manage these opportunities. (pp. 11-12)

Others, such as Katz (2003), already see it as a major academic discipline that is growing worldwide and succeeding beyond anyone’s past predictions (p. 298). The responsibility to provide students with entrepreneurial skills is shared by educators and the greater community including government, business leaders and the public, and its competencies important for all learners regardless of their entrepreneurial intentions. As Blawatt (1998) argues:

It will be up to society and the education system to stimulate the development of entrepreneurial graduates particularly through courses and programs in entrepreneurship, to produce increasing numbers of young managers who are attuned to effective ways of pursuing opportunities and managing resources. (p. 48)

Yet, there remains limited entrepreneurship research in areas such as Canada (Menzies and Gasse, 1999), and scant attention in the research completed on entrepreneurship programming issues such as effective teaching methods:

Entrepreneurship, as an academic discipline, lacks an appropriate forum – a number of articles presenting the results of entrepreneurial research frequently appear in journals, but research related to curriculum development, programme
content and problems associated with programme development, have, for the most part, gone unnoticed. (Garavan & O’Cinneide, 1994a, p. 5)

Katz (1991; 2003) argues that educators need to know how best to teach students in skills related to entrepreneurship, and that the uncertainty regarding what form entrepreneurship education should take, will be the dominant issue of the new century. Falkang and Alberti (2000) also recognize the need for better consistency in the content and approach to entrepreneurship courses and acknowledge how limited the research in this area has been.

This study has the potential to be of value to educators, program planners, and curriculum developers who are involved with entrepreneurship programming at the post-secondary level, because it makes known the experiences and understandings people have of this area from their respective institutional positions. It is the beginning of a “forum”; a place for sharing pedagogy, experiences, philosophies, and outcomes with other interested practitioners, without specifying a “best practices” model that must fit within all programs:

More theoretical guidelines to aid in conceptualizing how entrepreneurship as an innovative activity may relate to the culture and purpose of educational institutions should be developed, but the research agenda specifically does not advocate working toward the provision of a single authority to guide the teaching of entrepreneurship. . . . The absence of authority may be a positive for it ensures continuous diversity, and with this, vitality, relevance, growth and improvement as various industries and cultures adapt the combined practices of others, improve upon them to introduce the “best practice” of the day which competitors will copy, refine, and reconcile to meet the needs of their own cultures, then transform them into the next paradigm to be subsequently improved. (House, 1995, p. 162)

This study’s significance is relevant to an even broader community than entrepreneurship practitioners because its objective is to expand the notion and construct of entrepreneurship education to engender greater participation and integration with other disciplines and institutions. For if this research can cause educators to critically evaluate their assumptions about this area and consider the value of a more integrative approach, then the study can be of significance to educators across multiple disciplines. Unfortunately, as Kent (1990b) argues, there is limited research on how entrepreneurship affects, and is affected by, the social environment:
If entrepreneurship is to become a full-fledged discipline, capable of standing on its own merits rather than as an adjunct to existing majors in the business school, then a more broad-based approach to the collegiate entrepreneurship curriculum must be pursued. (p. 115)

The OECD (1989) in its document on enterprising culture, also advocates for a broader approach to entrepreneurship, moving away from a narrow business entrepreneurialism definition focused on business start-up and management, to a definition of enterprise learning where individuals, societies, and cultures learn competencies to respond to social and economic change. The implications for this more integrative approach is that is requires a shift in conceptualizing how entrepreneurship is defined and what qualifies as education under this framework:

What is significant about the implications of the broad approach for educationalists is that it requires changes in education methods and pedagogy towards what is termed ‘enterprise learning’ rather than (as in the case of the narrow approach) changes in the curriculum. (OECD, 1989, p. 7)

I hope that through this research I can encourage educators to reflect on their notion of entrepreneurship, question the inclusiveness of their approach, and examine whose interests are being served, in order to ensure the realization of its full potential in the educational context.

Chapter Preview

The first chapter has introduced the purpose and key issues of the study, and identified the research questions that guided this research. Chapter Two begins by mapping key terms and their meanings. The debate over the current state of entrepreneurship education, how the field should develop, and how supported educators are in their practice is then explored. This debate continues with the examination of entrepreneurial education from a broad liberal and vocational perspective, including arguments for and against its inclusion in the curriculum. This part of the debate informs a much larger discourse which is also discussed, pertaining to what is really worth knowing and who decides what knowledge is considered valid. Chapter Three describes the research design and context of public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia.
involved in entrepreneurship programming at the undergraduate level. The methodology is also explained, as is the data analysis procedures utilized to generate the main themes emanating from this study. The results from the document review stage are identified in Chapter Four, and the participant interview findings are provided in Chapter Five. The key findings and major themes of the study are discussed and analysed in Chapter Six in relation to the research literature in this area. Chapter Seven concludes the study by discussing the implications for entrepreneurship education and recommendations to support an integrated approach, areas identified for future research, and the impact of this study on my practice.
CHAPTER TWO:
LITERATURE REVIEW

This study explores the current state of the field of entrepreneurship education by mapping the course and program offerings at the undergraduate level in British Columbia, and investigating the lived experiences of educators. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, my goal is to not only document what is taking place in this province in relation to entrepreneurship education, but to also recommend that the field should develop in a particular direction— one that reflects an integrated approach to teaching entrepreneurship. In this chapter, I locate this specific research project in relation to the current scholarship of entrepreneurship education. Three key areas are covered in the following review.

In the first section, concepts and definitions of key terms related to entrepreneurship education are considered. In the second section I review what research has been undertaken and what other entrepreneurship scholars are saying about the growth and development of the field, what form its development is taking, and what the critical issues are for educators. The third and final section of this chapter shifts away from a focus on entrepreneurship education specifically to a wider discussion— the vocational-liberate debates about the goals of education. This third section includes a discussion of the need for an integrated approach to education generally, and the problems with elements of the debate that reinforce a false dichotomy between vocational and liberal aims of education.

Conceptual Language

With the revival of interest in entrepreneurship and small business, a number of terms have emerged to describe these activities, which are often used interchangeably, while ignoring the implications these have for policy and practice:

A number of key words such as 'entrepreneur,' 'small business,' 'enterprise,' enterprise culture,' and 'intrapreneurship,' are therefore in common use, not only among politicians, but among large sections of the business community. Several
of these words, particularly 'entrepreneur,' ‘enterprise,’ and ‘small business,’ are frequently used as if they were synonymous. Yet this is quite clearly not so. (Gibb, 1987, p. 3)

How does one interpret the imprecise language that surrounds these concepts, and what specific applications will be used for this study?

**Entrepreneurship**

The term entrepreneurship conjures up many different images, and there does not exist a standard definition that is widely accepted in the literature. “Despite more than two decades of research and study, a consistent definition that would locate the entrepreneur in a workable framework remains elusive” (Blawatt, 1998, p. 2). It is difficult to stereotype what defines a typical entrepreneur, and hence there are endless descriptions offered depending on the key characteristics that are emphasized. The French economist J.B. Say coined the term “entrepreneur” in approximately 1800 and defined it as someone who “... shifts economic resources out of an area of lower and into an area of higher productivity and greater yield” (Drucker, 1985, p. 21). This value entrepreneurs create through the course of change was studied in the 20th century by economist Joseph Schumpler, who referred to this process as “creative destruction” to identify entrepreneurs who revolutionized, reformed, or exploited old practices and became innovators and change agents in the new economy (Dees, 1998). Drucker (1985) builds on these earlier definitions but focuses more on “purposeful innovation” as opposed to the creation of change when describing entrepreneurship:

> Entrepreneurs see change as normal and as healthy. Usually, they do not bring about the change themselves. But – and this defines entrepreneur and entrepreneurship – the entrepreneur always searches for change, responds to it, and exploits it as an opportunity. (pp. 27-28)

Gibb (1987) focuses on this concept of innovation in addition to addressing the notion of change:

> Overall, however, there is support for the view that the entrepreneur brings together the factors of production, that he/she behaves in an ‘innovative’ fashion in managing these, and that innovation can be defined in terms of incremental change as well as major step change. (p. 4)
Dollinger (1999) also comments on the vast number of definitions of entrepreneurship, and identifies common characteristics found in these definitions including: creativity and innovation, resource gathering and the founding of an economic organization, and the chance for gain under risk and uncertainty (p. 4). He then summarizes these traits and provides his own definition of entrepreneurship which is “the creation of an innovative economic organization (or network of organizations) for the purpose of gain or growth under conditions of risk and uncertainty” (p. 4). Blawatt (1998) also emphasizes the creative aspect when he argues that “an entrepreneur is an individual who creates something of value at a time and a place where there was no such thing before. He or she initiates the development of a desirable product or service and then builds an organization to exploit it” (p. 13). Finally, Timmons (1990) defines entrepreneurs as their ability to seek out opportunities and to attract and build resources:

Fundamentally, entrepreneurship is a human creative act. It involves finding personal energy by initiating and building an enterprise or organization, rather than by just watching, analyzing or describing one. Entrepreneurship usually requires a vision and a passion, commitment, and motivation to transmit this vision to other stakeholders, such as partners, customers, suppliers, employees, and financial backers. It also requires a willingness to take calculated risks – both personal and financial – and then doing everything possible to influence the odds. Entrepreneurship involves building a team of people with complementary skills and talents; of sensing an opportunity when others see chaos, contradiction and confusion; and of finding, marshalling and controlling resources (often owned by others) to pursue the opportunity. (pp. 5-6)

Many of the books and articles addressing the issue of entrepreneurship highlight key characteristics that the authors state will improve one’s success, and often include self assessments with certain behaviours and traits checklists to help individuals determine their entrepreneurial quotient. “While most writers in the field of entrepreneurship agree that there is no single profile, no specific set of characteristics that defines a successful entrepreneur, there do appear to be some common attributes, abilities and attitudes” (Good, 2002, p. 12). Similarly, Blawatt (1998) claims the following:
While a number of researchers believe that the entrepreneur can be defined within a structure, others suggest that there are a number of behavioural components that can be set into schools of entrepreneurship. Others introduce the notion of discrete classifications, ranging from specific traits to interactionism. (p. 122)

Berman (1997) states that most successful entrepreneurs have a combination of certain personal characteristics that differentiate them from other people. These include drive, self-confidence, self-starter, high energy, passion, moderate risk-taking, and wanting to be their own boss (pp. 13-14). McGuckin (1998, pp. 9-12) believes there are six key skills that are necessary for entrepreneurial success; these include people, personal, financial, technical, communication, and marketing skills. However, there does not appear to be consensus on exactly which skills and behaviours are essential for entrepreneurial success, nor if each business type or industry requires the same set of characteristics. “It is important to emphasize that there are undoubtedly many attitudes and behaviours characterizing the entrepreneurial mind and there is no single set of attitudes and behaviours that every entrepreneur must have for every venture opportunity” (Timmons, 1990, p. 165). Definitions have also developed that refer to examples of what is considered a successful entrepreneur as a way of explaining the term:

However, while the definitions of what constitutes an entrepreneur are many and would likely fill many pages in a textbook, the simple observation is that most definitions identify an individual who is a successful entrepreneur. The labels are applied subsequent to one becoming successful. (Blawatt 1998, p. 123)

Similarly, Good (2002, p. 4) claims that “entrepreneurship is difficult to define precisely. Entrepreneurs tend to be identified not by formal rank or title, but in retrospect – after the successful implementation of an innovation or idea.”

There still remains an imprecise definition of “entrepreneur” two centuries after the term was developed. Due to the lack of clear consensus on its description, there also appears to be confusion over the language used to describe the education and training provided to entrepreneurs.
Small Business

Small business and entrepreneurship are often used interchangeably throughout the literature or included in each other’s definition. For example, the Small Business Profile 2002 (Western Economic Diversification Canada, BC Ministry of Competition, Science and Enterprise, and BC Stats, 2002) defines small business by focusing on the number of employees: businesses with fewer than 50 employees (also referred to as small and medium enterprises or SMEs) and businesses operated by a person who is self-employed but has no paid employees (p. 1). Their definition encompasses owner-operators and individuals who are self-employed. The United States Small Business Administration’s guidelines which consist of characteristics used to define small business (Corman & Lussier, 2001, pp. 1-9) also refer to number of employees (for example, fewer than 250 employees as a general rule in manufacturing) and annual sales receipts across different industries (for example, annual sales receipts under $2 million in the retail sector).

Many theorists view these concepts, small business and entrepreneurship, as having different definitions. Blawatt (1998) claims that although they are not mutually exclusive, they do have separate and distinct meanings. A recurring theme throughout the research literature is that small business and entrepreneurship are concepts that describe different processes and outcomes of entrepreneurial “states” based on characteristics of the ventures described broadly as either growth-oriented and innovative, or static and stable. Blawatt’s main distinction is whether this process is continually innovating, seeking out new opportunities and attempting to grow, which he characterizes as entrepreneurial, or whether the process is one that is managing the growth and looking for stability and consistency rather than pioneering improvements and advancements (p. 16).

Drucker (1985) does not feel that running a small business is a sufficient criterion for entrepreneurship, and requires characteristics beyond this activity. “Indeed, entrepreneurs are a
minority among new businesses. They create something new, something different; they change or transmute values” (p. 22). Similarly, Sexton and Bowman (as cited in Garavan & O'Cinneide, 1994a) see a clear distinction between the concepts and suggest that small business includes simple or small-scale forms of self-employment and that entrepreneurship, as a career, is practiced and thought about in different terms. “It must not be forgotten that while all entrepreneurs are self-employed, not all self-employed persons are entrepreneurs” (p. 4). Gibb (1987, p. 6) also makes this distinction between small business owners who actively manage the business, and the entrepreneur who demonstrates a marked use of “enterprising” attributes. These attributes include:

- Initiative
- Moderate rather than high risk-taking activity
- Creativity
- Problem-solving ability
- Imagination
- Hard work
- Strong persuasive powers
- High belief in control of one’s own destiny
- Independence/autonomy
- Need for achievement
- Leadership

Kent (1990a) claims there is a fundamental difference between small business management and entrepreneurship that should be reflected in the educational content provided to students. “Small business management is a very narrow field that provides instruction on how to run a business. Entrepreneurship education may include small business management, but goes well beyond to cover the steps necessary to innovate, start a business and carry it forward” (p. 9). Blawatt (1998) also uses criteria such as innovativeness to differentiate entrepreneurial firms from small businesses in three essential ways. First, the entrepreneurial firm is innovative and continues to improve its products and services. Second, it continues to grow, and seeks a dominant position in the market place. Finally, it continues to take calculated risks, opening new vistas in the market, taking on new products, and expanding the organization to fulfill growth objectives (p. 18).
Enterprise

Enterprise and entrepreneurship are often used interchangeably in the literature and many researchers do not distinguish between these two terms. For example, Falkang and Alberti (2000) discuss the tremendous growth in entrepreneurship courses and cluster both types of programs into one framework. “Many programmes broadly termed ‘enterprise’ or ‘entrepreneurship’ education have been carried out in schools and higher education institutions throughout the world” (p. 101). Gibb (1987) asserts that much of the confusion over the terms is that certain countries prefer and use specific terms that may not be as recognized or practiced in other countries; Canada and the United States both employ the term entrepreneurship education much more common than in Europe. The preferred term in the UK and Irish context is enterprise rather than entrepreneurship, although enterprise can be defined in terms of the same attributes as for entrepreneurial characteristics.

Some authors, such as Caravan and O’Cinneide (1994a), have made clear distinctions between enterprise education that represents a broader approach of competencies and abilities for enterprise learning, and entrepreneurship education that focuses primarily on the knowledge and skills for business start-up, growth and management:

The major objectives of enterprise education are to develop enterprising people and inculcate an attitude of self-reliance using appropriate learning processes. Entrepreneurship education and training programmes are aimed directly at stimulating entrepreneurship which may be defined as independent small business ownership or the development of opportunity-seeking managers within companies. (p. 4)

Hynes (1996) makes this similar distinction by stating that enterprise education can address a broad range of problems and activity, of which entrepreneurship is included. “Enterprise education will provide the introduction to entrepreneurship which is the foundation stone on which new businesses are developed” (p. 10). Similarly, the key difference Gibb (1987) makes, is that enterprise can be exercised in any task or environmental context whereas entrepreneurship
is enterprising behaviour most commonly occurring in commerce or business. “An entrepreneur is, therefore, simply an enterprising person” (p. 7).

The OECD (1989) expands on this distinction made between entrepreneurship and enterprise by claiming that enterprising skills are concerned with personal development and “. . . encompass those personal dispositions, abilities and competences related to creativity, initiative, problem-solving, flexibility, adaptability, and the taking and discharging of responsibility, and knowing how to learn and relearn” (p. 36). Enterprising skills, the OECD argues, can be applied to environments such as communities, schools and societies, and should not be used synonymously with the terminology of entrepreneurs who are engaged strictly in business or commercial activities. Furthermore, entrepreneurship is conceptualized as a “product” to be added to the curriculum, whereas enterprise is a learning process transferred to living and working contexts. “It [enterprise] is a statement about an approach to life, and not a description of a body of knowledge” (p. 38). Erkkila (1999) concurs after reviewing entrepreneurial education texts in three different countries:

As it appears in the current literature, entrepreneurship education in the United States is more directly focused upon small business and entrepreneurship, whereas enterprise education in the United Kingdom and Finland is aimed at the development of enterprising behaviour, skills and attributes, not only for business use. (p. 18)

**Social Entrepreneurship**

“The concept of ‘social entrepreneurship’ has been rapidly emerging in the private, public and non-profit sectors over the last few years, and interest in social entrepreneurship continues to grow” (Johnson, 200, p. 1). The interest in this area can be attributed to several factors including the government’s role away from a social welfare state, and the ineffectiveness of our social institutions (Dees, 1998). Yet a definition of social entrepreneurship seems as elusive as entrepreneurship, also due in part to the newness of this area. Dees refers to
Schumpeter, Say, and Drucker, and identifies similar characteristics such as innovation, value, opportunity and change, when describing social entrepreneurship:

Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector by:
- adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value);
- recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission;
- engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning;
- acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand; and
- exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created. (p. 4)

Similar to the debates described between small business and entrepreneurship, discussions regarding the classification of social entrepreneurship are also occurring. For example, Thompson, Alvy, and Lees (2000) talk about the distinction between activities in the social entrepreneurship field that are more traditional, and those that demonstrate creativity and innovativeness in their solutions:

In some cases the idea will be completely new and innovative and associated with the founder – in essence, truly entrepreneurial. In other cases the initiative will be a variant on a theme – sometimes a close copy, something genuinely different – but real enterprise will be required to make things happen. (p. 330)

The key feature that appears to be common to all definitions (see Creamer & Taylor, 2001; Dees, 1998; Johnson, 2000; Schuyler, 1998) is the “social” purpose of the activity; social problems, a social mission, social change, social causes, or social justice, are all referred to as the intended purpose and effect:

In spite of varying definitions of social entrepreneurship, one commonality emerges in almost every description: the ‘problem-solving nature’ of social entrepreneurship is prominent, and the corresponding emphasis on developing and implementing initiatives that produce measurable results in the form of changed social outcomes and/or impacts. (Johnson, 2000, p. 5)

This social purpose is also the element that differentiates social entrepreneurship from business entrepreneurship. “Mission-related impact becomes the central criterion, not wealth creation. Wealth is just a means to an end for social entrepreneurs. With business entrepreneurs, wealth creation is a way of measuring value creation” (Dees, 1998, p. 3).
Others define social entrepreneurship even more broadly claiming it can occur in the public, private, and non-profit sectors, looking more at the approach to social issues as opposed to the outcomes. “These definitions tend to put more emphasis on the ‘entrepreneurial’ nature of these activities and the creativity and innovation that entrepreneurs bring to solving social problems in unique ways rather than focusing on the social benefits such services can provide” (Johnson, 2000, p.6). Creamer and Taylor (2001) also point to the blurring of public and private sector spheres. For example, they have witnessed in the last ten years, for-profit companies integrating social values and a social commitment into their business decisions and company culture, and as a result, positively affecting their bottom line:

It is increasingly apparent that social responsibility need not be viewed as an impediment to achieving a more traditional idea of business success. In many cases, innovative entrepreneurs and business leaders are demonstrating that social entrepreneurship can help to create value, motivate an organization, and drive the success of an enterprise. (p. 73)

**Vocational Education**

Terms such as small business and entrepreneurship have been placed under a broader umbrella of vocational education. According to Kent (1990a), vocational educators were the first to recognize the importance of entrepreneurship and to begin to include it in their curriculums (p. 19). Pring (1995) uses this term to describe education directed towards establishing competency at work, by focusing on the usefulness of this learning:

In general, vocational preparation signifies the acquisition of skills, qualities, attitudes and knowledge that are judged to be important for entry into the world of work – either because the economy needs them (for example, trained mechanics or physicians) or because the learner would otherwise be ill prepared to find employment without it. (p. 187)

Lankard (1991) also refers to vocational education as instruction that prepares its graduates for employment in the workplace through the acquisition of job-specific and employability skills, and work experience programs which link students to the business community.
Pring (1995) compares vocational preparation with liberal education by looking at both the intended outcomes of these learning principles and the methods by which this learning can be imparted. "Consequently, a different set of virtues characterizes vocational preparation – enterprise rather than disinterested pursuit of the truth, entrepreneurship rather than love of ideas" (p. 187). Lankard (1991) believes vocational education and entrepreneurship education are complementary. "The profile of the adult entrepreneur reflects in many ways the characteristics attributed to vocational education students" (p. 1). Lankard feels that vocational education must teach more than occupational knowledge, job skills and work experience by encouraging students to think more broadly and creatively about career opportunities; entrepreneurship education provides that opportunity by teaching students how to anticipate and respond to change. Similarly, Ashmore (1996) states that it is vocational-technical education that is leading efforts to teach entrepreneurship across the country.

**Application in the Study**

There does not seem to be consensus in the literature, or in practice, on either the definition of entrepreneurship, or the language used to describe its educational process. Part of this can be attributed to the lack of research in this field and the absence of accepted theories of entrepreneurship education and training (Garavan & O'Cinneide, 1994a). For the purpose of clarity throughout this thesis, I will adopt the practice that Erkkila (1999) used in her study which was to group all entrepreneurship and enterprise activity under one term, "entrepreneurial education," to enable discussion between communities. "The rationale for using this term is to enable a shared discourse across contexts" (p. 3). I will utilize the concepts "entrepreneurial" or "entrepreneurship" interchangeably throughout the study to imply the use of attributes identified by Gibb (1987) which I listed earlier in this chapter. The definition of entrepreneurship adopted for this study is based upon Drucker's (1985) conceptualization, which is activity used to generate purposeful innovation or opportunity in order to create value, without limiting this
process to any specific context. "Entrepreneurship is by no means confined solely to economic institutions" (p. 23).

I realize this is a broad conception of entrepreneurship that could cover a vast array of activities. This implies that entrepreneurship is not just limited to business. It is a useful notion to utilize, because it supports that entrepreneurial thinking and practice should occur in all areas of practice, and beyond the domain of business. The reader may argue that such an inclusive and wide open conceptualization is too broad, and thereby loses some of its meaning. I recognize its limitations, but argue that this broad definition allows a more widespread application beyond the business context, and is appropriate in relation to the integrated approach that is supported in this study.

I made a simplistic distinction at the beginning of the study between entrepreneurship and small business in the context of educational courses and programs. This was necessary for my data collection process that required the selection of specific entrepreneurship courses for the document analysis. This distinction respectively consists of the start-up and operation of a business versus the management of the business. This categorization is similar to what Gartner and Vesper (1994) used in their study that surveyed business and engineering professors knowledgeable about entrepreneurship education. Their survey defined entrepreneurship as business entry, by start-up or acquisition, and they excluded courses such as small business management, which primarily focused on the management of ongoing firms (p. 180).

In this study I am addressing entrepreneurship education that occurs in a business setting, but mindful that entrepreneurship education occurs in other contexts. I recognize there is a tension between the claims I make to move entrepreneurship to a wider paradigm, and the focus in the language on business education. This, however, is the dominant orientation in the literature and in practice and I need to turn to this context to see how people make sense of these concepts, and begin working from within this language in order to move our understanding further. Even
though entrepreneurship is about more than business start-up, I make this distinction with small business because of how the literature associates it with characteristics such as creativity, innovation and growth. Additionally, most approaches to small business are not thought of as a space of innovation, although I recognize this could be. Therefore, these conceptions of entrepreneurship and small business are utilized from a business education context because this is their principal location, and it is important to see how people make sense of entrepreneurship education in their environment.

My notion of an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education is more aligned with a broader definition of social entrepreneurship, and the more expansive approach of enterprise learning. It is the "entrepreneurial" method to problem-solving, and the demonstration of personal initiative, creativity, and innovativeness in these responses that is central. The intended outcome of an integrated approach, however, is not limited only to not-for-profit contexts concerned with social improvement, but also to for-profit business ventures, and situations concerned with wealth and profit creation. I have also chosen to place the domain of entrepreneurship under the broad label of vocational education, because of its applied focus and emphasis. This will allow for direct comparison and discussion with liberal education doctrine as it pertains to educational objectives, values, and outcomes.

The rest of this chapter explores the debate over the current state of the field of entrepreneurship education, and the inclusion of entrepreneurship in public-based curriculum through the discussion of liberal and vocational approaches to the value and purpose of education.
The Growth and Development of Entrepreneurship Education

Growth of Entrepreneurship Education

The 1980s and 1990s have witnessed a surge in interest and participation in entrepreneurial education, apparent by the rise in the numbers of educational institutions teaching entrepreneurship courses (Jack & Anderson, 1999, p. 114). "Entrepreneurship is in vogue" (Garavan & O'Cinneide, 1994a, p. 3). Ronstadt (1990) points to significant growth beginning as early as the 1970's, and believes a new era of entrepreneurship education has begun, and that interest at the academic level will continue to grow for some time (p. 71). The dynamics of the economy, in addition to political changes, have focused attention on non-traditional forms of education and training that have been thought to hold promise for economic growth and success. Garavan and O'Cinneide (1994a) state that:

In recent years, many industrialized countries have suffered from economic recession, high unemployment rates and fluctuation in international trade cycles to a degree not experienced since World War II. This situation has tended to increase the attention paid by policy makers and political decision makers to the potential role of entrepreneurs as a possible solution to rising unemployment rates and as a recipe for economic prosperity. (p. 3)

There are many researchers, theorists, educators, and policy makers, broadly grouped under the vocational umbrella, who believe that entrepreneurship education should have a significant role in the curriculum for both school-aged children and university and college students. Arguments that support this position, emphasize entrepreneurship as a relevant economic policy for the ever-changing and global marketplace that characterizes the developed nations of today. This involves the merits and value placed on entrepreneurial skills to satisfy labour force requirements and the benefits of enhanced employment prospects through entrepreneurship education, as well as the applicability of these skills to non-entrepreneurial contexts. How has the entrepreneurship education field grown and change, and what factors have contributed to its development?
Mohan-Neill (2001) believes that entrepreneurship education programs are in the growth stage of the product life cycle (p. 185). Finkle and Deeds (2001) comment that the demand and supply of entrepreneurship faculty has increased spectacularly during the last nine years (p. 614). Katz (2003) traces the growth of entrepreneurship education in American schools since the first course offered in 1947 to the current situation which consists of more than 2200 courses covered at over 1600 schools, 277 endowed positions, 44 English-language refereed academic journals and over 100 centers (p. 284). The future growth for entrepreneurship education, Katz believes, will involve American business schools moving from offering single courses to full majors (p. 291).

University of Washington management professor and entrepreneurship expert Karl Vesper states that the visibility of entrepreneurs in business in the past three decades is playing a key role:

As headlines blared about the innovation and personal wealth that went hand-in-hand with entrepreneurs and start-up ventures, especially with the technology sector, the public became increasingly fascinated with the start-up businesses and the risk-taking mind-set that defines the entrepreneur. (Newton and Menricks, 2003, para. 2)

Similarly, Vesper and Gartner (1997) report that by the 1970s the image of the entrepreneur began to change, fuelled by the rise in entrepreneurial activity, and the increased exposure by the media. "Connotations of the term 'entrepreneur' began to shift from notions of greed, exploitation, selfishness, and disloyalty, to creativity, job creation, profitability, innovativeness, and generosity" (p. 406). Katz (1991) also points to the media, in addition to student interest and wealthy entrepreneurial alumni, who have helped to spur on entrepreneurship as one of the fastest growing areas in business schools (p. 100). And Finkle and Deeds (2001) point to the increased interest and recognition by the business press of the importance of entrepreneurship in the larger economy, and the increased popularity in the practice of entrepreneurship and the
status accorded to entrepreneurs in society, all as reasons fueling the growth of entrepreneurship programs (p. 613).

Vesper asserts that one of the critical reasons for post-secondary schools witnessing an increase in institutional support for entrepreneurship has to do with resources, or specifically money, as schools look to add entrepreneurship to their program offerings in order to tap into donations from wealthy alumni (Newton & Menricks, 2003, para. 2). Financial support, driven from entrepreneurial graduates, appears to be driving significant support for entrepreneurship education. “It is possible that no other area [than entrepreneurship] in American business education draws on a larger or more widely dispersed financial foundation” (Katz, 2003, p. 292).

Yet, even with the rise in the number and status of entrepreneurship programs in business and management schools, entrepreneurship has remained somewhat marginalized by the other fields as educators question its role and place in the educational system:

Faculty outside the field have been, and many remain, very skeptical about the validity of entrepreneurship as an academic field, the quality and rigor of entrepreneurship research and the need to hire academic faculty to teach and research in the field. (Finkle & Deeds, 2001, p. 615).

Therefore, despite the rapid growth and development of entrepreneurship education, it is necessary to investigate how recognized is this area of education, and how supported are the educators who work in this field.

**Lack of Institutional Support**

Despite well-documented growth of entrepreneurship education at the post-secondary level, there appears to be a lack of institutional support for this subject area. Gibb (2002) comments that despite a trend across the United Kingdom and other places to support entrepreneurship education, the status of this field in higher education remains fragile (p. 236). Its lukewarm support has been linked in part to the relative newness of the field, and the lack of entrepreneurship programming that has been available at post-secondary institutions. For
example, Newton and Menricks (2003, para. 1) state that entrepreneurial education began at Harvard University only in 1947 with a single course offering. They also point to Karl Vesper's national survey of American business schools in 1970 that found just 16 courses offered in entrepreneurship. Although Menzies and Gasse (1999) in their national study of entrepreneurship at Canadian universities found over 53 universities currently offering at least one course on this subject, they discovered a present void of programming evident at the graduate level. And McMullan and Gillin (2001) found that even though entrepreneurship courses have been offered in universities for over 30 years, graduate level degree programs are only seven years old (p. 57).

Watson (2001) comments that although the field of entrepreneurship has expanded since the 1980s, there is still a lack of a generally accepted definition of entrepreneurship. This has negatively affected the quality of entrepreneurship research, in addition to the lack of theory in the field, level of statistical sophistication, and absence of an adequate paradigm specifically for entrepreneurship. As a relatively new field, McMullan and Long (1987) argue that what type of education is needed for entrepreneurs is not yet well understood. Additionally, because it is a new form of education, it can expect resistance, and therefore make implementation more difficult.

Katz (2003) sees the biggest limiting factor of growth of the field as the lack of faculty at every rank (p. 297). Further, Katz (1991) reports that the majority of entrepreneurship courses at American colleges and universities are taught by part-time, non-tenure track, adjunct faculty without doctorates in business or related disciplines. "Could a field so staffed hope to compete with Ph.D.- rich ranks of policy or organizational behaviour" (p. 88)? Finkle and Deeds (2001) similarly believe that an important indicator of growth in the entrepreneurship field is the expansion in the number of tenure-track positions. Although they found this overall trend to be positive, it was not as strong as the trends in the broad market for entrepreneurship faculty. "It
appears that institutions are hedging their bets and minimizing their long-term commitments to the field, through the use of non-tenured faculty” (p. 619).

Ronstadt (1990) claims that the lack of institutional support for entrepreneurship education developed in part from an educational system that has valued the large, corporate organization (management education) over the study of smaller, entrepreneurial firms. In addition, there has been considerable debate between academics about whether this field is amenable to teaching and researching, and questions of why a separate field was needed when many argued that other areas of business, such as marketing or finance, could cover the subject matter. The early teachers of entrepreneurship were often taking on significant risks within their institution, and in respect to their career path. “Advocates of entrepreneurship often found themselves vulnerable to attack, not only when they proposed such programs, but also when they were being considered for promotion and tenure” (Ronstadt, 1990, p. 73).

**Resource Constraints**

Resource constraints have also been identified as a factor impacting the development and growth of entrepreneurship education. McMullan and Long (1987) believe entrepreneurship is competing against well-established programs in business and engineering schools for already limited resources. “Entrepreneurship education, despite its unusual economic significance, is only one demand among many in an already overloaded collegial system (p. 265).

Menzies and Gasse (1999) state that the lack of available faculty to teach entrepreneurship will be a significant barrier to sustained growth and expansion of this subject area in the future at the post-secondary level in Canada. According to McMullan and Long (1987), filling the academic positions in the entrepreneurship area is going to be a prohibitive cost for some institutions, and is subject to bureaucratic and political interference. “The lack of available expertise in conjunction with self-serving university politics is a dangerous

Furthermore, Gibb (2002) claims there are too few departments of entrepreneurship in Europe and no long-term career paths designated in this area, making it an unattractive route for faculty to take (p. 242). For Katz (2003), a fundamental weakness of education worldwide is a lack of PhD programs providing faculty in entrepreneurship (p. 297). Without ongoing research and teaching-oriented programs to train PhDs in entrepreneurship, Katz (1991) argues, there continues to be not enough trained academics to feed into the career track and a lack of existing associate professor positions in entrepreneurship:

Academically, entrepreneurship feeds its career pipeline by 'scavenging' or 'converting' faculty from other disciplines or with maverick doctoral students who design their own programs. . . . A field with aspirations of growth requires a steady source of qualified new doctorates. (p. 90)

Further compounding this issue is what Gibb (2002) describes as a lack of research into what are the appropriate competencies of entrepreneurship educators to be recruited. And Katz (1991) claims that many endowed positions in entrepreneurship remain unfilled because academics can not agree on whether the positions should be filled by academics oriented towards research, or entrepreneurs oriented towards practice (p. 98).

Other resource constraints include a lack of instructor materials for teaching in this area, and insufficient funding for the type of marketing these programs require. Fiet (2000a) conducted a convenience sample of 18 syllabi at a retreat of entrepreneurship scholars. He discovered no clear favourites on textbook choices, and that 83% of the respondents were using reading packets with no consensus in the group on what should be included in these custom materials. Fiet argues this implies dissatisfaction with current entrepreneurship texts, and signals huge variation in the course content educators are providing (p. 5). And McMullan and Long (1987) argue for special resources in entrepreneurship education because the requirements of
new venture programming are quite different from conventional university programs (p. 270). Additionally, they feel that recruitment and selection of entrepreneurship students should be tied to the future employment needs of the communities, and that the search process may, therefore, be more expensive than in other fields of study (p. 266).

**Diversity in Approaches to Entrepreneurship Education**

**Lack of Consensus**

There appears to be a lack of consensus regarding educational approaches to entrepreneurship education. Gibb (2002) asserts there is no agreement in the literature on what basic concepts of entrepreneurship should be taught, and identifies the ontological challenge for academics of where to position entrepreneurship education and how it is best understood. Chia (1996) states positivistic science remains the dominant paradigm influencing business schools (p. 410). For example, Fiet (2000a) believes failing to develop a relevant theory within the domain of entrepreneurship has led to a lack of consensus on fundamental questions such as course content. This reinforces criticisms that the entrepreneurship field is not ready to be taken seriously as an academic discipline (p. 4). Additionally, Fiet (2000b) argues that rather than teaching students mainly through the observing of successful entrepreneurs, educators should focus on teaching about the theory of entrepreneurship. “Scholars should teach theory to aspiring entrepreneurs because nothing is more practical for them than understanding the consequences of committing resources to launch a venture” (p. 104).

In contrast, Johannisson, Landstrom and Rosenberg (1998) claim that entrepreneurs seldom have time for explicit conceptualization, for theorizing beyond individual choice. Not all business situations they argue are amenable to theory building, yet tacit knowledge may evolve, embedded in holistic, intuitive understanding (p. 491). Chia (1996) also does not see entrepreneurship education lending itself easily to academic theorizing. Instead, Chia argues,
education should be about new ways of thinking and understanding, and imagination should highlight the “possibilities” of facts rather than the absorption of sterile information.

**Emphasizing the Practical**

The argument for entrepreneurship education in the literature is often framed in very practical and economic terms. For example, McMullan and Long (1987) state that entrepreneurship education is part of a modern economic development strategy that fosters job creation. They see the growing issue of unemployment as providing an opportunity for leadership by entrepreneurship education specialists (p. 262). Entrepreneurial education, Laukkanen (2000) also comments, can be used strategically by business schools for economic growth, regional development, and development of jobs. And Erkkila’s (1999) study shows that across various contexts, the rationale given for entrepreneurship education is a result of pressure to become economically more competitive. “In all three countries, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Finland, a free market economy is the dominant metaphor underlying the new developments” [in entrepreneurial education] (p. 13).

Also found in the literature is the endorsement of action learning as the key framework for entrepreneurship education. Academics such as Johannisson et al. (1998) argue for an action-oriented approach to learning. “The entrepreneur distinguishes him/herself by his/her ability to take, in interaction with others, needed measures to allocate resources according to opportunity” (p. 478). Gibb (2002) describes most European entrepreneurship courses focusing on what needs to be done to become an entrepreneur, and how to go ahead and “do it” and develop the business (p. 237). Carland and Carland (2001) believe that business students’ learning styles are most appropriately taught using experiential learning concepts and techniques, which they describe as centrally focused on active involvement. Ronstadt (1990) claims the early approaches to entrepreneurship education were extremely action-oriented with educators encouraging their students to “get out and do it now” (p. 73). Solomon and Mark-Weaver (1994) comment that
experiential teaching and evaluation pedagogies are increasingly being utilized in small business management and entrepreneurial courses in the United States. And Gartner and Vesper (1994) speculate that experiments encouraging students to engage in introspective and reflective activities seemed to meet with failure, perhaps due to the type of students, extroverts and action-oriented, who take entrepreneurship courses (p. 185).

**Concern with the Practical Approach**

The literature discusses how the emphasis on the "practical" and "useful" in educational programs, is of great concern to some academics who feel the focus on liberal values in education is diminishing. For example, Corson (2002) is worried that traditional forms of liberal education are being replaced by policies mandating teaching and learning activities for market-placed utility. "This means that preparation for the needs of employers is rapidly replacing the liberal studies preparation that students conventionally received" (p. 1). And Cutright and Griffith (1997) claim that liberal education is being devalued because of short-term vocational and corporate needs. They point to tensions that have always existed between humanistic education and technical education, and argue how recent governments in Canada are aligning more with big business interests, to the detriment and assault on the liberal arts:

One evidence of this trend and aggressiveness is made apparent by the restructuring of governmental ministries [in Canada] responsible for education, restructuring which has made plain the subservient role to which conventional higher education has been assigned below the preparation of the trained for specific workforce roles. (p. 3)

Programs such as liberal arts, Corson (2002) believes, are not seen to be teaching the skills, attitudes, and personal attributes that business needs, and their graduates are not perceived to have the same likelihood of securing jobs. This emphasis on practical skill building and job creation that many academics credit to entrepreneurship education, fits with what Cutright and
Griffith (1997) see in Canada as a “consistent movement toward vocationalization of government priorities” (p. 2).

**Future Development of a Distinct Entrepreneurship Education Field**

**Separation of Entrepreneurship and Small Business**

Gartner and Vesper (1994) claim there are fundamental differences between the “basics” of entrepreneurship education and the “basics” of business education. Why is it important to investigate whether entrepreneurship is perceived to be substantively different from other business areas, specifically small business? According to Gibb (1996), the literature does not do a good job of making useful distinctions between the small business owner and the entrepreneur, and this poses dilemmas for educators as to the conceptual base and teaching approach they will take (p. 312). Gibb (2002) argues that the failure in the academic community to take a strong conceptual stance on the relationship between owner-managed business and entrepreneurship causes a misdirection of resources (p. 239). And Watson (2001) argues that his study, which found that international academics in the field of entrepreneurship did think a distinction should be made between entrepreneurship and small business, identifies the importance of conducting future research in entrepreneurship, and recognizes the need for a separate entrepreneurship research paradigm (p. 50).

How is the distinction between the areas of small business and entrepreneurship made in the literature? Solomon and Mark-Weaver (1994) report that small business courses generally cover information on how to successfully manage the business to expect normal sales, profits, and growth. Entrepreneurship courses on the other hand, provide information focusing on profitability and growth as the main objectives of the entrepreneur. “Entrepreneurs are usually seeking rapid growth, immediate and high profits, and a possible quick sellout with a large capital gain” (p. 339). Similarly, Watson’s (2001) study found the activities most corresponding
to and identifying with entrepreneurs rather than small business owners were innovation, opportunism, and independent growth. The activities of artisan/craftsman, administration/manager, and security/family, were associated with small business ownership (p. 50). Gibb (2002), however, objects to this concept that firms that do not grow, face more stable and less uncertain environments, and therefore exhibit less entrepreneurial and creative problem-solving behaviour. It can also be argued, says Gibb, that growing firms in simple environments need management rather than entrepreneurship. What is more important, Gibb contends, is the complexity and uncertainty in the context and task environment in which the entrepreneur operates (p. 238).

**Separation of Entrepreneurship from Business**

Although there may not be complete consensus on how the areas of small business and entrepreneurship are differentiated, this distinction between the two fields does reinforce academics' claims for a new and separate paradigm; a conceptual grounding upon which to direct their research and education, and help discriminate entrepreneurship from other forms of business education, particularly its closest perceived field, management. “The framework of management education is not appropriate for entrepreneurship education” (McMullan & Long, 1987, p. 273).

McMullan and Gillin (2001) comment that entrepreneurship educators have been institutionally constrained within business schools, and that it may be more efficient to develop entrepreneurship programs outside of this environment:

Any new entrepreneurship program offered within a business school will usually have to fight against well-entrenched traditions, vested interests and established cannons of required knowledge. In some cases even entrepreneurship educators who have spent their career operating within a traditional business school may resist new models of education. (pp. 72-73)
Gibb (2002) argues that a new institutional context is needed, away from the constraining and inadequate method of business schools, because they focus on the corporate and bureaucratic approach that undermines entrepreneurial behaviour. McMullan and Long (1987) also feel that entrepreneurship programs may need to be offered in places outside the university because these “institutions have become cumbersome bureaucracies and are rife with political infighting” (p. 273).

Institutional and political constraints identified in the literature also limit the development of entrepreneurship education. Gibb (1993) believes the college and university environment can limit the capacity for enterprising approaches to learning:

Heavily programmed curricula, standard timetables, emphasis upon classroom control as a norm, narrowly focused job descriptions, rewards linked solely to subject excellence, high gearing to written examinations and testing of knowledge, lack of flexibility in the use of resources and highly hierarchical departmental structures can all militate against the creation of an enterprising mode of teaching. Some of these ‘constraints’ are imposed upon the education institution by the regulatory environment, some are products of internal management decisions and styles. (p. 29)

Ronstadt (1990) comments that entrepreneurship courses have had to fit into an existing curriculum, and that this accommodation is never easy to achieve, politically or administratively, especially when it is a new program or multiple courses (p. 82). It is imperative, he comments, that you gain the support of an “administrative champion” to assist with this integration and to garner support.

McMullan and Long (1987) see business schools as focusing on education geared for the large organization context which is not applicable to the entrepreneur. Laukkanen (2000) also states that business schools have geared their education towards medium and large firm hierarchies and their “graduates become ‘socially useful’ when and if they meet compatible organizational contexts, typically corporate-type organizations” (p. 35). Johannisson et al. (1998) claim the approach that is taught at business and technological schools is in stark contrast to the
action approach which they believe is needed to educate entrepreneurs. “The university context wherein academic courses about or for entrepreneurship are carried out in many respects does not acknowledge entrepreneurial qualities such as action orientation and self-confidence” (p. 482). And Chia (1996) claims that the business world that managers and entrepreneurs must work in is characterized by unpredictability, volatility, and dynamism. Traditional approaches to educate these positions have often been less useful, and even counter-productive because business schools adhere to the positivistic science paradigm of thought.

Furthermore, educational programs have not done a good job of teaching creativity because of the need for standardized assessment and what McMullan and Long (1987) refer to as regimentation. “Business schools have not only learned to tolerate regimentation, some have learned to embrace it, developing lock-step programs involving the same group of students across several classes” (p. 266). Similarly, Chia (1996) argues that business school’s narrow view of academic rigour has taken away imagination and creativity. “Business schools as such are deemed, in most instances, to have failed to equip their graduands with the necessary imagination, resourcefulness, and process skills to cope with the complexities of ‘real’ business situations” (p. 410). What is required, Chia argues, is a radical change or a paradigm shift away from prescribed analytical problem-solving capabilities that teach administrative and bureaucratic thinking rather than entrepreneurial thinking, if business schools are going to contribute to a vibrant enterprise culture.

**Challenges for the Entrepreneurship Educator**

**Teaching Approaches**

There is support in the literature that entrepreneurship can be effectively taught. For example, according to Johannisson et al. (1998), the dominant view in the last decade has been that it is possible to educate individuals to become entrepreneurs (p. 477). And Ronstadt (1990)
argues, the question entrepreneurship researchers and teachers ask of whether entrepreneurship can or should be taught, is increasingly being replaced by questions of “what” should be taught and “how” (p. 72). Stephen Spinelli, director of Babson’s Arthur M. Blank Centre for Entrepreneurship, also believes entrepreneurship can be taught, but is less sure about how effective the educational process is.

But I’m not sure it can always be learned. There are processes to entrepreneurship that we teach, but does that create a prescription for entrepreneurship? No. There are millions of variables, and they’re too dynamic for us, at least in our present state of understanding, to be able to prescribe success. But can we teach students enough to push up the odds of success? I think so. (Newton & Menricks, 2003, para. 6).

There is an indication in the literature that teaching approaches are influenced by historical patterns and institutional pressures. “Traditionally, business is taught passively by lecture and illustration of problem and solutions. That paradigm and its historic and persistent role permeate the university system in the United States” (Carland & Carland, 2001, p. 98). Fiet (2000b) argues that instructors are more likely to use lecturing approaches than theory-based activities which he supports, because they require a greater time commitment and result in fewer institutional rewards. “Thus, we often find instructors rely more upon passive lecture approaches because they can be accomplished within acceptable evaluative tolerances, particularly when the institution is dependent upon grants to support its research agendas” (p. 111). And hooks (1994) believes our educational institutions are so deeply invested in a banking system,⁵ that teachers are more rewarded when they do not teach “against the grain” (p. 203).

Ronstadt (1990) argues, however, for new and better pedagogical approaches to teaching entrepreneurship. McMullan and Long (1987) state that entrepreneurship education requires team teaching, and that this method may also include practitioners and people from other disciplines, which is not easy to coordinate and can be costly to the organization (p. 269). Gibb

---

⁵ An approach to learning that is rooted in the notion that all students need to do is consume information fed to them by a professor and be able to memorize it and store it (p. 14).
(1993) sees enterprising modes of teaching including the educator as a facilitator, guide, and partner, using an enterprising style of learning versus a didactic style, learning by doing and discovery, and moving away from being an expert in a tightly controlled environment (p. 23). Fiet (2000b) argues that students need to be involved in the learning process and that teachers should act like a coach rather than an evaluator of student performance. And Gartner and Vesper’s (1994) study found a trend in teaching entrepreneurship education away from using outsiders, such as guest speakers, for delivering lectures on content. Instead, educators were using outside experts in the roles of counselor and advisor to the students (p. 185).

Gibb (1993) also advocates for enterprise learning and an enterprising classroom environment that includes learning under uncertainty, ownership and control by students, flexibility, and freedom to make mistakes while maintaining clear goals (p. 21). Similarly, Ronstadt (1990) argues for an uncertain and often unstructured teaching environment similar to what entrepreneurs will face in practice. And hooks (1994) believes the classroom should be an exciting place, with flexible agendas, movement beyond boundaries, and recognition that everyone in the classroom contributes and influences the classroom dynamic. “To educate as the practice of freedom, means critical awareness and engagement, and that the teacher and students are active participants and not passive consumers; an approach which goes beyond the boundaries of rote, assembly-line approaches to learning (pp. 13-14).

Because entrepreneurship is an applied program, McMullan and Long (1987) also see the choice of educator as critical, and the importance of achieving a balance between the academic and practitioner perspective. “Whether they like it or not, educators serve as role models. There are many academics who would not make good role models for future entrepreneurs” (p. 268). And hooks (1994) believes that radical pedagogy and liberatory teaching practices involve the experience, or voice, of the educator in the classroom. Yet, hooks warns that there has been a
real critique of the place of experience, or confessional narrative, in the classroom which is unfortunate because it helps to establish a communal commitment to learning:

One of the ways you can be written off quickly as a professor by colleagues who are suspicious of progressive pedagogy is to allow your students, or yourself, to talk about experience; sharing personal narratives yet linking that knowledge with academic information really enhances our capacity to know. (p. 148)

There is also support in the literature for teaching entrepreneurship using experiential and active learning, and non-traditional assessment tools. McMullan and Long (1987) believe entrepreneurship education should deal with ambiguity and complexity. They support modern experiential techniques and hands-on experience for students working on real community ventures (p. 267). Carland and Carland (2001) argue that business students respond better to a paradigm with experiential learning concepts, and propose teaching entrepreneurship with an interdisciplinary team of professors, using a team-based and student-centred approach (p. 101). Solomon and Mark-Weaver (1994) also support and encourage entrepreneurship educators and trainers to continue to use more unconventional and experiential-based teaching and evaluation methods in their practice:

Traditional paradigms will not work when the focus of the learning is to broaden horizons and perceptions and, in fact, move individuals to a different plan of thinking and action, where the focus is for them to become “paradigm pioneers” and to blaze new trails for others to follow. (p. 352)

And Johannisson et al. (1998) support linkages with the broader community, and encourage practitioners to team up with students conducting projects in the academic setting and business field (p. 493).

How are these non-traditional educational practices perceived by the institution and its students? Gibb (2002) talks about academic rigour and respectability and the perspective in academia that if you teach about entrepreneurship, using teaching methods such as cases and simulation, it is academic and acceptable. But, if you teach for entrepreneurship which is more activity-based learning, even project-based, it is not seen to be as rigorous. Fiet (2000b) claims
the lack of predictability in the classroom can be threatening to professors who would prefer a more tightly controlled process. “Surprisingly, it can be threatening to students also because they think that the evaluation of their work and learning could be adversely affected by their perception of less classroom structure” (p. 110). McMullan and Long (1987) believe professors who use modern experiential techniques may find their approach in stark contrast to other professors, and that students may face difficulties adjusting to these methods. “Students generally prefer clarity to ambiguity and simplicity to complexity especially when they are facing the constant stress of evaluation” (p. 267).

hooks (1994), although not speaking specifically about entrepreneurial education, believes there are students who will resist new pedagogical processes, as “transgressing boundaries” is frightening, and they do not want to be in a classroom that differs in any way from the norm (p. 9). Radical pedagogical practices, she believes, have met with resistance by students who found these methods unsettling and not credible, making teachers feel their practices were faulty and unreliable; as a result, educators have often returned to traditional practices. “Of course, they should have expected that students who have had a more conventional education would be threatened by and even resist teaching practices which insist that students participate in education and not be passive consumers” (pp. 143-144). Furthermore, because students may find new pedagogical approaches as challenging and less predictable, this may cause conflict with professors who want to be liked and admired by their students. hooks feels there is currently a major backlash that is seeking to delegitimize progressive pedagogy. “I think our fear of losing students’ respect has discouraged many professors from trying new teaching practices” (p. 145).

**Student Tensions**

Gartner and Vesper’s (1994) surveyed business schools and engineering schools throughout the world to identify practices and plans pertaining to entrepreneurship education at
their schools. They asked educators to describe new things or “experiments” they had undertaken in their courses, and classify them as successes or failures. Their study reported that experiments requiring students to engage in reflective and introspective activities seemed to meet with failure. They speculate that it may be related to entrepreneurship students’ action-oriented approach or pragmatic nature which support assignments only if they can see how their efforts will produce some direct benefit (p. 185).

Another issue of their study that appeared to have a lot of influence regarding whether it was perceived as successful or not, was the instructors’ assumptions regarding the knowledge and experience a student brings to class. In their study, “assuming that students have a working knowledge of the business basics (e.g., assuming that students can generate a cash flow statement, calculate a current ratio, or undertake a ‘cold call’) often leads to failure” (p. 181). Having a more accurate view of the incoming students’ skills and abilities might be a factor they argue in whether the course will be seen as a failure or success. “What might be occurring is that instructors who are initially overly optimistic about student knowledge and skills become disappointed when these assumptions are not met” (p. 182).

Further, Laukkanen (2000) argues that too little attention is being spent on the selection and composition of entrepreneurship students beyond generic entry requirements, especially of undergraduates (p. 31). And Vesper and Gartner (1997) comment that traditional measures such as the Graduate Management Aptitude Test (GMAT) and Grade Point Average (GPA) scores may not be good predictors of students’ entrepreneurial capabilities. “A measure that is used to predict success in school (i.e. GMAT) may be an inappropriate measure to predict success at starting and growing a business” (pp. 405-406).

In her study, Mohan-Neill (2001) found there to be different markets for entrepreneurship education, and argues for different types of programs to meet these needs. One target is people employed by large companies who are supported by their employer to participate in MBA-type
programs and have long-term entrepreneurial or intrapreneurial goals. The other segment is people paying for their own education who want shorter-term and non-traditional programs, such as certificates, seminars and workshops, and who are older and more experienced. These students tend to be more demanding, Mohan-Neill discovered, and form the growing number of part-time students enrolled at less well-known schools (p. 194).

Laukkanen (2000) believes that undergraduate students exhibit a low probability of entrepreneurial action and require additional learning and stronger support systems (p. 37). This learning can consist of employment and experience in the community and may explain why recognized credential educational programs are sought. Further student issues may be related to the entrepreneurial programs targeting mainly business students which means that any needs outside of a small business or new venture context are ignored (Gibb, 2002, p. 240). Finkle and Deeds (2001) identify the situation whereby entrepreneurship remains mainly an elective subject in most schools and thus very dependant upon student interest (p. 614). And Ronstadt (1990) argues that single courses and elective courses in entrepreneurship only reach a minority of entrepreneurs and that this field needs to be accessible and taught to more students. “Unless these courses are required or other required courses are ‘entrepreneurialized,’ most future entrepreneurs will not be educated entrepreneurs” (p. 77).

Role of Ethics

The literature identifies that the role of ethics in entrepreneurship education is subject to political influences, such as market pressures. For example, Finlay (2002) claims that to ensure that graduating business students have been exposed to the differences between ethical and questionable business practices, it is up to Canada’s “corporate captains” to demand loudly that business schools make ethics a priority (p. 101). It requires industry endorsement, he argues, before the field sees it as an essential component of the curriculum.
The literature also indicates limitations in how the subject of ethics is being taught. A study of 1700 MBA students from international business schools reported in a recent newspaper article, confirmed that students are not getting adequate preparation on how to manage value conflicts such as fraud and mismanagement, and students want to learn how to better balance the complex, interdependent needs of business and society. "They want to understand the relationship between business success and socially responsible behaviour, but the courses they are taking are not helping them connect the dots" (Harding, 2003, section C1, para. 4). Finlay (2002) claims that Canadian management faculties do not appear to be rushing to revamp their curricula despite the recent corporate scandals. For example, Finlay refers to the Toronto-based Canadian Centre for Philanthropy report which identified only 7 of the top 16 business schools transforming their course offerings to address issues of corporate responsibility (p. 100).

The lack of consensus on what is appropriate to teach, and the lack of expertise in this subject area, are additional constraints identified in the teaching of ethics. Finlay (2002) sees no consensus across Canadian business schools about how ethics should be taught. Even if agreement could be reached, Glen Whyte, Associate Dean at Toronto’s Rotman School of Management, admits that traditional teaching methods have been ineffective in changing attitudes and behaviours. “The dominant teaching model has failed” (Harding, 2003, Section C1, para. 9). Wesley Cragg, Gardiner Professor of Business Ethics at York University’s Schulich School of Business, points to the current situation whereby few faculty members who teach ethics in business schools have any formal education or training in ethics:

The teaching of ethics, says Cragg, ‘poses substantial risks’ for faculty members, especially ‘when they raise issues in the classroom, where they are supposed to be the expert.’ Combine this fear with a corporate ethos that ‘projects the view that everything is all right,’ and Cragg believes ‘there’s a real danger that what has happened over the past year will be shunted aside. I think we’re on a bit of a knife edge at the moment.’ (Finlay, 2002, p. 105)
Professor Cragg also believes there has not been the political will in business schools to teach ethics, because the private sector has not encouraged this practice and have intentionally avoided getting too specific in order to protect themselves. “The Golden Rule of Business Education has always been that it is the private sector, specifically those twin gods – the corporate donor and the employer – who have the true power to change the way management, in all its facets, is taught” (Finlay, 2002, p. 101).

There was discussion in the literature for a more prominent role of ethics in the entrepreneurship curriculum. Ronstadt (1990) sees ethics as playing a much more critical role in the “new school” of entrepreneurship which is emerging based on new knowledge about entrepreneurship and new and better pedagogical approaches. The old school focused little on ethical assessment, treating it more as an afterthought and not as a core issue of instruction. The new school, in contrast, sees ethical assessment as critical for long-term entrepreneurial success and views it as a central analytic part of pedagogy (p. 76). Laukkanen (2000) recognizes that entrepreneurial education, especially focused on wealth and new ventures, may be viewed by some academics as promoting socially irresponsible and unethical behavior in students. Yet, not teaching for entrepreneurial capabilities and action in today’s society could also be seen as irresponsible. What is important, Laukkanen believes, is that ethical issues should penetrate entrepreneurship education, while also addressing wider cultural issues (p. 42).

Similarly, Finlay (2002) has identified Canadian educators in the public post-secondary sector who are taking innovative approaches to ethics teaching, from the development of core modules and electives in ethics, to the infusion of existing curriculum material with ethical questions. Other approaches include the use of a dedicated ethics center. For example, Wayne Norman, Chair of Business Ethics at University of British Columbia’s Centre for Applied Ethics and a professor in the Faculty of Commerce, believes they have adopted a superior approach whereby a five-person core teaching team emphasizes ethical approaches to business issues and
addresses ethical questions raised in subject areas taught by other lectures, ensuring an embedded ethics component to every case study they do. “We avoid the dilemma which many business schools face, where they either have a course which few students take and which is ghettoized, or they pretend there’s a little bit of ethics in every courses, when there probably isn’t” (p. 105).

The rapid development of the entrepreneurship education field is well documented. However, its growth does not seem to be accompanied with significant institutional support and resources. The literature does appear to call for a separate field, distinct from closely related areas such as management and small business. As well, there is support to move entrepreneurship away from a business context and into a separate paradigm that recognizes the unique requirements of this area. Yet, it is evident there is a lack of consensus on how the field should develop and challenges for entrepreneurship educators working in the field.

I would argue, however, that attention needs to be given to the types of entrepreneurship education that happen in a business context. I suggest that good business education can be both entrepreneurial and integrative. This means that the curriculum can taught in enterprising ways, promoting creativity, innovation and resourcefulness, while also reflecting a social and ethical orientation. If entrepreneurship is moved out of the business area completely, then educators lose the opportunity to use entrepreneurial methods to address business problems, as well as social, environmental and cultural issues.

The next section expands the debate and looks more broadly at the overall aims of education. Through the discussion of liberal and vocational approaches to education, the role of entrepreneurship in educational curricula is discussed and debated.
The Vocational-Liberal Debate about the Aims of Education

Liberal Education

Entrepreneurship education has strong critics; a significant and vocal group who can be placed in the liberal education "camp." Criticisms, such as those stated by Barlow and Robertson (1994), include that schools are not meant to be pre-employment centers and that the models used in entrepreneurship, specifically of the marketplace, bring different values and purposes that contravene what schools were designed to achieve:

Education trends are following global and economic trends. Both governments and international organizations are giving up on the goal of equality and universality – some reluctantly, others with enthusiasm. Instead, they are acquiescing to a class system born of deep economic disparities. They have accepted, by and large, the corporate model of competitiveness and the "inevitability" of Social Darwinism. 6 (p. 166)

Although there is a recognized need for educational reform, there remains wide disparity between the direction liberal education proponents and vocational advocates support. In order to more fully understand the beliefs and principles that structure these diverse positions, it is important to pose a larger question: what is worth knowing?

Barlow and Robertson (1994) pose this and similar questions when they discuss the political dimensions of curriculum guidelines. For example: What is worth knowing? Who decides what is worth knowing? Who decides which skills are necessary or desirable for which students? (pp. 124-125). Egan (1997) ponders this question when he talks about the problems of deciding what measures of knowledge are required to be adequately educated when knowledge is placed as the core competency of education. "It also leads to Herbert Spencer’s questions of ‘what knowledge is of most worth’? which has remained unanswered, and unanswerable in general terms, for more than a century" (Egan, 1997, p. 25). In an attempt to unpack the value

---

6 Movement of thought that started in the late nineteenth century as an application of Charles Darwin's insights to human affairs; its most (in)famous exponent was Herbert Spencer. Social Darwinism holds that the principle of "the survival of the fittest" applies to human ethics and politics just as it does to biological evolution (Social Darwinism, para. 1).
systems that comprise answers to the above question, it is important to focus on what each position believes the true aims of education are, and the best strategy through education to achieve these purposes.

Those who espouse liberal learning are often faced with the criticism that the schools are not preparing their students with the skills that the changing economy needs, or specifically what business wants:

There is a feeling – widespread and deeply rooted – that the educational system is not succeeding. This is reflected in the belief that schools and colleges are not preparing young people adequately for the world of work; that they have failed to instill the social values necessary for a well-ordered society; that students are ill-prepared psychologically as well as economically for an unpredictable future; and that standards are too low. (Pring, 1995, p. 5)

There appears to be a shift from an emphasis on education’s social purposes, to a predominant economic emphasis which positions education as a key element to a nation’s global competitive position:

In other words, the imperatives of globalisation re-orient the policy concerns of national states in such a way that they are increasingly preoccupied with creating conditions necessary to promote economic competitiveness in the new international economic order, rather than attending to problems of social integration or nation building or to education policies designed to achieve equality of opportunity in the labour market. (Ball, 1999, p. 4)

Barlow and Robertson (1994) also discuss the issues of equality of education, and reject notions of education operating on a business or corporate model because they believe the mandate of schools is to educate all students. “Public education is intended to balance the interests of all citizens, since we all stand to profit – or lose – from the skills, knowledge and attitudes acquired by children at school” (p. 113).

Liberal education, it is argued, is not about preparing students for a certain occupation or job, but rather about developing and cultivating a value system that will enable them to function as informed citizens who can contribute in meaningful ways to their society. “Indeed, lack of economic utility is frequently seen as a hallmark of a liberal education” (Pring, 1995, p. 10). The
principles and concepts taught through a liberal education curriculum are believed to have a
greater capacity to teach students about their responsibility as citizens, and about concepts such
as morality, equality and liberty. The social philosopher and critic Russell Kirk (as cited in Gow,
1989) believed the development of wisdom and virtue is the true purpose of education:

The primary purpose of a liberal education is the cultivation of the person’s own
intellect and imagination, for the person’s own sake. . . . True education is meant
to develop the individual human being, the person, rather than serve the state. . . .
Formal schooling actually commenced as an endeavor to acquaint the rising
generation with religious knowledge: with awareness of the transcendent and with
moral truths. Its purpose was not to indoctrinate a young person in civics, but
rather to teach what it is to be a true human being, living within a moral order.
That person has primacy in liberal education. (pp. 545-546)

Corson (2000) argues that a liberal education was not intended to be connected with any
particular life destination or with preparation for work of any definite kind. “Instead, its
graduates were shaped by rich contacts with the classics, with the other humanities, and with the
natural sciences, so they could take their proper place as ‘agreeable’ people in the polite society”
(p. 112). Stunkel (1999) reiterates the theme that it is narrow and impractical to conceive of
liberal education as a method to increase chances of employment:

Liberal education is supposed to foster global consciousness, good citizenship,
community service, and diversity training, all presumably on top of broad
learning, critical thought, decent writing, and serious reading. (p. 55)

When discussing liberal education, Cronon (1999) describes a tradition that celebrates and
nurtures human freedom. “Freedom and growth: here, surely, are values that lie at the very core
of what we mean when we speak of a liberal education” (p. 7). Similarly, Langiulli (2000) states
that a “liberal education is that systematic cultivation of those qualities that make human beings
excellent: reason and the freedom grounded in that reason” (p. 40).

Pring (1995) states that the liberal idea’s chief aim is to develop the intellect, consisting
of disciplines such as mathematics, religion, and philosophy, that allows one to get at the truth of
things; developing this intellect is primarily for intrinsic value. Also, because developing the
intellect is such a demanding task, this schooling needs to be removed from distractions such as the world of business or usefulness, and away from the marketplace, and only taught by scholars who are authorities in the area; a concept that has its roots in Plato's ideals of education. Finally, liberal education is envisioned as Oakeshott (as cited in Pring, 1995) describes as a conversation in which the learner is brought into a world of ideas for the principal reason that it transcends them into a higher form of learning (pp. 184-186).

What exactly it means to be a liberally educated person is difficult to quantify, and misleading to imply that one can complete a set of courses or certain learning experiences, and emerge as a liberally educated person:

A liberal education is not something any of us ever achieve; it is not a state. Rather, it is a way of living in the face of our own ignorance, a way of groping toward wisdom in full recognition of our own folly, a way of educating ourselves without any illusion that our education will ever be complete. (Cronon, 1999, p. 10)

Cronon goes further in trying to explain how to recognize liberally educated people, by describing ten skills he admires in people who seem to embody the values of a liberal education. These include listening, writing, reading, problem solving, and connecting and he emphasizes that learning these skills benefit the individual, as well as the human community. "In the end, it turns out that liberty is not about thinking or saying or doing whatever we want. It is about exercising our freedom in such as way as to make a difference in the world and make a difference for more than just ourselves" (p. 11). There is a common thread, Pring (1995) asserts, between all the various interpretations of liberal education, which consists of the significance given to the pursuit of reason, and the capacity to understand, know and pursue the truth:

For that reason, liberal education was based firmly on the nature of knowledge, learnt not as a set of inert and discrete ideas but as disciplines or active thinking, internalized and interconnecting with each other. And this idea of liberal education has dominated the formation of our educational institutions, at every level and in every shape, and the content of the learning promoted by them. (p. 184)
Liberal learning is not confined to the school years, and proponents, such as Langiulli (2000), believe there is definitely a place for this type of education in colleges and universities:

The transformation that coincides with the primary end of institutions of higher learning is the cultivation of the students’ minds primarily, then derivatively their hearts and their actions in such a manner as befits liberally educated persons. It is with this end that colleges and universities prepare their students, not merely as business managers, lawyers, priests, physicians, accountants or teachers, but as human beings precisely in their humanity. . . . It is then that students will best be suited to learn and master the special skills of their professions, and to become competent, responsible and mature citizens and not the moral rebels so consciously cultivated and celebrated in the imperial and manipulative media as transgressive. (pp. 40-41)

If a college or university can teach students to be informed, thoughtful and mature citizens, they can learn to contribute and participate in a democratic society. D’Innocenzo (1999) in his article on the “Aims Of Education” quotes Theodore Roosevelt as saying that “he believed colleges were the places where students should learn that they have responsibilities as citizens” (p. 82). D’Innocenzo speaks to key issues already discussed such as virtue, knowledge, and connectedness, when he summarizes his aims of education:

Quests for reliable knowledge, perspective and identity; cultivating civic virtue; appreciating the enduring satisfaction of forever being dissatisfied; and recognizing that all of our lives are interconnected, and that we must find ways to celebrate diversity. (p. 84)

Engen and Kaha (2000) discuss Martha Nussbaum’s book on “Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education” and present her philosophy of education that has a definite moral foundation:

Nussbaum recognizes that higher education is in the business of creating citizens who reside in an increasingly global community and who must interact with one another in kind and respectful ways that facilitate human dignity. She argues that universities must work to ‘cultivate humanity’ in their students, to create citizens of the world who are compassionate and understanding. (p. 22)

Liberal learning, as discussed by some proponents, does not claim that only certain subjects or disciplines are worthy of study, but rather supports broad learning across many fields. “Confinement to one dimension of knowledge or partisan immersion in the lore of one’s ethnic
group are incompatible with liberal thought and sensibility" (Stunkel, 1999, p. 57). What is important is that students are exposed to many different views and assumptions and taught how to critically analyze and learn from these teachings; process here is seen as more important than content. “The goal, if it can be called such, is to expose students to the variety of human perspectives, and cultivate tolerance for all of them” (Langiulli, 2000, p. 43).

Robert Coles (as cited in Engen & Kaha, 2000) asserts the importance of teaching practices, and how this becomes a significant learning experience for the students in their discovery of what a good citizen resembles. “Our messages in the classroom do much more than simply transmit information, they build – or disrupt – community, and they teach about citizenship and moral vision in ways we too often ignore” (p. 22). Ball (1999) talks about the intrinsic value of knowledge and how crucial it is not to lose sight of its importance, especially with the emphasis on measurement that assumes validity of outcomes is tied only to what can be measured (p. 9).

Imbedded in the liberal philosophy is the assumption that a liberal education is superior to other forms of education whether they are classified as general, vocational, training, or business. Although entrepreneurship is becoming more recognized because of factors such as government funded self-employment programs, corporate downsizing, and higher professional unemployment, western society still has low regard for entrepreneurship because its entrepreneurs have tended to come from socially marginalized groups while the mainstream still pursues professions that are further removed from commercial activities (House, 1995, p. 150). “Entrepreneurs come from every level of education, and many have emerged from poverty or lack of so-called educational success” (Ashmore, 1990, p. 211). Similarly, the OECD (1989) reports that enterprise learning developments are outside the mainstream of education, either targeted in a narrow approach to the elite, or in a broad approach to those who are less able, or have dropped out of the education system. “Only in a few schemes is enterprise regarded as
being relevant to everyone. Thus, in addition to the policy/practice ‘gap’, a mainstream/fringe
gap is evident” (p. 8).

Peters (1973) makes the distinction between being trained which denotes narrow
specialization, and education which is of the “whole man” (p. 19). To be educated Peters
suggests, is to imply that one is “better” or that this education has “value” or that it is a desirable
form of life. Again, there is the message that the pursuit of knowledge is as important as the
content or outcome of the learning:

The first thing that must be said about an educated man [sic] is that he [sic] must
be one who not only pursues some particular activity such as science or cooking,
but who is also capable of pursuing it for what there is in it as distinct from what
it may lead on to or bring about. (p. 18)

Furthermore, it is this notion Peters talks about that education can be transformative, reflective,
or fulfilling more because of the process than because of the particular subject that one is
exposed to. “To be educated is not to have arrived at a destination; it is to travel with a different
view” (p. 20).

The aims of education for liberal learning, it is argued, involve a much broader view of
education than do forms of training, business, or vocational education, and therefore, these
principles should continue to be the basis for future educational reform:

The development of curiosity, judgment, empathy, aesthetic appreciation and
skill, respect for difference, and so forth have time and again been validated by
the public as capacities schools should encourage. (Barlow & Robertson, 1994, p.
123)

However, with the increased recognition of entrepreneurship as a major political and economic
theme of the late twentieth century, there is increasing scrutiny of the curriculum as to whether it
is preparing students to become productive members of society. For example, Vaz (2000)
discusses that the best way to prepare students of liberal education for working in the twenty-first
century, is to teach them how to manage and excel with change in their chosen profession, and
expose them to an international perspective, so they are able to participate as active, informed, and global citizens (p. 24).

Critics of liberal education believe the majority of principles found in a liberal education are in opposition to what society requires today of its learners, and House (1995) comments that “...many suggest the principles of liberal education are inherently hostile to the values required of an industrial state” (p. 40). In fact Sklar (as cited in House, 1995) cites that the Trilateral Commission as early as the 1970’s had recommended the following:

To maintain social stability more young people should be steered from a liberal education toward vocational training, that the career expectations of ‘surplus’ university graduates be lowered and that education be directly related to the needs of the labour market. (p. 38)

If the liberal ideal only sees education as principally developing the intellect, and if the vocational tradition focuses exclusively on the usefulness of the knowledge and how students can be prepared for entry into the world of work, then a profound division about the true purpose of education between these two approaches is inescapable.

**Vocational Education**

Pring (1995) defines the characteristics of vocational preparation as focusing on skills, attitudes, qualities, and knowledge primarily for entry into the world of work. It is the pursuit of competence which is primary, whether at work, in the home, or the community, rather than the pursuit of intellectual excellence for its own sake. It is the belief that this learning is best done by engaging the learner in an adult world, through practical and activity-based tasks, with authorities from industry and commerce:

Vocational preparation, therefore, uses the language of usefulness, fitness for purpose, effective means to an end. It cherishes different values. It respects different personal and social qualities. It requires a different process of control and accountability. (Pring, 1995, pp. 187-188)
Ashmore (1990) argues that the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of our workforce are our most valuable economic resource, and that vocational education is the means to develop these competencies:

Entrepreneurship education is a vehicle for vocational education that brings new prospects and challenges as we compete for our global economic position in the twenty-first century. Whether vocational graduates become entrepreneurs or merely more knowledgeable employees does not matter; both outcomes are important to the future economic success of this nation. (p. 229)

Proponents of enterprise education, not only believe that entrepreneurship is increasingly becoming a viable career option, but that entrepreneurial knowledge and skill building is an effective strategy for students to develop employment prospects. “Over the long-term, a self-reliant entrepreneurial community reduces both barriers to opportunity and barriers to sustainability” (Chaytor Educational Services, 2000, p. 130). Fleming (1999) discusses the usefulness of instilling entrepreneurial beliefs and developing entrepreneurial skills among graduate students because it provides them with a way of searching out and analyzing opportunities:

Educating for enterprise promotes an awareness of business ownership as a career option and motivates young people to look creatively at their future opportunities. Graduate expertise is also crucial to many sectors of the economy where increasingly enterprise skills and competencies can stimulate a change philosophy that will foster growth. (p. 405)

Fleming (1999) also talks about how entrepreneurship courses have been integrated into faculties, in addition to business, such as engineering, science, and education. Recognition of the importance of these courses is reinforced by employers who often seek students with “entrepreneurial flair,” and students who believe their employment prospects are enhanced (p. 406). For example, an announcement for employment with the new Home Depot organization, in the Kelowna Daily Courier newspaper on January 20, 2001, advertised entrepreneurial skills as one of the key attributes they were looking for in prospective employees:
Career fair. Do you think outside ‘the box’? Are you interested in joining a team where your ideas and entrepreneurial spirit are rewarded? With the world’s #1 home improvement retailer, you can enjoy great pay, excellent benefits, outstanding opportunity, fun, training, company ownership and so much more! (Career Fair, 2001)

Educators around the world are being encouraged to adopt entrepreneurship as a vehicle for creating and disseminating knowledge with the goal of raising national competitiveness (House, 1995, p. 2). Because of such factors as changing business patterns, movement to different markets, downsizing of large companies, and emergence in western countries of a small and medium-sized enterprise (SME) economy, entrepreneurship education is being tied to the development of an enterprise culture. These factors have bred widespread interest in supporting the SME strategy and entrepreneurship:

This increased interest has emerged for a number of reasons, namely the recognition of the contribution of the small firm sector to economic development and job creation. Much of the economy’s ability to innovate, diversify, and create new jobs comes from the small business sector. (Hynes, 1996, p. 10)

Although academic opinion still differs about the extent of the SME contribution to growth and employment, and the place of entrepreneurial education in the school system, the field is gaining support and recognition. “As a consequence of the entrepreneurial trend and widespread lay beliefs of the societal and economic efficacy of entrepreneurship, the field has acquired a higher profile, more status and more resources than previously” (Laukkanen, 2000, p. 25).

Workplace trends such as the downsizing of large corporations, and advanced technology with the introduction of the internet, have helped to fuel the surge in small business. Not only has the internet helped to stimulate self-employment, it has made it more possible for small business, including business owners with no employees and home-based businesses, to compete in the domestic and foreign markets. Therefore, it is crucial that people are trained in technical skills, especially in the area of computer technology. It is also critical that people, including professionals, prepare for self-employment. “Many of the jobs will be entrepreneurial as younger
people start their own businesses and become their own bosses” (The Laurier Institution, para. 9). The OECD (1989) asserts that virtually every country in the industrialized world appears to be in the process of cultivating entrepreneurial values and building enterprise cultures. “Enterprise skills are seen as among the many skills needed by those in the labour market, which will have an ever-increasing need for flexibility and versatility” (p. 11).

Supporters of vocational education believe that these abilities to be innovative, creative, flexible, and opportunity-driven, will be critical for success in the 21st century. As the concept of the “job” continues to be transformed, it is predicted that “in the future, many employers will hire short-term and contract workers instead of full-time employees” (The Laurier Institution, para. 9). Life-long careers with a single organization are increasingly not available and business analysts now predict that young people today will change their careers 9.7 or more times during their working life. The new economy, or information age, has changed the nature of work, so the secure positions that many young people’s parents experienced are no longer attainable. “Certainly we’ve seen as you go back into the eighties, and right through the nineties, with all the layoffs, people are beginning to realize the era of the 20-year job is dead. More and more employees will work consultant-style” (Leonidas, para. 3). People are being required to be flexible and adaptable to the changing needs of the marketplace, and as a knowledge worker, to take control of and invest in lifelong learning:

As entrepreneurs, young people will need to be creative and explore new ways of making and identifying work opportunities. While offering workers greater freedom in employment, contract work, short-term work and self-employment will all require considerable initiative and enthusiasm. (The Laurier Institution, para. 9)

The changing political and economic landscapes across industrial countries have led to small business playing a more prominent and less marginal role in the economy. Drury (1999) points to the opportunity for colleges in the United States to offer entrepreneurial education that target start-up ventures because the majority of net job growth is coming from small businesses,
an important economic driving force in America (p. 2). Sage (1993) suggests that “a number of
US studies have shown the growth of smaller enterprises to be a prime motivator of economic
expansion,” and responsible for significant job creation (p. 66). Fleming (1999) comments on
how institutions in higher education in Ireland are shifting their traditional syllabus structure to
include both academic learning and practical work experience. “Knowledge and enterprising
skills are the key to innovation-led development and much of modern industry in Ireland has
emerged from a combination of these two factors” (p. 405). In Great Britain, Prime Minister
Tony Blair recommended that entrepreneurship should be taught in schools, and commented on
the need to turn the nation into a more pro-enterprise culture (Entrepreneurs To Order, 1998). In
Germany, the importance to the national economy of entrepreneurial ventures has been
recognized, and it is argued that entrepreneurship should be integrated into the education system
at the earliest possible opportunity so that the entrepreneurial spirit can be nurtured and
encouraged throughout the educational process (French & Puchner, 1999, pp. 372-373).

Students are also demanding that their learning has linkages to successful employment in
the workplace, and are turning to vocational learning or entrepreneurial courses. House (1995,
p. 40) states this has happened due to economic patterns and pressures since the 1960’s. The
push for curriculum changes has been fuelled by what Pring (1995) refers to as educational aims
based on preparation for life, personal effectiveness, and relevance. “Both parents and pupils (but
not teachers) put utility and relevance to working life high on their lists (p. 16). Schachter (1999)
reaffirms this trend of kids flocking to business courses and loving entrepreneurship, because
regardless of what career the student is looking at, they realize that there is the possibility that
this could also be a business:

In a world where business and finance are evermore pervasive, these courses offer
students relevance and help to prepare them for the world of work. They also help
them pick up skills that have individual and societal benefits alike — such as
helping them to avoid the perils of youth unemployment or to be more
knowledgeable consumers. (p. 58)
Educators, policy makers, researchers, and the business community who support enterprise education, often see the educational system as anti-commercial or anti-industrial; a system that works against or ignores the modern economic and political structure. The schooling system is so concerned with promoting stability and teaching a set of common values and norms, that the enterprising skills that are so important to one’s survival in the “new order” are not being fostered (House, 1995, p. 105). Egan (1992) discusses the purpose of schools today, which is in part to make sure students graduate with a similar view and understanding of the society they live in, and that their beliefs are consistent with their culture. “While we may not like Durkheim’s insistence on the term, we must recognize that a central aim of schools is toward homogenization of children; we aim to make them alike in important ways” (p. 645).

Many, such as House (1995), believe that this overemphasis on “socialization” does not accurately take into account the transformation that is occurring in industrialized nations:

This transformation apparently demands that societies become more global in outlook, competitive and dependent upon the rapid transfer of knowledge, requiring that a new culture supportive of innovation be built. . . . Given the task of acculturation is the education system which shapes the economic and political views of those who enter influential roles in government, the media and education. The values that institutions of higher education impress upon an emergent society will depend upon the values of the educators, how aware they are of alternative perspectives and whether they are open to ideas that contradict received wisdom. (p. 133)

House goes further to claim that by having an educational system focused on promoting social stability and conformity, and values that do not reflect the modern society, students are being set up to fail given the challenges and tasks they will be faced with when they attempt to find meaningful work and make sense of the economic order:

If the acculturating components of education promote attitudes and affections that are not particularly beneficial for a society that is supported by commerce and trade, they still promote compliance to an abstract authority while leaving students without the intellectual or behavioural mien to cope with economic change effectively or to introduce viable economic alternatives. (p. 150)
Proponents of liberal learning maintain that their curriculum cultivates equality, respect, freedom, and dignity and vocational education promotes competitive ideals, corporate loyalty, and a sorting system which teaches primarily to the "best" rather than to the masses (Barlow & Robertson, 1994). Supporters of entrepreneurship education, however, claim the education system's hierarchical structure is in direct contrast to the flatter and horizontally structured organizations found in many small and medium-sized enterprises that characterize the modern economy. It is this bureaucratic organization of education, critics of liberal education argue, that nurtures this homogeneity of its students, and stifles innovation and creativity:

But now, with an expressed need to foster creativity and leadership, the bureaucratic model is considered dysfunctional. The values and behaviours it transmits are thought to undermine self-confidence, initiative, and the ability to think for oneself, and reinforce instead the necessity of conformance and the legitimacy of relationships of inequality which will be perpetuated outside the educational institution. (House, 1995, p. 150)

Egan (1997) discusses the influence Plato's ideas have had on schools and his beliefs about how people should be educated. Plato believed that certain forms of knowledge would allow students to be connected with one another and to enter into cultural conversations of a higher level, and provide them with a rational and privileged view of the world. One can argue that these ideals are elitist, and have promoted assumptions about the superiority of certain forms of knowledge and subject matter over others, and put divisions between the primacy of liberal forms of knowledge as compared to vocational education. "Knowledge is valued less for its social utility than for its presumed benefit to the mind of the student; thus Latin has a higher status than automobile maintenance" (p. 15). Pring (1995) also talks about this elitist view of liberal education and the disdain for the practical and the useful:

It [liberal education] writes off too many young people. They fail the initiation test. Their voices are not allowed into the conversation, and the voices they listen to are not considered to be worth hearing. It is as though the liberal education is but for the few. Furthermore, the liberal tradition, in focusing upon the world of ideas, ignores the world of practice – the world of industry, of commerce, of earning a living. (p. 186)
Vocational theorists perceive entrepreneurship education to be more inclusive than liberal
critics argue, and to be more embracing of "marginal" learners:

Enterprise skills are seen by some as an important component of quality general
education, while others see educational techniques requiring enterprise on the part
of the student as ones that are attractive to otherwise reluctant learners, and/or
which motivate them to acquire basic academic and vocational knowledge and
skills. (OECD, 1989, p. 12)

The rationale for vocationally-based education is often based entirely on market goals such as
meeting existing labour force demands, enhancing national competitiveness, and promoting
economic progress, and is devoid of educational goals centred on democracy and community. If
only this narrow view of vocational education is promoted, then it is reasonable to assume that
its aims are incompatible with those supporting liberal educational ideals.

**Incompatible Aims?**

Is it possible that there are some common tenets between these two educational
approaches? What are the key concerns liberal theorists perceive and how do vocational theorists
respond to these? For example, liberal educationists oppose the view of schools as training
grounds for prospective employees as if the only material worth teaching are the skills that a
business requires to remain competitive. Barlow and Robertson (1994) claim that this
perspective conceives of the educational system as merely a preparatory training ground for the
business community rather than providing a broad based and liberal schooling that teaches
virtues such as judgment and respect, equality and fairness:

Elementary and secondary schools were never intended to be employment
training centers. The education you are receiving is supposed to be in the tradition
of a liberal education, which means schools are to help you acquire the skills and
knowledge to live "in liberty" alongside your fellow citizens. Your education
should be about how to make a life, not how to make a living. (p. 246)

Stunkel (1999) claims liberal study is misunderstood by students, parents, employers and faculty,
because they believe education should be about finding employment, which makes liberal study
worthless because it does not provide them with the career prospects they expect from their schooling:

They are right that liberal education is impractical. It does not train students for careers. But they have lost touch altogether with its unique advantages. Consumer activities, entertainment, and self-absorption are higher priorities than anything so exotic as learning to respect truth (an ideal the academy has diminished) or to explore the 99 percent of knowledge and experience lying outside a student’s parochial upbringing. (p. 55)

A liberal education, Barlow and Robertson (1994) insist, provides a much broader form of knowledge than social utility, and they argue that a marketplace or corporate model of education serves to undermine the core values that liberal learning is all about. “Preaching this culture of competitiveness in the schools promotes this version of capitalism and sets out to undermine, without being too blatant, values of co-operation, equality and collective rights” (p. 82). The fear is that if schools let “business” into their classroom and let them control their curriculum, students will learn a very narrow, biased and limited view of the world that teaches them only how to be good corporate citizens, rather than good community or social citizens who know how to act and think considerately and responsibly around more than just the work environment. A revealing quote from Gary Johncox, Vice-president of MacMillan Bloedel, (as cited in Barlow & Robertson, 1994) illustrates a very narrow and self-serving view of what business would demand from the educational system:

I think if I had my way, we would only teach six core subjects in high school. I realize that my list is selfish to my industry’s needs, but is nonetheless what we need. 1)English; 2)Mathematics; 3)Physics; 4)Chemistry; 5)The importance of showing up for work; 6)How to get along with others. With only half my tongue in my cheek, I think we get all the geography, law, ethics, and probably more than enough biology from TV. (p. 123)

On the other hand, vocational education does teach a broad base of skills and competencies that are critical and valued not only for self-employment, but for working effectively within organizations. Teaching individuals how to recognize and make the most of opportunities in their environment through abilities such as critical thinking, innovation, and
analytical skills, is part of vocational education. The OECD (1989) argues that enterprise is a much broader approach:

It is based on the belief that enterprise involves using the imagination, being creative, taking responsibility, identifying ideas, organising for action, making decisions, managing, dealing and communicating with others, assessing performance, and the like in a wide range of living and working contexts. (p. 38)

Enterprise is not a new educational intervention, the OECD argues, but simply a new label for elements of educational practice concerned with personal development (p. 40). Additionally, vocational educators are realizing the possibilities for self-improvement, and the accessibility of educational options resulting from their programs. “Vocational education is providing experiences to build positive self-esteem and confidence in young people – supplying the building blocks of an internal locus of control” (Ashmore, 1990, p. 219).

Many students believe that entrepreneurship education, while important for learning how to start up their own business, is applicable to a broad spectrum of careers, and provides relevant skills that are recognized by other fields. Ries (2000) claims that career and technical teachers are finding a growing interest by their students to teach entrepreneurship; students feel the tools they learn and improve upon such as personal skills, problem-solving, negotiation, and confidence-building, will be applicable to any field they choose whether or not they become self-employed. “Educators say the boom is largely in response to marketplace realities; the programs are expanding students’ career options and better preparing them for life’s wider challenges” (p. 27). Ashmore (1990) argues the skills, attitudes, and values encouraged by vocational programs are analogous to these traits fostered in entrepreneurship education and has resulted in the growing leadership for entrepreneurship education in vocational education. “Personal initiative and diverse special skills are the ingredients for an entrepreneurial economy. Vocational educators are recognizing that these same ingredients are the purpose of vocational programs in the high schools and two-year colleges” (p. 211).
Advocates of enterprise education reiterate that it teaches more than the narrow field of skills in starting up a business; such education imparts knowledge that is academic as well as industrial in nature. Warwick (1998) states that the education system should encourage entrepreneurial skills because, he believes, "enterprise is the key determinant of success in most areas of human endeavour" (p. 31). He also asserts that in this constantly changing and dynamic society, individuals, if they are to succeed, will need certain traits such as adaptability, ingenuity, decision-making, personal responsibility, and drive. Warwick further emphasizes that enterprise is not only concerned with individual tendencies, but also with an ability to work with others, so that areas such as team building, problem-solving, and networking are given equal priority.

Critics of vocational education still dispute that schools should be teaching entrepreneurial skills and knowledge about self-employment; they believe this promotes a very narrow, commercial, and individualistic view of society. However, Warwick (1998) believes that a return to the liberal curriculum and more formal methods are steering education in the wrong direction:

It teaches dependency in an age of enterprise and, at a time when complex, global problems require interdisciplinary co-operation, encourages the separation of different subjects instead of demonstrating their independence. . . . What kind of preparation is this for a life at a time when change has become endemic, when the only remaining certainty is uncertainty? (p. 31)

Change, the OECD (1989) argues, needs to be treated as a certainty, and individuals, communities, and nations will need to recognize the need for lifelong learning:

Both the certainties and uncertainties point to the need for a capacity, on the part of individuals, labour markets, and societies as a whole, to go beyond the ability to cope with change, beyond even the ability to make positive use of change, to the ability to create it. To do so, it is argued, will require enterprise skills. (p. 19)

House's (1995) research found that many entrepreneurs exhibit a high need for achievement, an internal locus of control, and values of independence, and that these qualities encouraged innovation and the ability to act upon and implement innovative ideas:
These are the minimal skills to cope with change, and they are composed of analytical abilities which assist in adapting to new situations; oral and written communication skills; a facility with mathematics and computers; second language skills; and a capacity to interact successfully with people from various cultural, professional and socio-economic backgrounds. With the shift from hierarchical work structures to those which provide employees higher levels of responsibility, autonomy and decision making authority, management skills in problem solving, teamwork, conflict resolution, information handling, decision making, communication and diplomacy have been added to the list of basic skills deemed essential for everyone, and are recommended to be part of a general curriculum accessible to all disciplines and most levels of education, from primary to tertiary. (pp. 147-148)

The OECD (1989) believes that enterprise skills need to be incorporated into the educational system and embraced by organizations, institutions, communities and societies:

It was suggested that whilst in the past, ‘enterprise’ has tended to be grasped by, or seen as the prerogative of the political, scientific, technological or business ‘elite,’ the present circumstances and extent of societal change suggests that societies are entering an age in which all their citizens will need to be enterprising in all aspects of their lives. The educational implication is that ‘enterprise’ needs to be part of the core curriculum and methods of school. (p. 44)

Dickinson (1999) reports that directors of entrepreneurial programs around New York state agree that demand for their programs is growing. Gary Lira, who is the Managing Director of the Syracuse University School of Management in Entrepreneurship and Emerging Enterprises, states that approximately one third of the entrepreneurship students actually pursue business ownership while the other students use their skills to work in established organizations. “Some students will work for newer companies whose management can appreciate their unique training. Some will work for older, larger corporations and engage in corporate entrepreneurship” (p. 8). Enterprise educators argue that teaching students about business, encompasses more knowledge than just learning about a business start-up. The New York Institute of Entrepreneurship launched an on-line business education program that inspires students in grade 8 through 12, to pursue entrepreneurship and business ownership as a viable career option. The curriculum is also geared towards reinforcing math, reading, technology, and critical-thinking skills (Hubbard, 1999, p. 17). The Sun Kids Venture business courses for
children run by the Centre for Entrepreneurial Students in Tokyo, Japan, states that their program was started to challenge the models of Japanese education that stress group solidarity and inhibited individual or creative thinking. Instead their programs stress the value of “out of the box” thinking (Child’s Play, 2000).

Entrepreneurship can be applied to non-profit as well as for-profit organizations and it can reach out to and engage learners who have difficulty with mainstream education. Cocyman (1999) discusses what she believes is a new form of entrepreneurs who work in non-profit areas of business and education and who feel they have a contribution to make. Eric Schwartz, who is cofounder and president of Citizen Schools in Boston, says that he sees a rise in this notion of social entrepreneurism. “A lot of people are looking for meaning and are realizing that in the nonprofit field you can be an entrepreneur, have the thrill of building something and dealing with big issues, but still be helping young people and making the community a better place to live” (p. 17). In an interview with George Walters Jr. and Aaron Bocage, co-founders of Education, Training and Enterprise Centre Inc., Bocage stated his support for a national policy that has incorporated entrepreneurship into the curriculum, just like the “three R’s” and that this was especially crucial in inner-city schools. In the article, “On The Streets Where You Live,” (2000) Bocage states:

In a poor community it’s often difficult to look past the problems, because the problems seem so pervasive. But someone who recognizes opportunity can look beyond those blighted areas and see the possibilities. Too often people brought up in poor communities never learn to recognize opportunities, the essence of entrepreneurship. (p. 117)

**Bridging the Divide**

This chapter began by asking what is the current state of entrepreneurship education, and what knowledge is considered worth knowing? It examined the growth and limitations of the field, the philosophical approaches to this subject area, and the challenges for educators in their practice. This chapter also reviewed the supposed bifurcation between liberal theorists primarily
promoting principles of intellectual excellence and personal autonomy, and vocational theorists encouraging mainly practical and useful competencies, and preparation for the world of work. Egan (1997) talks about these dual aims when he claims that the goals of the education system are both to enhance the competitiveness of nations and the self-fulfillment of citizens (p. 9). The OECD (1989) has suggested that the goals of enterprise education be reoriented to balance the release of human enterprise with the promotion of responsible citizenship (p. 35) promoting a society which is not only innovative and competitive, but also cohesive and caring (p. 49).

These principles have been implemented in several British universities through a program called Enterprise in Higher Education which is an experiment aimed at “education through enterprise,” a category first discussed by Jamieson (1984). This type of enterprise education, House (1995) states, “…strives to teach traditional subjects in ‘enterprising’ ways so that students become active learners and perhaps comprehend the commercial possibilities of their discipline of choice” (p. 102). It teaches life skills and enterprise skills and emphasizes enterprising competencies including skills associated with communication, groupwork, problem solving, leadership, and self-awareness (Caird, 1990, p. 50). Its focus on life and work competencies and transferable skills, with the aims of promoting enterprise awareness and competency development, differ from small business training geared specifically to set up or improve business. “Though some participants may become entrepreneurs, it is primarily hoped that such initiatives will produce enterprising employees” (Caird, 1990, p. 53).

As liberal theorists argue about the need to develop citizens who can promote stability and order and make meaningful contributions to their community, how they find significant work that allows them to function and provide for themselves and their family, and allows them the opportunity to contribute to their society cannot be ignored. Fraser (1997) argues that in order for schooling to be truly democratic and offered to all, the world of work should be considered as one of the best environments for developing these egalitarian conditions (p. 35). Additionally,
with the changing nature of work, enterprising skills are being highly recognized and valued by employers, and also by individuals who can perceive and evaluate opportunities, and be innovative, creative and flexible, beyond merely their work environment:

The ability to be enterprising is a quality that will be as needed in tomorrow’s citizens as specific skills and basic knowledge, both of a high level. Some would argue that it is the most important attribute of all, since, among other things, being enterprising means knowing how to learn and relearn as well as how to adapt and innovate. (OECD, 1989, p. 48)

**Broadening the Approach**

In this chapter, I have discussed a broader notion of vocational education where entrepreneurial approaches are applied to public and non-profit contexts, and enterprise skills are encouraged by all citizens, fulfilling educational objections espoused by both traditions. House (1995) argues that the needs of education today are broader than what one tradition is able to adequately address. “There is a growing recognition that developed industrial societies need considerably more than the skills and knowledge that a general (or liberal) education or a vocational (or professional) education at their best are able to provide” (p. 154). Fraser (1997) also points out how the education system was never meant to be seen purely as a training ground for workers, and talks about Dewey’s notion of a broader standard for education when he comments that people are more than mere workers. “For Dewey, the student is preparing to be worker and citizen, preparing for ways to produce an income and for ways to live well” (p. 33). Furthermore, Pring (1995) believes that “a philosophy of education needs a much more generous notion of what it is to be human than what has too often been captured within a liberal ideal,” yet cautions that the vocational alternative has been too narrowly defined, reducing knowledge into competencies and educators into technicians (p. 191). Instead, Pring argues for the need to “vocationalise the liberal idea” by broadening the notion of vocational preparation and ensuring it becomes part of a re-examined idea of liberal education which strives for social improvement, in addition to intellectual excellence (pp. 192-193).
What would this broader approach to teaching entrepreneurship education, in practice, look like? Case studies of different types of ventures could be utilized to demonstrate entrepreneurial approaches, including for-profit, non-profit, and socially responsible entities. These ventures could be of different sizes, be situated in separate locations, and consist of a variety of mission statements and measures of success. Projects could link students with the broader community through experiential methods, as they learned how to apply entrepreneurial problem-solving techniques to an array of issues facing different types of organizations. Students could investigate socially responsible practices in business contexts and in other environments, and learn from organizations that achieve financial as well as social and environmental targets. Students could also test their own business ventures against measures of sustainability, and demonstrate how their business operations meet standards of fair and equitable practices. By exposing students to a variety of entrepreneurial practices, and incorporating ethical standards into their own measures of evaluation, students would learn beyond a merely technical approach to entrepreneurship education.

**New Paradigm for Entrepreneurship Education?**

Gibb (2002) argues for the need to move entrepreneurship into a wider context, and feels this can be accomplished by encouraging individual enterprise ability and enterprising behaviour in organizational, social, and economic circumstances. A broader “enterprise” paradigm is needed, Gibb asserts, because entrepreneurship should not be viewed solely as the domain of business:

The aim is to provide a broader conceptual framework for exploration of the value of the entrepreneurial paradigm to society and academe. This will provide the base for examining the wider intellectual challenge in responding to the political rhetoric and the apparent economic, social and business imperative. (p. 243)

This need for a paradigm shift outside of the purely business context, and for new institutional frameworks, has been argued in the literature:
The fact that the practitioner academic is likely to be one of the continuing hallmarks of entrepreneurship education in the future should create even more problems for fitting such programs within business schools since they are so firmly based on the academic model, especially in North America. (McMullan and Gillin, 2001, p. 73)

Academics like Gibb (2002) have broadened this notion by claiming the need for a more holistic and interdisciplinary entrepreneurship paradigm that is relevant to a range of stakeholders and organizations:

Perhaps the foremost is to move the focus of entrepreneurship teaching and research away from the narrow business orientation towards the notion of the development of the enterprising person in a wide range of contexts and the design of organizations of all kinds to facilitate appropriate levels of ‘effective’ entrepreneurial behaviour. In this vision, the management of small owner-managed business and the pursuit of entrepreneurship and innovation in large companies can be seen as but two of many contexts for enterprising behaviour. (p. 258).

Similarly, Chia (1996) believes this paradigm shift needs to include exposure to literature and to the arts and to different ways of seeing the world in order to provide important “aesthetic logic” to occur:

It is this paradigm-shifting educational strategy that is capable of effectively producing entrepreneurial managers who are consistently capable of ‘thinking the unthinkable’ and of inventing new figurational patterns of order out of the chaotic unpredictability, volatility and dynamism of the current global environment. (p. 423).

What would this integrated approach, or new paradigm look like, and how can such an approach be implemented? Gibb (1993) claims that although enterprise education has established solid links with progressive and liberal education philosophies in practice, these relationships are not as accepted by theorists and academics, because of the political and ideological overtones associated with the emergence and growth of enterprise education (p. 25). What is needed instead, Gibb (2002) argues, is to move entrepreneurship into a wider interdisciplinary context to focus on issues of personal and organizational enterprise, culture, sustainable enterprise development, social issues, and the environment, and away from the market liberalization
paradigm. In addition, Gibb (1993) believes that educators need to rethink or change the conceptual language, to encompass a broader meaning that can be used in the context of any curriculum, rather than purely in the small business and entrepreneurship sphere:

The key innovative aspect of much of enterprise education in the UK is, however, that it is designed to be part of the basic schools' curriculum. It can be 'taught' by teachers from a variety of subject areas and is addressed to a range of ability and age groups. This gives it a unique differentiation from programmes labeled entrepreneurship education in Europe or North America. (p. 30)

A new approach to entrepreneurship education needs to incorporate pedagogy that considers and reflects the social, contextual, and cultural aspects of learning (Gibb 2002, p. 253). Corson (2002) argues for a critical approach to literacy\(^7\) that has applicability to students in the field of entrepreneurship. Specifically, he recommends incorporating discussions about how students' (and as future entrepreneurs) lives are connected to a broader society, and the responsibilities, possibilities, and limitations that are associated with this connection. This can be achieved by using curriculum materials and examples that reflect a diversity of practices, such as for-profit and not-for-profit businesses, and social responsibility practices, and to study examples of businesses from different cultures, of different sizes, using a variety of measures of success.

Hynes's (1996) process model of entrepreneurship education (see Appendix D) describes three types of outputs, of which two, personal and career, speak to this broader form of learning. Ronstadt (1990) suggests new pedagogical approaches that recognize entrepreneurship as a career process. This path may be "uneven" and distinct for its students, involving possibly multiple ventures, and intrapreneurial experience working for other people (p. 75). McMullan and Long (1987) feel "entrepreneurship education needs to be differentiated more by stage of venture development rather than by department of functional expertise" (p. 268). Similarly, Gibb (2002) looks at how knowledge is organized and makes a claim to get away from the functional

\(^7\) The critical approach to literacy equips children with literacy for active, autonomous, and democratic citizenship (p. 11).
approach taught in business schools. Instead, Gibb proposes a method that includes knowledge around personal and organizational developmental processes, and includes feelings and motivations in learning; a more holistic and interdisciplinary approach than the rational, decision-making model of business (p. 253).

A broader approach also includes a role for morals, values, and ethics in the curriculum. Corson (2002) argues for “critical language awareness” and “critical literacy” to prevent education aimed only at the needs of a corporate and global marketplace. As educators, Corson believes you have to provide students with the skills and opportunity to challenge common sense judgments and to critically think about groups such as the media, government, and business, recognizing that they have agendas that are primarily serving the needs of their organizations. For critical literacy this means critically asking: Who makes decisions? Who benefits and who suffers? What alternatives are available? How can change occur? (p. 11).

Macklem (2002) believes that the pressure to produce better and almost instant returns for shareholders draws attention away from important factors such as long-term strategic thinking, and may cause investors to ignore potentially harmful corporate actions. In view of the corporate scandals that have plagued the boardrooms of well-respected companies and the public outcry that has ensued, it can be argued that it is irresponsible and limited not to provide a broader perspective to students. Macklem suggests there is nothing wrong with pursuing profit, unless this is done to the exclusion of everything else. “As owners, shareholders have the power to insist that corporations take into account more than the immediate bottom line when decisions are made” (p. 55). It can be argued that educators have the power to ensure their students do as well.

---

8 Critical language awareness means teaching students how to critically look at the information they receive, and to think about the social and cultural significance of discourse, to defend themselves from what Corson calls assaults from the marketplace (p. 10).
Summary

Discussion in the first part of this chapter pertaining to the language used in the area of entrepreneurship education demonstrates the slipperiness of these concepts and terms. The lack of consensus from entrepreneurship scholars on how to define entrepreneurship and its educational process, reinforces the relative newness of this field and the challenges of establishing a distinct area of education. Without a common conceptual understanding and language, it is difficult for current entrepreneurship scholarship to progress in a cohesive and credible manner.

The second section examined the current state of the field of entrepreneurship education. The literature identifies this area’s rapid growth and development as evidenced by the increase in programming and familiarity with this area of education. But its lack of acceptance in the institutional context, and the identification of resource constraints, signals insufficient support and recognition. Entrepreneurship scholars argue that a new context, distinct from the business framework, is needed to recognize and appreciate the field’s unique needs. However, there is not consensus on how the field should develop, which poses pedagogical challenges for entrepreneurship educators.

Support for the field of entrepreneurship was further discussed in relation to the purpose and aims of education. The final section explored vocational and liberal approaches to education, with entrepreneurship education being placed under the vocational area. Theorists from these two educational approaches advocate for curriculum and instruction based upon what they argue to be incompatible tenets, which some scholars argue has set up a false dualism. In this thesis, I, along with other scholars, have suggested that there is an alternative to this bifurcation that combines the aims of these competing ideologies into a new integrated approach, and identifies the need for a separate paradigm for entrepreneurship education. This consists of teaching methods that incorporate enterprising skills and knowledge, with ethical principles and
democratic decision-making. Students learn about how to be entrepreneurial in various contexts, while also being mindful of socially responsible practices, and how their actions impact upon the broader community in which they live and work.

In the next chapter I outline the research design, methodology and context of post-secondary entrepreneurship education in British Columbia where the research investigation occurred. I also discuss the data analysis and data management process I utilized to investigate these research questions, in addition to the limitations and soundness of the research methodology.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the research design and methodology, data collection and management process, data analysis procedures, and trustworthiness of the data.

Research Design

There have been numerous studies conducted which have surveyed colleges and universities around the world to track and document specific information about the entrepreneurship courses offered at their institution (see, for example, Vesper, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1993 as cited in Gartner & Vesper, 1994; Menzies & Gasse, 1999; Timmons, 1999). The purpose of my study was not to duplicate this research by reviewing and tracking programming at a national or international level, but rather to focus on the region where I work. Furthermore, because my practice is positioned in the public post-secondary education system in British Columbia, I chose to focus on those institutions.

These earlier studies have used survey methods or a census approach to collect the data, while not talking directly with the educators involved with the programs. The research design I employed consisted of two different stages and two different methods: content analysis of publicly available curriculum materials, and in-depth interviews with educators.

The two stage, two method research corresponded with the research goals of the study. Stage One consisted of a broad mapping of the post-secondary entrepreneurship education programming environment in British Columbia, reviewing curriculum materials that were publicly available. The review focused specifically on what subjects were being taught as represented in a variety of public documents obtained from the institutions’ web pages and promotional materials, or directly from the administrators and instructors involved with these courses and programs. The information gathered included course and program descriptions, course and program outlines, and departmental and institutional descriptions and philosophies.
During Stage One, I reviewed curricula from all 28 public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia. This included seven universities, five university-colleges, eleven colleges and five institutes as listed and categorized by the Ministry of Advanced Education, Training and Technology (para. 2). Four institutions\(^9\) were excluded from the study because they did not offer any courses or programs on entrepreneurship. The remaining 24 institutions were grouped into three categories according to how the subject of entrepreneurship was offered: 1) contains one course on entrepreneurship whereby one course appears to cover the entire subject of entrepreneurship; 2) contains at least two or more distinct courses on entrepreneurship; and 3) provides one or more options, specialties, concentrations or programs centred on entrepreneurship. An institution in this third category may offer a set of courses strictly for an entrepreneurship program, in addition to offering one or more separate entrepreneurship courses.\(^{10}\) Appendix B provides a breakdown of the 28 public post-secondary institutions from British Columbia reviewed and the categorization utilized.

In Stage Two I sought to uncover the educational context and rationale for the programming decisions. This process explored the philosophies, attitudes and values of a select group of educators, and the institutional environments in which their practice occurs. I collected demographic information on these 12 interviewees (detailed in Chapter Five) in order to describe the participants and present a general picture of who was included in the study. Specifically, I asked participants if they would tell me about themselves such as their age, educational background, family status and cultural or ethnic background. I also asked if they would discuss their teaching and/or curriculum development experience in the field of entrepreneurship, and

\(^9\) Emily Carr Institute of Art & Design, Institute of Indigenous Government, Justice Institute of British Columbia, and Vancouver Community College

\(^{10}\) This resulted in the institution's individual course or courses being evaluated under Part A, and the entrepreneurship specialty, option, concentration or program being evaluated under Part B, described in more detail in the Data Management section of this chapter.
any business experience they felt was relevant (see Appendix C). More details on these two stages follows.

**Stage One: Document Analysis**

**Content Analysis**

The history and context of a particular setting can be determined, in part, from reviewing documents. This is an unobtrusive method which can be utilized to identify values and beliefs of participants in the setting (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Content analysis was the research method employed to review and analyze the entrepreneurship documents. “Content analysis is a research tool used to determine the presence of certain words or concepts within texts or sets of texts” (Colorado State University, n.d., para. 1). It is a research methodology that makes inferences about the sender of the message, the message itself or the audience receiving the message, from the text that is studied (Weber, 1985). Examining institutional entrepreneurship documents, such as course outlines and program brochures, provided insight into the objectives and content of this programming, and the anticipated outcomes for the learners.

Weber (1985) argues that “there is no simple right way to do content analysis. Instead, each investigator must judge what methods are appropriate for his or her substantive problem” (p. 13). There are two general categories of content analysis: *conceptual analysis* which establishes the existence and frequency of concepts, usually represented by words and phrases, in a text, and *relational analysis* which prods deeper to examine the relationships among concepts in text (Colorado State University, n.d., para. 4). The method employed in this study was one of conceptual analysis because I primarily wanted to examine the presence of certain words or phrases with respect to my research question. The key feature of this conceptual analysis is that the text under investigation is broken down or classified into manageable content categories, a process that is basically one of selective reduction. “By reducing the text to categories consisting
of words, sets of words or phrases, the researcher can focus on, and code for, specific words or patterns that are indicative of the research question” (Colorado State University, para. 6).

I chose to include all public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia in order to get representation across the various institutional contexts including colleges, universities, university-colleges, and technology institutes. I used the “comprehensive” purposeful sampling strategy because the entire group of entrepreneurship course and program documents were included. According to McMillan and Schumacher (1997, p. 398), this is the preferred sampling strategy. The document review comprised of only undergraduate courses and programs, because there were very limited entrepreneurship offerings at the graduate level in British Columbia. Since I chose not to include institutions outside of British Columbia, I cannot make the claims that my data is generalizable to all public post-secondary institutions in Canada or elsewhere, or to the private post-secondary education sector in British Columbia.

Each institution was initially assessed, primarily through their website and course calendar, to determine what entrepreneurship programming was offered and was only selected if the course or program had entrepreneurship as its central theme. All courses, across the entire institution, both inside and outside of business, were reviewed. This stage required a decision on the level of generalization to be used; “whether concepts are to be coded exactly as they appear, or if they can be recorded as the same even when they appear in different forms” (Colorado State University, n.d., para. 12). This was particularly related to the notion of what is entrepreneurship and how it is defined because the term entrepreneurship conjures up many different images and words, and there does not exist a standard definition that is widely accepted. This was evident from all the different course and program names used in addressing the subject of entrepreneurship across the various institutions which made it difficult in certain situations to determine which courses or programs qualified for this study (see Appendix B for a list of all the entrepreneurship courses and programs included in the study).
In “determining the level of implication” (Colorado State University, para. 12) I would allow in coding for entrepreneurship, I chose to accept a broad array of terms. The courses and programs were reviewed for key words and concepts such as *entrepreneur, entrepreneurial, entrepreneurship, new venture, enterprise, business ownership, how to start a business, small business,* and *business plan.* The documents were then reviewed to determine if the “primary” focus of the course and program description, objectives, outcomes and assignments was to learn about entrepreneurship. The biggest challenge came with courses termed *small business management/development* as it was often unclear until the course outline was reviewed and any other courses or programs in the institution were also reviewed, if its central theme was about starting a business, or about learning the management of a business,\textsuperscript{11} the latter being excluded from the study.\textsuperscript{12}

Once the particular course or program was identified, the text within curriculum documents was analyzed. The specific words and concepts that were the focus for the content analysis were chosen using a conceptual framework I developed based on Hynes’s (1996) process model of entrepreneurship education (see Appendix D). This model was consulted and referred to in the development of questions used for the review and analysis of the entrepreneurship documents. Hynes’s model was utilized because it operationalizes, to a certain extent, the integrated approach I seek to promote for entrepreneurship education. Specifically, the

\textsuperscript{11} For example, at Okanagan University College (OUC) in the Faculty of Business there were three courses that could be considered to be entrepreneurial courses. These included Buad 293: Entrepreneurship; Buad 298: Small Business Management; and Buad 272: Policy Simulation. The Entrepreneurship course dealt with business ownership throughout the whole course and the assignments were all related to learning about and developing aptitude around entrepreneurial skills and processes. The Small Business Management course, however, only discussed entrepreneurship as one section of the course, while the primary emphasis was on learning about effective management practices for small business. The Policy course used a computer simulation to teach teams of students how to operate a fictitious company, however, the emphasis was on strategic management, team development, time management and knowledge development in the functional areas of business including management, marketing, operations and finance. Therefore, only one course, Buad 293: Entrepreneurship, was included in the study from OUC.

\textsuperscript{12} For example, the course outline of MNGT 252: Small Business Management at the University College of the Cariboo stated: “In Buad 259 – Entrepreneurship last term, you developed an entrepreneurial perspective which resulted in developing a comprehensive business plan. In MNGT 252 – Small Business Management you will develop some of the managerial skills needed to make your entrepreneurial business a success.” Therefore, Buad 259 was included and MNGT 252 was excluded from this study.
framework provides for multiple alternative structures and learning mechanisms to ensure that learning across all student groups takes place. The model also provides for a synthesis of conceptual and analytical knowledge with practical application, and focuses on the development of skills and aptitudes. Lastly, this model also recognizes the diversity of roles taken by the educator ranging from the academic to the practitioner (p. 10).

The key questions in the content analysis were designed according to the categories of inputs, content focus, teaching focus and outputs utilized in Hynes’s model of entrepreneurship education. Inputs refer to what antecedent criteria are required for entrance into entrepreneurial courses and programs, and how the students’ needs and requirements have been factored into the course and program design. For this study, inputs were assessed through the prerequisites stated for the course/program and any other prior learning stated as necessary for completion of the course/program. The content focus is concerned with the subject matter and topics that are being taught, and for this study, course and program content as stated on course and program descriptions and course outlines were examined. The teaching focus segment assesses the methodologies that are utilized by the educators; the documents were examined to determine if any teaching methods were explicitly stated. Student assignments were also noted in an effort to deduce what activities were being incorporated into the learning methods.

Finally, the outputs section focuses on the learner outcomes. Documents were studied to determine the target outcomes for each course and program from items such as stated objectives and assignments, and philosophies, principles, mission or vision statements included in the material. As well, I made an effort to ascertain the philosophy or values underpinning each course and program. This was assessed through the course and program descriptions and where these courses and programs were offered within the institution to determine the level of support and resources for this subject area. Additionally, any benefits statements, learner outcomes or
course objectives were analyzed to determine the intended purpose and significance of this instruction, and its assumed value and worth to the learner.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

The review and analysis of the curriculum documents was conducted in two parts. Part A studied all the individual entrepreneurship courses offered across post-secondary institutions in British Columbia at the undergraduate level. This included institutions that offered more than one entrepreneurship course and institutions that also offered entrepreneurial programs. Four entrepreneurship courses were excluded from Part A after a reasonable effort was made to collect curriculum documents, because the lack of information, specifically course outlines, provided insufficient data for comparison. This phase, therefore, included the analysis of 22 courses across 18 different institutions. Once the entrepreneurship courses were selected, each course’s documents were thoroughly examined and a summary written for each course following a curriculum assessment grid I had developed.

After the courses were assessed, a coding schedule was developed to reflect all possible response categories for each section of the curriculum assessment, and a spreadsheet template was developed to track the responses for each selected entrepreneurship course. Finally, each course was analysed and ranked on each section of the curriculum assessment grid based on their course summary, and this process was completed two times in an effort to improve the reliability of the findings. A summary of the findings from this analysis is included in Chapter Four.

---

13 For example, Kwantlen University College’s BUSI 2425 course was reviewed in Part A and their entrepreneurial programs, which consist of other courses not including BUSI 2425, were studied in Part B.

14 This included ENT 302: Entrepreneurship and Small Business for the Non-Specialist offered at University of Victoria, BUSN 250: Exploring Business Ownership & BUSN 404: Entrepreneurship and New Venture Development offered at Douglas College, and BUS 152: Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management offered at North Island College.

15 Four institutions had two entrepreneurship courses included in the study: British Columbia Institute of Technology, College of New Caledonia, University College of the Cariboo, and University College of the Fraser Valley.
Part B studied all the entrepreneurial programs offered across post-secondary institutions in British Columbia at the undergraduate level. Only one program, College of New Caledonia’s Business: The Next Generation, was excluded because no information other than a very brief program description located on their website could be collected even after repeated attempts were made to locate additional data.\(^\text{16}\) This phase, therefore, consisted of 13 programs across eight institutions.\(^\text{17}\) The same process conducted for Part A of the study was also utilized for Part B, and the results are also summarized and discussed in Chapter Four. The differences in this portion of the study was that entire entrepreneurship programs were reviewed as opposed to individual entrepreneurial courses.

The grid used in both Part A and B of the document analysis consisted of the following assessment criteria:

**Definition of Entrepreneurship** – Part A: The subject of entrepreneurship was defined through the course name, course description and any explanation on the course outline as to how this topic or subject was identified or described. Part B: The subject of entrepreneurship was defined through their specialty/option description, as well as reviewing the course descriptions and course outlines which comprised of this program.

**Position** – Part A: How the institution, or specifically the department which offered the course, approached this subject. This was assessed by examining where this course was located (e.g., department/faculty), type of certification (e.g., degree/diploma/certificate), and whether it was a required or elective course. Part B: How the institution, or specifically the department approached this subject, was assessed by examining where this program was located (e.g.,

\(^{16}\) Regarding the institutions which offered an entrepreneurship program but for which course outlines were not available for all or some of the courses, these institutions were still included in the study. This is because many of the questions of the study were concerned with the program as a whole, in addition to separate courses that made up the program. There was often information provided on program brochures or on the web site which offered more details about the overall program goals and objectives; therefore sufficient data could be collected.

\(^{17}\) British Columbia Institute of Technology had three entrepreneurial programs; Douglas College, Kwantlen University College and Langara College had two entrepreneurial programs each.
department), type of certification (e.g., degree/diploma/certificate), and the number and composition of the courses that made up the specialty/option.

**Prerequisites** – Part A: The prerequisites for a course, and the year (if more than a one-yr. program) that this course was offered to the students, were studied (implying the set of courses students needed to complete before taking this course). Part B: The prerequisites for a program were studied, as well as the sequencing of courses, to assess what prior learning or inputs the students were required to have in order to complete the program.

**Content** – Part A: The course content was assessed through the course textbook and supporting materials (e.g., course pack of readings) selected for the students, as well as the course topics described in the course outline. Part B: The program content was assessed through a review of the courses offered which made up the specialty/option. In addition, each course in the program was examined for the textbook and supporting materials (e.g., course pack of readings) selected for the students, as well as the course topics as described in the course outlines.

**Outcomes** – Part A: The course outcomes were derived from course objectives as stated in the course description and on the course outline. Part B: The program outcomes were derived from objectives stated in the overall program description, in addition to objectives stated in individual course descriptions and course outlines.

**Student Assessment & Teaching Methods** – Part A: How a course evaluated the students’ learning was assessed through course assignments. Teaching methods were deduced from course assignments and the course outline which revealed activities, such as guest speakers and case studies, which were incorporated into the learning methods. Part B: How an overall program evaluated the students’ learning was assessed through the course assignments in each of the courses. Teaching methods were deduced from course assignments and course outlines.

**Values** – Part A: The values embedded in the course were inferred through any philosophies, principles, mission or vision statements provided on the course outline. As well, any benefits
statements, learner outcomes or course objectives were assessed to try to determine the intended purpose and significance of the course, and its assumed use and worth to the learner. Part B: The values embedded in the program were inferred through any philosophies, principles, mission or vision statements provided on the overall program description. As well, any benefits statements, learner outcomes or course objectives were assessed to try to determine the intended purpose and significance of each course, and the overall program, and its assumed use and worth to the learner.

**Coding Strategy**

Prior to my analysis, I began with what Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 51) call a “start list” of codes. These codes were identified from the curriculum assessment grids, and I used these codes to review and evaluate the entrepreneurship documents in Stage One of my data collection process. Miles and Huberman claim that “codes are attached to ‘chunks’ of varying size – words, phrases, sentences, or whole paragraphs (p. 56) . . . . and are efficient data-labeling and data-retrieval devices which empower and speed up analysis” (p. 65).

My start list of codes, before I engaged in content analysis, consisted of descriptive titles based on Hynes’s model: “course title,” “definition of entrepreneurship,” “position of course,” “prerequisites,” “course text,” “course subjects,” “course outcomes,” “course assignments,” “teaching methods,” and “value.” These codes were used to summarize and group data, what Miles and Huberman (1994) call “first-level descriptive codes.” Creswell (1998) argues for a shortlist of approximately five or six categories with labels or codes that will be expanded upon when the database is reviewed, and then narrowed in the final writing or narrative stage (p. 142).

As I analyzed the curriculum documents, I highlighted the key parts of the text by circling or underlining the relevant areas, and wrote a code in its margin to identify this section. Once I completed the analysis of entrepreneurship curriculum documents and wrote up my findings, I expanded upon and altered these first-level codes to represent more interpretive and
explanatory codes, and then grouped these summaries of data into what Miles and Humberman (1994) refer to as "patterns." These patterns consisted of a smaller number of themes such as "repackaging," "skills training," and "integrated approach." An overview of the findings and identification of the major themes from the document review are presented in Chapter Four.

**Stage Two: Interviews**

**In-Depth Interviews**

"As in-depth interviewing often involves qualitative data, it is also called qualitative interviewing" (Berry, 1999, p. 1). Kvale (1996) argues there is a close relationship between in-depth interviewing and qualitative research. Qualitative interviewing, he believes, is based on the art of conversation of daily life. I chose to conduct qualitative research for my study because I wanted to describe and analyse participants' beliefs, attitudes and perceptions regarding their sense of entrepreneurship education:

Qualitative research is concerned with understanding the social phenomenon from the participants' perspective. Understanding is acquired by analyzing the many contexts of the participants and by narrating participants' meanings for these situations and events. Participants' meanings include their feelings, beliefs, ideals, thoughts, and actions. (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997, p. 392)

Twelve semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with educators from the institutions whose documents I had reviewed:

A study focusing on individual lived experience typically relies on an in-depth interview strategy, although this may be supplemented with journal writing by the participants in the study or other forms of data; the primary strategy is to capture the deep meaning of experience in their own words. (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 61)

As argued by Creswell (1998), I chose a qualitative approach for Stage Two because I wanted to know how educators understand and articulate their understanding of entrepreneurship education, and how their practice is structured to reflect these meanings, philosophies and beliefs (p.17).

I also wanted to learn about the institutional environment in which this teaching was delivered. "The topic of the qualitative research interview is the lived world of the subjects and
their relation to it. The purpose is to describe and understand the central themes the subjects experience and live toward" (Kvale, 1996, p. 29). Creswell (1998) asserts that when you are trying to describe the views of a small number of individuals who have experienced the phenomenon, the process of collecting information involves primarily in-depth interviews, and may also include the self-reflection of the interviewer as a preparatory step to interviewing, or in the first stage of data analysis (p. 122).

The qualitative research interview, according to Kvale (1996), is “semistructured,” or similar to what Patton (as cited in Berry, 1999, p. 2) refers to as the “guided interview” because it is conducted using an interview guide which focuses on certain themes and may include suggested questions. “The subjects not only answer questions prepared by an expert, but themselves formulate in a dialogue their own conceptions of their lived world” (Kvale, 1996, p. 11). I had prepared a set of open-ended questions for interviewing each participant (see Appendix C) to ensure all relevant topics were covered. I used these questions to explore and prod interesting areas in the conversation which I felt warranted further investigation. “This type of interview [in-depth] involves asking informants open-ended questions, and probing whenever necessary to obtain data deemed useful by the researcher” (Berry, 1999, p. 1).

“In the 1980s, there was a considerable growth in using interviewing as a method for educational research and now it is generally agreed that interviewing is a key method of data collection” (Berry, 1999, p. 1). There are advantages to this method including what Marshall and Rossman (1999) argue is the ability to generate large amounts of data quickly. I was able to gain rich, personal information about a small group of educators’ beliefs, attitudes and perspectives regarding an intimate subject area of their practice. “Typically, qualitative in-depth interviews are much more like conversations than formal events with predetermined response categories” (p. 108). It also provided me with the opportunity to study my own teaching, perspectives and
philosophies, and is consistent with the research done in the EdD program; grounded in problems of practice, which are addressed or explored through research.

**Selection Criteria**

I performed 12 in-depth interviews, as well as conducted a self-reflection prior to interviewing participants, (elaborated further in the data collection section) which allowed me to identify and make transparent my assumptions and values which I described in Chapter One. I used a purposeful sampling method for selecting the participants to interview. McMillan and Schumacher (1997) assert that purposeful sampling is appropriate when the researcher is using small samples and wants to increase the usefulness of the information from this small group, and when the objective is to learn about these cases without needing to generalize the findings to all cases (p. 397).

Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 28) developed a typology of sixteen strategies for purposeful sampling. The “criterion” sampling option from this typology was employed in my study because all interview cases met the criterion of post-secondary educators intimately involved with the instruction and curriculum development of entrepreneurship courses and programs. Other purposeful sampling options utilized from Miles and Huberman’s typology included “maximum variation,” “snowball,” and “convenience.” Maximum variation explains that I interviewed educators from courses and programs which were unique and had “diverse variations” in how they were packaged, offered and taught to the learners, yet there were important “common patterns” in that they were all trying to teach the topic of entrepreneurship (p. 28). Snowball is defined as “cases of interest from people who know people who know what cases are information-rich” (p. 28). Two of the interviews with educators involved in the instruction of entrepreneurship courses, recommended two other people from their institution who they felt had the experience and knowledge with this subject area to add value and understanding to the study. Finally, the convenience purposeful sampling option was used
because I did not have time to interview educators involved with every entrepreneurship course and program in British Columbia. The limitations of purposeful sampling are discussed later in this chapter.

McMillan and Schumacher (1997) argue that in purposeful sampling, information is gathered about the differences between the “subunits” before a sample is chosen so that the researcher can find the “information-rich” participants to study. “In other words, these samples are chosen because they are likely to be knowledgeable and informative about the phenomena the researcher is investigating” (p. 397). Creswell (1998) argues that researchers who design qualitative studies and use a purposeful sampling strategy need to have clear criteria and to provide a justification for their decisions. “I especially like when writers can identify their specific strategies, offer definitions for them, and provide brief rationales for their use” (p. 118).

The process for selecting which entrepreneurship courses and subsequent educators to investigate further involved the documenting during Stage One of any unique practices that differentiated the course. For example, it was important to select courses that utilized different course materials, as there were great similarities in content and outcomes for courses using the same text. I wanted to get a cross-section and diversity of the type of programming being developed, and also the different perspectives and approaches being utilized in the educators’ practice. Of the 22 courses from 18 institutions reviewed in Stage One, I conducted eight one-on-one interviews with the key person responsible for the development and/or delivery of the course. In all but two cases, the participants were currently teaching the entrepreneurship course, or teaching at least one of the courses in the entrepreneurship program.18

18 In one case, the participant I interviewed was in an administrative position, and no longer teaching in the entrepreneurial program. However, he was integrally involved in the development of the entrepreneurship programming at their institution. In the other case, the participant had retired very recently from the institution where she held an administrative position overseeing the entrepreneurship programming, and had previously held the position of tutor specifically for their entrepreneurship course.
Courses Selected

The institution that I chose, the course title, and a description of the reasons for my selection are presented below:

1. Open Learning Agency - Business Management 104: Something Ventured, Starting Your Own Business

   This course was selected because it was the only syllabus that addresses the topic of social responsibility in its entrepreneurship course. This was also only one of two courses offered through distance education so it was useful to investigate how this topic was structured without using face-to-face instruction. For example, course materials included a video series and a Canadian Telecourse Guide, and two textbooks that no other institution utilized. I interviewed the tutor for this course and he recommended that I speak with another person who was one of the original tutors and also spent considerable time as the Manager of Business Programs overseeing this course. I subsequently interviewed this person as well, and therefore, have two representatives included in the study from this institution.

2. University College of the Cariboo - Bachelor of Business 477: Entrepreneurship

   Originally, this course was selected because of its topics, text, instructor, and objectives. For example, the course text was used only in this particular course and the author of the text was the instructor for the course. However, at the time of the interviews the instructor had resigned from the institution and the course was no longer being offered. I was redirected to another instructor who taught the other course that I had reviewed in the content analysis process called Buad 259: Entrepreneurship. It was very relevant to include her in the study because she was still teaching this course, although it was now being taught in the School of Tourism instead of the School of Business. Additionally, she was the current Chair of the Department of Tourism.

---

19 Module 7 (out of seven modules in total) was titled “Social Responsibility and Small Business” and one of the course objectives was to “explain the social responsibility business carries towards the community.”

Management, and was responsible for the development of a new major in entrepreneurship in their tourism management degree that was being offered in the fall of 2003.

3. Okanagan University College - Business Administration 293: Entrepreneurship

Although I was the current instructor for this course and knew the course intimately, I had not been involved with its initial design and development. I wanted to interview the instructor who had developed this course and taught it for the ten years before I joined the department, in order to learn about the history of the course and how it had evolved to its present state, and what philosophy had driven the original development and course growth.

This instructor also recommended I interview another person from the institution who had been involved in entrepreneurship instruction at the College and other organizations for over twenty years. This instructor had also been teaching the entrepreneurship course for several years at Okanagan University College and was responsible for the development and evaluation of the online and distance format of this course. Furthermore, as this was the institution where I was currently employed and teaching, it was important for my practice to understand as much as I could about the history, politics, and philosophies, surrounding this subject, if I was going to continue to be one of the lead instructors in the development and growth of this area.

4. British Columbia Institute of Technology - Business Administration 3800: Business & Entrepreneurship

The second most commonly used course text by five of the institutions included in Stage One, Part A of the study was written by Walter S. Good and, therefore, I considered it useful to evaluate one course syllabus that used this material. As well, since I use the same text in my entrepreneurship course and have reviewed two editions of the textbook, I am very familiar with the structure and content of the text and was interested to see how this particular material had been incorporated into another institution’s entrepreneurship course. Furthermore, the course at

---

British Columbia Institute of Technology included unique topics and outcomes that were beyond the scope of the text, and therefore I wanted to explore what other curriculum materials were utilized to cover these areas and what specific subject matter was presented.

5. University of Northern British Columbia - Commerce 302: Entrepreneurship

It was important when selecting the interview sample that different course methods and materials were chosen to ensure a variety of perspectives. This course was only one of two courses out of the 22 courses analysed which had selected this specific course text and it was the only course to include a business plan template as part of its required materials. In addition, it was also one of the few courses to list as a subject area the topic of “social and ethical issues” as part of its curriculum.


The course description stated “this course is specifically designed to provide students with the knowledge required to start-up and successfully operate a small business endeavour.” What is unique about this course, and only observed in three of the courses, was that a computer simulation was the learning tool. The course used the most common text used by eight of the institutions included in Stage One, Part A of the study, in addition to also using a simulation text. I also wanted to explore through the interview process how a simulation was incorporated into an entrepreneurial course while also teaching from a separate course text (for example, some institutions provide a separate course for the simulation method, such as our course at Okanagan.

---

22 This included the key topic area of “The Ethical, Legal and Regulatory Environment” and two course objectives: “Explain the key theories and concepts of business analysis and entrepreneurship and apply them to various business situations;” and “Apply contemporary entrepreneurial theories to understand and determine effective organizations in a variety of situations.”


25 In the course outline it stated that “this computer simulation is designed to help the student learn course content through ‘doing.’ It allows the participant to learn the various facets of business while doing it”!


University College), and to analyse further the two distinct approaches this course used to meet its course objectives.\(^{28}\)

**Programs Selected**

A similar process for identifying which entrepreneurship programs to further investigate was carried out. The criteria for selection included the recognition of a "unique program format" that was differentiated from other entrepreneurship programs in the province. For example, several of the programs consisted primarily of business courses packaged together with a few specific entrepreneurial courses and appeared to be very similar to programs in other business areas such as marketing, small business or general business; only one of these programs was considered for further analysis through the interview process. Programs that were uniquely tailored towards an entrepreneurial perspective, and programs that utilized novel teaching formats and methods, such as a summer foundation component, were chosen. As well, an attempt was also made to choose programs of varying length and credentials such as certificate, diploma and degree programs. Of the thirteen programs analysed from eight institutions, five curricula were identified for further investigation, with one institution being excluded after repeated attempts made to locate an educator willing to be interviewed were unsuccessful. Thus, four interviews in total were conducted with key educators involved in entrepreneurship programs at their institutions in British Columbia. The institution that I chose, the program title, and a description of the reasons for my selection are presented below:

1. **Langara College: Small Business Entrepreneur Certificate Program**

   This was the only certificate program selected, and the only program chosen which packaged a number of separate business courses from various areas into an entrepreneurial

---

\(^{28}\) First approach: "An entrepreneurial approach, which specifies opportunity identification. Rather than just considering management as a problem-solving process, the course attempts to give the student a feel for what is involved in starting or managing a growth-oriented small enterprise." Second approach: "An interdisciplinary approach, which draws from economic theory, management concepts, accounting methods, the behavioural sciences, and related subjects."
program. I felt it was important to explore how these courses were selected and how they contributed to the program outcome: “to assist entrepreneurs with the initial stages of their small business development.” The other reason this program was selected was through earlier discussions with one of the instructors and administrators of the program, it became apparent that this department had to make significant changes to the courses to reflect falling enrolments (their aim was for thirty students but they had thirteen in the last two years). They had to “piggyback” on other courses to make it feasible to offer the program. I felt it would be beneficial to explore further why this trend was happening, and what is the future of this program.

2. Kwantlen University College: Bachelor of Business Administration Program in Entrepreneurial Leadership

This degree program was unique because its curriculum was designed to include a combination of practical entrepreneurial courses and broad liberal education courses. The program began in the student’s third year and consisted of fifteen entrepreneurial courses (concentrating on entrepreneurial skills) and five liberal education courses. It was the only program in my study that integrated both vocational and liberal education learning. This was reflected in the overall program outcomes which included: “technical business skills through their subject specific studies; general success skills through their employability skills studies; and a better understanding of human society and how to contribute to it through liberal education studies.”

Also worth exploring was this notion of providing graduates with “applied and practiced employability skills.” These employability skills were listed on each course outline, as well as

---

29 Required liberal education courses included: LBED 3310: Power Relationships I; LBED 3311: Power Relationships II; and LBED 4900: Community Involvement and Contribution. For the two liberal education electives offered, students select from the following group of liberal education courses: LBED 3110: Work, Technology and Society - Structures and Processes; LBED 3120: Study of Cultures; LBED 3130: The Philosophy of Critical Thinking, Logic and Scientific Reasoning; LBED 4215: Ethics, Morality and Social Issues for Business; LBED 4810: Innovation and Creativity; and LBED 4820: Creativity Development.

30 Employability skills for the entrepreneurial program included: creative thinking and problem solving, oral skills, interpersonal skills, entrepreneurial skills, teamwork and leadership skills, personal management skills, writing
how the course met these learning outcomes. Additionally, it was worth investigating the unique methods used to achieve these outcomes such as practicums, learning partnerships with business, applied projects and assignments, work experience, and simulated environments. Finally, in terms of the liberal required courses, I also wanted to explore further the reason for offering the course on ethics, morality and social issues as an elective, rather than a required course.

3. University of Victoria: Bachelor of Commerce Program with an Entrepreneurship Area of Concentration.

This degree program had won several awards and had been internationally recognized for its entrepreneurship area of concentration. I wanted to explore, through the interview process, its statement that the program would “teach you how to be an entrepreneur rather than merely teaching about entrepreneurship.” Central to this notion was the University of Victoria model of entrepreneurship education. As well, one of its program objectives was that it taught students to become an expert in entrepreneurship within five years of graduation. This notion of “expert,” and what it meant and how this was achieved, warranted further investigation. I also wanted to discuss in greater detail with the program instructor their interdisciplinary and international program approach that also emphasized the importance of ethics.

4. Royal Roads University: The Bachelor of Commerce Program in Entrepreneurial Management

One unique aspect of this degree program was its non-traditional structure; it was organized on a quarter system that condensed the traditional third and fourth year curriculum into one calendar year. Another distinctive feature of the program format was the three-week...
Foundation Program that was held in September for all learners and covered areas where some learners were deficient, and established the skills and relationships necessary for a learning community.\(^{33}\) I considered it useful to explore through the interview process this Foundation Program further as well as the philosophy of a “learning community”\(^{34}\) which the program was based upon and tried to make central in its all its teaching. Finally, there were a couple of specific courses in this program that I felt were unique, and warranted further investigation. Specifically, this included the “Entrepreneurial Expertise” course and the “Entrepreneurial Project” course. The former course listed topics that included the nature and theories of entrepreneurship which few courses addressed, and how it gave learners a broad understanding of the field of entrepreneurship and the role it played in society. The latter course is described as a capstone course for the program in that it integrated all the content taught in the program, and allowed learners to “practice all the phases of entrepreneurial management.”

**Development of Interview Questions**

Once I completed the document review stage, wrote up my findings and began identifying the educators I wanted to interview, I answered the interview questions myself. I wanted to review how clear the questions appeared and to explore my own feelings and attitudes in this area. My purpose was to identify my beliefs before I conducted the interviews so I could pay careful attention to how these values informed this study to prevent seeking answers from interviews that only reinforced my views. Marshall and Rossman (1999) argue that when conducting qualitative in-depth interviews, the researcher should respect how the participant frames and structures the responses. “The participant’s perspective on the phenomenon of interest should unfold as the participant views it, not as the researcher views it” (p. 108). I have

\(^{33}\) Topics of the Foundation Program included team building, financial statements, computer skills, problem-solving and sizing up the business.

\(^{34}\) This learning community was defined as “a place where learners and faculty share in the responsibility to create learning opportunities.”
articulated assumptions and included them in Chapter One to make them transparent and known to the reader.

I also conducted a pilot interview with one of my colleagues at Okanagan University College, who was also included as an interview participant in the study. This strategy was used to test out the interview questions and evaluate the feedback, to determine if these questions were able to get at the key issues of the study. What I realized from this self-reflection and pilot interview was that I was essentially asking the same questions of the participants as I was of the course and program documents, and not exploring the philosophies, beliefs, attitudes and values of the participants that explain the reasons behind many of the educational decisions.

I wanted the interviews to expand and probe areas that could not be answered with the materials already collected, and therefore I modified the interview questions to better reflect these objectives. For example, the questions: “Based on the courses/programs that cover entrepreneurship in your department, how is entrepreneurship defined? What key concepts or ideas are common throughout your course descriptions/outlines”? were changed to: “What does entrepreneurship education mean to you? How is this philosophy reflected in your current educational course/program”? Rather than asking participants to: “Please list the subjects that are covered in this entrepreneurship course/program and why these topics are important content for the student to know,” I asked: “What skills, knowledge and entrepreneurial characteristics does this course/program purport to teach, and where is the emphasis provided? What is the role of social, moral and ethical issues in this course/program? Characterize the learner you are hoping to attract to this program/course.” Instead of inquiring about: “What teaching methods do you utilize to teach this course/program? How effective do you feel these methods are”? I asked: “Do you feel it is possible to teach entrepreneurship? What are the challenges (additionally in a distance education format, if applicable)? What instructional methods do you believe are most effective in teaching this material”? During the interview I also adapted my questions to each
particular situation and followed up on certain points discussed by the participant that I felt were relevant to the study.

As a result of the pilot interview, I realized I also wanted to examine the politics of curricula, and the different perceptions between the topics of small business and entrepreneurship. I therefore included the questions: “Is your current format (e.g., content, length, position in the curriculum) how you would ideally like to offer this course, why or why not? What constraints impinge on your ability to offer the ideal format of your course”? I rewrote my interview questions and submitted them for ethics approval prior to completing the rest of my interviews (see Appendix C). I still included my pilot test in the study because my participant was very thorough in her responses and she expanded upon many issues that were pertinent to the newly revised questions. I also followed up with her after the interview questions had been modified to ask additional information that I felt was not covered in the original interview.

**Interview Process**

All participants were contacted by e-mail at the beginning of July 2002 to determine their interest in participating in a telephone interview through a Letter of Initial Contact (see Appendix E). Once the Information Letter had been emailed, I contacted the participants two weeks later, by e-mail, to inquire if they had any questions about the study and interview session, and to determine their interest in participating. Once their interest in participating in an interview was confirmed, I e-mailed the participants a Consent Form (see Appendix F) they were required to sign and fax or mail back to me before the interview could occur. Three participants did not get their consent forms back to me before the interview, even after several reminders, and requested that they be able to give their consent verbally over the phone prior to the interview, which I accepted. Out of 12 participants only one interviewee chose Option A on the Consent Form.

35 One participant contacted me immediately after the initial contact and said he was interested in participating and was going away shortly on holidays, and so we conducted our interview five days after the initial contact.
which stipulated that he did “not” want his name, or the name of the institution he represented, to be identified in any reports of the completed study. One other participant verbally changed the option he had selected on the consent form from not including his name and institution with his comments (Option A), to having his name associated with his responses (Option B) after the interview was completed.

The interviews were conducted between July 2002 and January 2003. Each interview took between 30 and 90 minutes to complete with the average interview being approximately 60 minutes in length. With prior consent given from the participants, all the interviews were tape recorded; this was made possible during the phone interviews with the use of a speaker phone. A list of the interview questions were provided to all participants well in advance of their interview, although several participants commented that they did not have time to review these questions prior to the interview being conducted. All phone interviews were conducted in my office, and the two face-to-face interviews were conducted in the participants’ offices. The interviewees were very generous with their time and I did not feel hurried or pressured during our conversation.

During each interview, I adapted my questions for each particular situation, and probed the participant further in areas that were relevant to the study. I also at certain times talked confidentially about other findings from the interviews when relevant to the issue we were discussing, to share these experiences and add to the understanding of these topics. The response from participants was usually positive as they appreciated the opportunity to share and discuss similar issues across institutions; it was as if I was facilitating this discourse between educators without having all the participants present at one time. For me, this was an exciting outcome of the interview process.
Data Management

I asked participants for their consent at the conclusion of the interview to contact them again if any of their material needed further clarification, which they all agreed to. Except for the pilot interview, I found no need to take this step when analyzing the data. Within one week after conducting the interview, I listened to the taped interview, jotting down themes which immediately came to my attention as issues I would want to carefully review during the formal analysis stage. I transcribed the first pilot interview so I could understand this process and how best I wanted the transcription to occur. I also transcribed the interview with the participant who did not want his name or institution to be associated with his comments in the study, to keep his information confidential.

The remaining 10 interviews were transcribed by a professional transcriptionist who returned the tapes within one to two weeks. We set up a transcription procedure that included verbatim description of all words, a blank line to indicate a word she could not understand, and an underlined word to indicate a word she thought she had possibly misspelled. I was then able to go through the interview and edit or insert any words that were missing. I also had the transcriptionist put my initials “KM” before I spoke and the initials of the participant before they spoke, so I was clear as to which discussion was attributed to which person. I did not inform the 10 participants that I would be having the tapes transcribed by another person because they all agreed to Option B on the consent form (see Appendix F). However, I did have the transcriptionist sign a confidentiality agreement that all information transcribed for my doctoral research project would be kept confidential and no names or comments stated by the participants would be discussed with anyone other than the researcher. I also had the transcriptionist save the interview data only on a floppy disk and not the hard drive of her computer, and hand in this floppy disk with the interview tape once she had completed transcribing each interview.
Each interview tape was coded with the participant's name, institution, and date of interview, except for the one interviewee who wanted to keep this information private; this tape was labeled using a confidential code with the information of the participant's name, institution, and date of interview kept at home in my locked filing cabinet. This is also where I stored my consent forms, log of participants' demographic information, personal journal of my research study experiences, printed interviews and interview tapes. My interviews were also kept on the desk copy of my home computer and protected by a login password that only I could access.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis is the process of bringing order, structure, and interpretation to the mass of collected data. It is a messy, ambiguous, time-consuming, creative, and fascinating process. It does not proceed in a linear fashion; it is not neat. (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 150)

I did not use one method for analyzing my data, but rather employed concepts from Creswell (1998), Marshall and Rossman (1999), and Miles and Huberman (1994) to try to make sense of, and interpret the volumes of data I collected. I also did not find the data analysis to proceed in a predictable and linear fashion, but rather in a circular, or what Creswell (1998, p. 142) calls a "spiral process." I engaged in "early analysis" as Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 50) recommend whereby I reviewed and analyzed each interview I had conducted before proceeding to the next interview. I found that by studying each conversation I gained new understandings of the phenomenon under investigation which provided for a better appreciation of the topics which the interviewee discussed and also led to new ways of approaching and discussing their experiences.

As Marshall and Rossman (1999) suggest, "the researcher is guided by initial concepts and developing understandings but shifts or modifies them as she collects and analyses the data" (p. 151). I also found it helpful each time to review my management of the interview process to learn from and improve upon my questioning and information retrieval techniques.
I began my interview field work with a start list of descriptive and interpretive codes, and patterns or themes that I had developed out of the analysis conducted in Stage One. During each interview, I jotted down notes in the margins of the interview questions, mainly to help with my questioning throughout the interview, but also to highlight any key issues which came to my attention. After each interview was conducted, I made an effort to listen to the tape in its entirety within one week of the interview before sending it to be transcribed, and jotted down any initial first impressions of the data. This process is referred to by Miles and Huberman (1994) as a rapid, practical way to do first-run data reduction which captures thoughtful impressions and reflections (p. 52).

Once I received the transcribed text of the interview, I read each interview line by line, immersing myself in the data. As I read, I used a highlighter to color the areas of text which were significant for coding, and wrote descriptive terms in the margins of the text to summarize each highlighted area. I then returned to my original notes written during the interview, and after first listening to the interview on tape, I began trying to synthesize and sort the text into categories or codes, “winnowing” the data as Creswell (1998) recommends. I then constructed a summary sheet for each interview in a word document which consisted of bolded themes with key points or codes that fit under each theme. I cut and pasted direct quotes from the transcribed interviews and included them under specific codes to demonstrate how the participant experienced this topic, which Creswell refers to as “horizontalization of the data.” My goal was to create this summary sheet of each interview before I conducted the next interview, and I was successful in achieving this task for the majority of interviews, having only a couple of instances where the interviews were scheduled too closely together to permit a full analysis prior to the next interview.

Initially I used the pre-set codes I had developed in Stage One. However, new codes or keywords developed as I continued to analyze and sort the data, including “course development,”
“target market,” and “lack of demand.” As Miles and Huberman (1994) state, other codes will emerge progressively during data collection and analysis, and they demonstrate that the researcher is open to what the participants have to say, rather than being determined to force-fit the data into preexisting codes (p. 62). After I reviewed all the interviews I went back to the summary sheets and tried to find salient themes, or recurring ideas or language to link the texts together. I also went back to each interview to look at what pieces I had highlighted and what sections I had omitted, to review if this was not relevant data.

I hired a nursing colleague, Sonja, who is an Associate Professor with my institution and also a PhD student currently engaged in and competent with qualitative analysis, to review my interview data. Sonja analyzed 11 of the 12 interviews as I did not include the data from the one participant who did not want to be identified in the study. She provided written comments grouped into codes which were often different categories than I had identified, including “learning activities,” “program issues,” and “faculty issues.” These differences occurred even though she had reviewed my findings from Stage One prior to her analysis in order to help her understand and contextualize the data. Sonja also conducted a cross-analysis of all the interview data, and combined these codes into patterns which she discovered emerging from the text.

I used the role of Sonja as an additional researcher which McMillan and Schumacher (1997) claim is another method to enhance validity. The other purpose of having an additional person analysing the data was to highlight different ways of reflecting upon the data, and also to identify areas of the text I had not highlighted, which encouraged me to question and reflect upon why I had not included this data in my original findings:

Part of this phase is to evaluate the data for their usefulness and centrality. The researcher should determine how useful the data are in illuminating the questions

---

36 Although the eleven participant interviews that Sonja reviewed had signed consent forms stating they did not mind being identified in the study, Sonja did sign a confidentiality agreement stating that all information analysed for my doctoral research project would be kept confidential, and no names or comments stated by the participants would be discussed with anyone other than the researcher.
being explored and how they are central to the story that is unfolding about the social phenomenon. (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 157)

I reviewed Sonja’s comments and compared them to my analysis to identify consistent and unique patterns, and then began the work of combining the themes together into a goal of approximately five or six larger themes, as Creswell (1998) recommends, when you are getting ready to write your narrative. For example, the issues of “curriculum politics,” “teaching constraints,” “institutional constraints,” and “productivity/demand/marketability” all became grouped under the major theme of “political tensions.” The issues of “course materials,” “faculty,” “teaching methods and assessment,” and “treatment of ethics” were combined under the broader theme of “implementation struggles.” This proved to be a laborious process and as Marshall and Rossman (1999) comment, an “intellectually challenging phase of data analysis,” because every time I reviewed the data I learned new things about how the participants experienced the phenomenon under investigation. “For editing and immersion strategies, the categories are generated through prolonged engagement with the data – the text. These categories then become buckets or baskets into which segments of text are placed” (p. 154).

I also chose, at this stage, a method of further testing my data analysis by contacting one of my interview participants and requesting she review the assessment I had completed. I provided her with an overview of my research goals and key questions, my methodology, and a summary of my findings. As someone with substantive knowledge of the field and familiar already with the study, I wanted to use her feedback as a way of checking the validity of my findings and to gain any new insight or reflections on the data I collected.

Another challenge became knowing when to stop analysing the data:

Fieldwork understanding comes in layers; the longer we are in the environment, the more layers appear to surface, and the choice of when to close down, when to go with a definite coding scheme or definitive analysis, can be painful. That choice may be dictated as often by time and budget constraints as on scientific grounds. (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 62)
I looked for what Strauss (as cited in Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 62) calls “saturation”; when all the main experiences can be readily classified and a sufficient number of regularities emerge. I reviewed the text until I could find no new themes or methods to organize the data. I was looking for consistent patterns across the interviews, but I was also looking for outlier themes that were relevant to a minority of the participants, or even just one interviewee, as I had singled out these institutions based upon the demonstration of unique practices. I had completed the spiral phases, as outlined by Creswell (1998), which includes a describing, classifying and interpreting loop, and I began his final phase of presenting the data. “The researcher then constructs an overall description of the meaning and essence of the experience” (p. 150). Chapter Five describes my interview findings, and reconstructs for the reader how the phenomenon of entrepreneurship education was experienced by the participants in the study.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

**Stage One**

Using content analysis to analyse the entrepreneurship documents presented limitations as to what conclusions could be drawn. This was often due to the lack of information provided in the documents. When there were no explicit answers to the questions used to review the documents, assumptions were made based upon the limited information available. Examples of these assumptions included:

**Course Content:** In some documents no course topics were identified, and sometimes only the textbook chapter numbers were listed. Many of the course outlines mirrored the course chapters of the text they were using, but it was unclear which topic areas were emphasized or the weighting or importance attributed to different topics. Additionally, the stated topics were not always described in enough detail to reveal what I believed all the areas of instruction covered. Hence, the topics tracked for the study consisted only of those listed on the documents.
Teaching Methods: Often this information was not provided on the documents and the instructional methods had to be inferred based upon the course assignments.

Assignment Outcomes: In most of the documents these outcomes were not explicitly stated and the outcomes were deduced based upon the nature of the assignment.

Prerequisites: For some of the courses offered in the third or fourth semester of a diploma program no prerequisites were listed, yet because these courses were offered at the 300 or 400 level, it implied that previous courses were a necessary foundation for these upper level courses. Yet without explicit prerequisites stated, none were listed in the content analysis process. Several of the entrepreneurship programs offered in the third and fourth year did specify that a diploma was a prerequisite for entrance into the program, and this information was included.

Position of Course: It was unclear when dealing with some of the institutions, whether a particular entrepreneurial course was required or was an elective, and I had to deduce this from whatever limited information was provided. Thus, it made it hard to determine whether a department felt this was an essential component of their curriculum, and which departments believed their students should be exposed to this subject area, which does illustrate to some degree the level of faculty support and resources applied to this topic.

Value: This component was deduced from mission/vision statements and learner outcomes, but was rarely explicitly stated on any documents. Also, it was unclear if departmental outcomes and benefits statements applied specifically to the course under study. Further, it was often hard to identify which were the more significant learner benefits.

Finally, there was difficulty in receiving information from a few of the institutions. Several attempts by e-mail and phone were made to the department chair, administration and instructors in an effort to collect the information. This had more serious implications for Part A of the study because if course outline information was not provided, these courses were not used in the sample due to insufficient data; thus, four courses were excluded in this phase as already
discussed. Part B of the study, however, could still include these courses, because the main focus was on broader program questions and although individual course information was important, it was still possible to study issues such as program objectives, goals and format, without specific course data.

One of the greatest strengths of using content analysis is its unobtrusive and non-reactive nature, leaving the research setting undisturbed (Colorado State University, n.d., para. 48; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). The researcher can choose where the focus in the data lies after it has been collected, and because it is a fairly straight-forward process, the information and analysis can be more easily reviewed, enhancing external validity (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 117). The difficulties with content analysis are that it often disregards the context of the text, and is rather static, not taking into account the dynamics of the situation after the text is produced. For example, I collected and analysed the curriculum documents in the summer and fall of 2001. When I conducted my interviews with educators in the summer and fall of 2002, I discovered that many of these entrepreneurship courses and programs had been modified or altered quite significantly since they were studied. Therefore, the information gathered through the document review stage reflects the curriculum that existed during a specific time.

**Stage Two**

To gain new insights not possible from the documents, and hence, further improve the usefulness of the findings, I also performed 12 in-depth interviews with educators from the institutions whose curricula were analysed. For example, Marshall and Rossman (1999) argue, “limitations in one method can be compensated for by the strengths of a complimentary one” (p. 133). Similarly, Creswell (1998) claims that “unquestionably, the backbone of qualitative research is extensive collection of data, typically from multiple sources of information” (p. 19).

There are limitations of the research method, in-depth interviews, and the purposeful sampling process that I used. Purposeful sampling is used when a researcher wants to understand
something about the cases they are investigating without needing or desiring to generalize to all cases (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997, p. 397). The interview process does not represent “all” the views and perspectives of entrepreneurship educators in public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia. There are particular kinds of ideas represented because only certain educators were interviewed, and therefore, some understandings and meanings may not be included in the study. I recognize that the participants, almost exclusively, came from business, because that is where the entrepreneurship programming was positioned. So, their views and philosophies and attitudes will represent a particular type of location, one that is situated primarily in the domain of business. As a result, their position does influence their world view and perspective on issues in the area of entrepreneurship education. But I chose these educators because of the educational approaches they supported, and did not support, and because they were interested in these issues, and self selected to participate in the study.

The size of my sample was also limited to my ability to conduct my research. As Miles and Huberman (1994) state, a “convenience” sample may save time, money and effort at the expense of information and credibility (p. 28). And I acknowledge that I am bringing a passion for entrepreneurship, and support for an integrated approach, to this study. Furthermore, that my position as an entrepreneurship educator, or interested insider, may inform my understanding of these issues and the assumptions that I make.

I chose not to interview the educators from every entrepreneurship course and program I analysed in the document review stage. Therefore, there will always be limits to the claims I can make from my research. My research objective was one of transferability versus generalizability, which will be discussed further under the “soundness of research methodology” section. Furthermore, interviewing does have its weaknesses as Marshall and Rossman (1999) explain. Interviewing relies on cooperation from the interviewee to share their information and to be
truthful, and it depends on the researcher to ask the questions which will evoke long and detailed responses and the ability to comprehend the responses to the questions (p.110).

Because I did not have direct access to individuals, 10 of the 12 interviews were conducted over the phone. The limitation of this method, as stated by Creswell (1998), is that the researcher cannot see the informal communication, and has to rely on only the words expressed (p. 124). It is more difficult to probe over the phone with a less articulate or shy individual because you cannot see from their body language any clues to their hesitation. There are often more distractions as well, such as students coming to the educator’s office during the phone call; there is less opportunity to hold the interviewee’s attention when you are not sitting face-to-face. Furthermore, I was not an observer in the participants’ classes. Therefore, I had to rely on the interviewees’ ability to explain their educational experience and rely on their understanding of the events that occurred, such as how the students perceived the learning.

**Soundness of Research Methodology**

Creswell (1998) asks “how do we know that the qualitative study is believable, accurate and right” (p. 193)? The soundness of my study comes from its comprehensiveness and the two different methods that were used. The trustworthiness of the data is reinforced by my attention to researcher bias, and the detail and level of transparency that was provided to allow the reader and others to understand the research process and how I reached the claims that were provided. Marshall and Rossman (1999) pose questions that they believe all social science research should be able to answer. “All research must respond to cannons of quality – criteria against which the trustworthiness of the project can be evaluated” (p. 191). The criteria they discuss is borrowed from Lincoln and Guba’s four constructs: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. I will use this framework of constructs to demonstrate in more depth the soundness of my research methodology.
Credibility is the first construct and its aim is to ensure that the researcher accurately identifies and describes the research setting, population and theoretical framework (p. 192). I have detailed the research site, participants of the study, criteria for selection, data collection and analysis procedures, in addition to the conceptual language, and framework, that informed this study.

The goal of the second construct, transferability, is to demonstrate that these findings will be useful to similar situations (p. 193). The educators I interviewed were all involved with curriculum development and instruction of entrepreneurship courses and programs in undergraduate public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia. They had similar work settings, and they were struggling with similar questions of their practice, including how their course/program should be structured, what components should it teach and how should it be taught, what objectives did they want their students to master and how could they effectively evaluate this competence, and what other factors must be considered when designing and offering these courses and programs. Unfortunately, there are few forums for educators to get together to discuss these issues, especially across institutions, and this study’s aim was to share these experiences and provide a collegial environment where this dialogue can begin to take place:

The construction of knowledge is not completed by the interaction of the researchers and their subjects, but continues with the researchers’ interpretations and reporting of their interviews, to conversations with other researchers about their findings. (Kvale, 1996, p. 296)

To improve transferability, I used two different data collection methods to reinforce and expand upon the research issue. “Designing a case in which multiple cases, multiple informants, or more than one data-gathering method are used can greatly strengthen the study’s usefulness for other settings” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 194).
Dependability is the third construct whereby the researcher accounts for any changes in the phenomenon under study. This is in contrast to positivist notions of reliability which assume unchanging conditions in a study and ease of replication. “This assumption of an unchanging social world is in direct contrast to the qualitative/interpretive assumption that the social world is always being constructed and the concept of replication is itself problematic” (p. 194). As Kvale (1996) argues, qualitative research involves alternative conceptions of social knowledge, meaning, reality and truth. “There is a move away from obtaining knowledge primarily through external observation and experimental manipulation of human subjects, toward an understanding by means of conversations with the human beings to be understood” (p.11). The entrepreneurship courses and programs I investigated were constantly changing as educators updated, revised and altered the educational materials they used on a regular basis. This was apparent when I interviewed the participants and discovered some changes to the curriculum documents I had reviewed during Stage One. Interviewing the educators from many of the institutions gave me an opportunity to understand what these changes were, and to discuss why these modifications had been made.

The final construct is confirmability which argues for the objectivity of the research and includes the ability to confirm findings and a process for responding to and minimizing researcher bias. Throughout my study, I worked very closely with my doctoral program committee, who rigorously reviewed my research and asked hard questions about methods, meanings and interpretations. I kept records of these encounters in a binder that included the e-mail correspondence, and all our meeting conversations that I taped and transcribed so I could go back on numerous occasions and refer to what we discussed. Stored in this binder was also a journal of my research process and experiences, as well as a folder of all my raw interview data which included margin notes, main themes, cross themes and data not included in the findings. During the interviews, I used mechanically recorded data, specifically the use of tape recorders,
to provide accurate accounts of the conversation, which is one of nine possible strategies McMillan and Schumacher (1997) recommend qualitative researchers use to enhance the validity of the data collection and analysis techniques. In essence, I left a trail of my data analysis process that could be reviewed and verified by another researcher.

I used a second data analyst who reviewed the interviews and provided her working notes on the data including summaries of key themes and any similarities noted across interview documents. I chose this process as I recognized I was very close to the data because of my practice, and I wanted to ensure I was paying attention to key parts of the text and documenting the central issues arising out of each interview. I acknowledged my practice, identified and listed my assumptions and provided them in Chapter One of the study, as well as reflected on the interview questions in an attempt to make my values transparent to the reader, while recognizing that my own practice was an integral part of the EdD research program.

I also further tested my data analysis by reviewing the summary of the findings with one of the interview participants to receive feedback on and confirmation of my interpretations of the data. I agreed during the interviews to provide a summary of the findings to all participants after the study was completed, which the majority of the participants requested and seemed genuinely interested in receiving. I believe I made every effort to demonstrate the soundness of my methodology and to describe my processes to make them as understandable and transparent as possible. It was my goal to aim for what McMillan and Schumacher (1997) argue qualitative researchers should follow, which is to “use as many strategies as possible to insure the validity of the design” (p. 404).

**Summary**

In this chapter, I discussed the rationale and process of using two different stages and methods in the research design. I also explained the criteria used to select the curriculum documents and interview participants. The data collection, analysis, and management procedures
were mapped out to demonstrate the procedures utilized. Finally, I discussed the limitations and delimitations of the methods employed and the strategies I utilized to enhance the trustworthiness of my data. In the next chapter, I present the findings obtained from reviewing entrepreneurship curricula across public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia.
CHAPTER FOUR:
FINDINGS FROM DOCUMENTS

Stage One of my study consisted of a review of entrepreneurship course and program curriculum materials at the undergraduate level in public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia. Content analysis was employed to analyse these public documents using the conceptual framework of Hynes's (1996) process model of entrepreneurship (see Appendix D).

This detailed analysis may appear somewhat tedious to the reader. However, this documenting process provides an important overview of what the public post-secondary entrepreneurship education field consisted of in 2001. By identifying what programming was currently being offered across the various institutions, the findings reflect upon and begin to answer the research question of what is the state of undergraduate entrepreneurship education in British Columbia and how established is the field. As well, the documents provide rich information about the content, format, delivery, and objectives of entrepreneurship curricula, which provides insight into the goals and aims of this programming. It also provides an indication of the approach to entrepreneurship education the institution and its educators have adopted, and the commonalities and differences with liberal and vocational approaches to education.

The findings from Stage One are divided into two parts: Part A discusses the analysis of individual entrepreneurship courses, and Part B discusses the analysis of entrepreneurship programs. The discussion of these findings is followed by a summary and interpretation of these data into broad themes. These patterns highlight key findings from the documents, and identified areas that merited further, and more in-depth exploration, through the interview stage.

---

37 As discussed in Chapter Three, this process was completed in the summer and fall of 2001, and therefore, course and program changes since that period of time are not reflected in these findings.
Part A: Entrepreneurship Courses

This part of the document review included the review of 22 undergraduate entrepreneurship courses offered across 18 different institutions in British Columbia. The courses selected were consistent with the criterion that the primary focus, including description, objectives, outcomes and assignments, was to learn about entrepreneurship.

Course Titles

The course title and course description were used to identify and describe how the subject of entrepreneurship was defined by each institution. The findings found that the most commonly utilized course name employed by 9 of the 22 institutions reviewed was “Entrepreneurship” or “Entrepreneurial Development.” Four of the courses had a very similar title of “New Venture (or New Business or New Enterprise) Development (or Planning),” and two courses explicitly stated that their course was about “How to Start a Business.” Four courses had “Small Business Management” in their title, and one course was titled “Entrepreneurial Management.” Finally, two courses highlighted business planning in their title.

The findings indicate that key words such as “entrepreneurship,” “venture,” “enterprise,” “business,” and “planning,” are associated with, or used to define, entrepreneurial courses. The technical and concrete process of creating something is apparent in these course titles with the words of “venture,” “enterprise” and “business,” and the emphasis on the practice of these skills is evident with the focus on “planning.” Entrepreneurship does appear to be the preferred term. However, the use of management in course titles, does indicate an approach by some institutions that this subject area also encompasses the management of the business, in addition to its start-up and growth. The fairly technical and specific course titles also indicates an introductory and relatively basic level course offering.
Course Descriptions

Course titles often suggest the main focus areas of the course, and this was confirmed further in the study through the analysis of course descriptions. Seventeen courses discussed how to start a business (through the process, practice or development of skills), 13 courses described how to complete a business plan, and eight listed how to identify and evaluate business ventures. There was also a common reference in five courses to small business management issues, in three courses to the role of small business in society, and five courses included the concepts and theory of entrepreneurship as part of its course description.

It appeared from the course descriptions that a very technical and skill-based approach was being employed for these entrepreneurial courses, as they mainly described how to evaluate, plan, and start-up potential business opportunities. Setting up a business appeared to be the key activity of entrepreneurship. Some of the ways that entrepreneurship is qualified in the literature and differentiated from other areas like small business, were not evident in these descriptions. This includes characteristics such as creativity, innovation, change, risk, uncertainty, opportunities, growth, achievement, and leadership.

Positioning of Courses

The position of the course examined how the subject area of entrepreneurship was approached and supported by the institution. This was determined by what department was responsible for the course, and whether it was a required or elective course, and in what program of study. Twelve institutions offered one entrepreneurship course in its entire curriculum, and this course appeared to be an introduction to and overview of the topic. Kwantlen University College and Camosun College also provided one stand-alone entrepreneurship course, but additionally Kwantlen University College offered two entrepreneurship programs, and Camosun College offered one entrepreneurship program, each made up of separate courses. Two institutions, University College of the Cariboo and University College of the Fraser Valley,
offered two distinct courses dealing with this topic. British Columbia Institute of Technology also offered two different entrepreneurship courses, but additionally offered three entrepreneurship programs. All entrepreneurship courses were offered in “Business” departments, faculties or schools, except in two institutions where the departments were specified as “Administrative Services.”

These findings indicate that the majority of institutions only support offering an introductory course in entrepreneurship, and that this area of programming is not well developed at their institution. As well, entrepreneurship appears to be a subject that is most closely identified with business-related programming. Considering the concern voiced in the literature regarding the limitations of entrepreneurship being positioned in a business context, this may influence the growth, or lack thereof, and development of this field, as well as how it is supported in the institutional arena.

Entrepreneurship was found to be a required and/or elective course across several different programs (degree, diploma and certificate) for many of the institutions. Overall, entrepreneurship courses were positioned more often in business programs as electives, and more often in a diploma program, in comparison to a degree or certificate program (see Appendix G, Table 1). These findings demonstrate that entrepreneurship is seen as a subject that is applicable more to the lower levels, which further reinforces this basic and introductory level content and approach. Its majority position as an elective course, indicates that its not viewed as a core component of the business curriculum, and left up to the initiative and interest of the student. This finding further indicates that entrepreneurship is not well supported or well developed in the
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38 Douglas College also provided two entrepreneurship courses and two entrepreneurship programs, but because their individual courses were not included in the analysis due to a lack of information, this institution was not included in this part of the study.
39 These included: School of Business; Faculty of Business; Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration; Faculty of Community Access, Business and Information Technology; Department of Business Administration; Department of Business Management; and Commerce department.
public post-secondary context, as exposure to this subject area is not considered an essential part of students' education.

**Prerequisites**

The type and number of prerequisites required were reviewed to understand the criteria established for entrance into these courses. Thirteen of the entrepreneurship courses did not require any prerequisites. This finding reinforces the earlier results that many of these courses are an introduction or overview of the subject of entrepreneurship, and therefore do not require additional knowledge necessary for successful completion. In the nine courses where prerequisites were stated, all requirements included first year courses (as entrepreneurship is often offered in the second year), and mainly in the areas of marketing, finance/math and accounting. It appears that students are getting exposure to a very basic and limited view of entrepreneurship. The curriculum is reflective of a technical and practical approach, and broader and wider programming does not seem to be well developed.

**Course Content**

To give an indication of the approach or perspective adopted in teaching this subject area, the content of the courses was examined to determine the topics discussed and curriculum materials used. In nine of the courses, the text used was Wesley D. Balderson’s “Canadian Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management.” Two other texts were utilized which also shared “small business management” in their title. This reflects the small business management theme found in several of the course titles and course descriptions, and the close relationship in the entrepreneurship courses between the subject areas of entrepreneurship and small business; an issue that will be discussed later on in this chapter.
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The second most common entrepreneurship textbook used in five of the courses was Walter S. Good's "Building a Dream: A Canadian Guide To Starting Your Own Business" which is a very practical "how-to" workbook on the process of how to start a business, and provides an overview of all of the key business areas to consider. Again, this choice of textbook reflects the type of entrepreneurship course that many of the institutions were offering: an introductory level, technical, practical approach to starting up a business, and reflects the vocational orientation of the programming. The choice of curriculum materials also emphasizes the importance educators have placed on using Canadian content.

The most common topic covered in the entrepreneurship courses reviewed was financing of the business, followed closely by the business plan. The functional areas of the business plan such as marketing, operations, human resources and financial management were frequently listed topics. Also, areas related to types of business such as franchising and buying a business were regularly listed, in addition to how to identify and evaluate business ideas. Only three courses identified social and ethical issues as one of their topic areas (see Appendix G, Table 2). The course topics frequently followed the outline of the course chapters in the text. These findings demonstrate that many educators depend upon the organization of the course textbook and selection of course topics, when structuring their own course. It also further reinforces the evidence that starting a business is conflated with entrepreneurship.

Course Outcomes

Fifteen entrepreneurship courses stated that the completion of a business plan and learning how to launch a successful business were key objectives the course aimed to meet. This finding is consistent with the most popular textbook choices that emphasize practical, "how-to" methods for starting a business. Other outcomes included practical skills, such as how to identify

and evaluate business ideas, deliver presentations, identify financing opportunities, and learn/practice the management of a company. Common outcomes to many courses also included the understanding of the role of small business in society, and understanding small business management issues. Missing from this list is any reference to ethical or moral outcomes (social responsibility is listed by one course) or any discussion of the theories or concepts of entrepreneurship. As well, there appears to be limited discussion about the distinctions made in the literature about entrepreneurship (see Appendix G, Table 3).

The findings pertaining to course content and course outcomes, demonstrate a major focus in the courses on topics related to business start-up such as financing and business planning, and also reflects the emphasis on practical skills. The lack of importance on issues of ethics and social responsibility, indicates a limited and technical approach that does not place a priority on these topics in the entrepreneurship curriculum, and reflects values more aligned with a vocational orientation.

**Student Assessment and Teaching Methods**

How the students were evaluated in their courses, and the methods used to deliver the material, were assessed to provide an indication of what learning educators felt was important. With the business plan being such a common subject and course outcome, it is not a surprise that 20 institutions had a business plan assignment component (worth an average 38% of the student’s grade). Sixteen institutions used exams, tests and quizzes to assess students’ knowledge of entrepreneurship for an average course value of 43%. Also common was class participation used in 14 courses for a weighting of 13% and presentations skills that were utilized in 11 of the courses for an average of 13% of the student’s grade. Due to a lack of information in course documents, it was not clear what the individual and group assignments and projects were, and this warrants further investigation (see Appendix G, Table 4).
In regards to the teaching methods employed by the instructors of these courses, it was very difficult to determine what methods were used as this information was often missing or not explicitly stated in the course documents. Therefore, to provide a comparison of methods used across the courses is not feasible and certainly warrants further exploration. The teaching methods that were included were lectures, group discussion/seminars and labs, on-line discussion, case study analysis, guest speakers, videos, consulting, and simulation.

The apparent diversity in teaching methods reflects that educators appear to follow what Hynes's (1996) refers to as formal methods, such as examinations, and informal teaching practices, such as skill building and discovery methods. The student assessment weighting reflects a major focus on learning the components of the business plan and the functional areas of business, key skills required for starting up a business venture. This is consistent with the course titles, description, content and outcomes.

Value

The value criterion is the overriding purpose of the course and its intended benefit to the learner; simply, what is the true essence of the course. The most significant value for the learners that was extrapolated from the entrepreneurship course documents was to teach students the process and practice of how to initiate, plan, establish and operate a successful business. The other key value was providing the tools to complete a business plan, seen as the blueprint to run a company. Other common benefits included the ability to make decisions, grasp the basics of small business management, identify and evaluate business ideas, and analyze case studies.

Summary of Review of Courses

Overall, the document review appeared to indicate a fairly low-level and introductory focus in the entrepreneurship courses, suggesting there may be a lack of support for this subject area as a core part of the business curriculum. This implies that entrepreneurship is not a well-
established area of educational programming at the undergraduate level in public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia. In addition, the focus by educators on teaching the technical, business start-up process and required practical skills, demonstrates a fairly limited perspective, that does not reflect tenets of a broader or more integrated approach to entrepreneurship education.

These findings, as has been previously mentioned, also point to how running a business is considered synonymous with entrepreneurship. Additionally, there was little evidence that entrepreneurship education, as currently practiced in British Columbia, includes other criteria as discussed in the literature. This includes notions of innovation (Drucker, 1985), creativity, risk, and uncertainty (Dollinger, 1999), opportunities (Timmons, 1990), initiative, imagination and leadership (Gibb, 1987), and growth (Blawatt, 1998).

**Part B: Entrepreneurship Programs**

There were 13 entrepreneurship programs from eight institutions reviewed for this section of analysis. The programs differed in structure including separate and stand-alone entrepreneurial series, as well as entrepreneurial specialties, concentrations or options as part of broader business programs.

*Program Titles and Descriptions*

The variety of entrepreneurial programs offered across the province in both structure and content was reflected in the different names and descriptions of these programs. Six programs discussed teaching the mechanics of how to start a business, while one program described teaching how to become an entrepreneur rather than merely teaching about the entrepreneurial process. Six institutions included the development of broad entrepreneurial and leadership skills, and four institutions integrated technical and fundamental business skills in their program descriptions. The management of small business, and success within entrepreneurial companies was discussed by three programs. Finally, four of the program descriptions included the
knowledge and understanding of specific tasks, such as the development of a business plan and in two programs, how to finance a business (see Appendix G, Table 5).

Using the program titles and descriptions to determine how institutions defined the subject of entrepreneurship, it appeared there was some diversity in their approaches. While some programs seemed to adhere to a technical, skill-based definition, others appeared to incorporate a broader and more expansive view of entrepreneurship. In these latter programs, entrepreneurship related to more than the business start-up process and was an activity and orientation useful across various contexts.

**Institutional Location of Program**

Eleven of the 13 entrepreneurship programs were offered in an institution’s Business Department or Faculty of Business. Four programs offered a degree, three offered a diploma and five offered a certificate upon completion. The length of the program was difficult to determine and compare as some programs included a common core of courses for all business students plus a number of specialized courses in the entrepreneurship area. Other entrepreneurship programs began in third year, expecting, but not including, a set of lower level business courses or a completed diploma program before commencement. What is unique about several of the institutions, specifically the Technical University of British Columbia (Tech BC), University of Victoria (UVIC), and Royal Roads University (Royal Roads), is the delivery method. Specifically, they have deviated from the traditional eight-month term, and in two cases, offer a foundation or core module prior to the outset of the program. Provided in Appendix H is a brief summary of how each entrepreneurship program is offered within its institution.
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43 BCIT’s Venture Program was offered in their Venture Development Centre, and Langara College’s Recreation Enterprise Diploma Program was offered in their Department of Human Performance & Recreation, Division of Health, Applied Science & Human Services.

44 On February 7, 2002, British Columbia’s Minister of Advanced Education Shirley Bond announced the government’s decision to integrate Tech BC and Simon Fraser University (SFU) with the takeover of TechBC by SFU (see: http://www.peak.sfu.ca/the-peak/2002-1/issue6/ne-techbc.html).
It is apparent from the course and program findings in the document review that entrepreneurship was almost exclusively offered in the business area of programming. This has implications for the type of students that are targeted or eligible to enroll, and how the curriculum is structured to reflect this type of student. Additionally, it suggests that there is little support for this type of programming outside of the strictly business arena, which may further reflect upon the lack of acceptance or establishment of this subject area in public post-secondary education curricula.

**Prerequisites**

Every entrepreneurship program, except for one, listed prerequisites for entrance. Since several of the entrepreneurship programs began in the third and fourth year of a degree program, it is logical that institutions, specifically four, included a two-year business related diploma or set of courses as a requirement for admission. Four of the institutions also wanted some prior experience before starting the program, including business experience, co-operative work terms, or work experience. A number of programs also began in the first year of post-secondary schooling. Prerequisites for six programs consisted of completion of high school Mathematics and four programs required the completion of high school. Finally, because a few of the programs centred on the successful development and implementation of a realistic venture, two of the programs required a fully developed business concept, plan or portfolio as part of the application process (see Appendix G, Table 6).

The type of program appeared to dictate the prerequisites required to successfully enter and complete the curriculum. The degree programs identified a two-year business-related diploma as an entrance requirement, seeing the need for a broad-based business background to achieve the more expansive program goals. The short-term programs, such as eight-month certificate programs, were much more limited and technical in their focus, and thus required
specific competencies prior to enrollment to ensure the practically-focused educational objectives could be realistically obtained in the shorter period of time.

Program Content

Upon review of the program curriculum materials, it was apparent that the majority of programs in British Columbia consisted of business courses with a few specific entrepreneurial courses packaged and offered as an entrepreneurship program. One exception was BCIT's Venture Program which was a three-month program offered under one course title, Vent 1000, covering a wide array of business topics. However, when one reviewed the five major areas of study this program offered, specifically business planning, marketing, accounting and finance, computer skills and small business management, parallels could be made with the content of other entrepreneurship programs which also offered these major areas of study, but mainly in the form of separate courses.

Several of the programs were offered, not as a specific entrepreneurial series, but rather as a business program having an entrepreneurial concentration, option or specialty. This included:

- BCIT's Marketing Management Diploma of Technology with a specific focus in entrepreneurship
- Douglas College's Business Management Diploma Program, New Venture Management option
- Kwantlen University College's Bachelor of Business Administration in Accounting, entrepreneurial leadership area
- Tech BC's Bachelor of Science - Management and Technology, in high tech entrepreneurship
- UVIC's Bachelor of Commerce degree with an entrepreneurship area of concentration.

All of these programs, except for one, appeared to offer a variety of business courses and topics with only a few specific courses titled and centred specifically on the topic of entrepreneurship.^[For example, BCIT offered its entrepreneurship program in level three and four of its diploma and had two courses, MKTG 3306: Entrepreneurial Skills, and MKTG 4409: Entrepreneurship Skills Practicum, devoted exclusively to this topic. Douglas College offered two courses, BUSN 253: Entrepreneurship, and BUSN 254: Business Planning for New Ventures, in its New Venture Management Option. Kwantlen University College offered]
UVIC’s entrepreneurship area of concentration was the one program that looked as if it deviated from this format and was structured somewhat differently as it offered one core module of five entrepreneurship courses taught as one unit.46

The other format of entrepreneurship programs was classified according to their program title, which involved a specific entrepreneurship program in comparison to a program with an entrepreneurship concentration. These programs included:

- BCIT’s Associate Certificate in Entrepreneurship
- Camosun College’s Enterprise Development Certificate Program
- Douglas College’s New Venture Management Certificate Program
- Kwantlen University College’s Bachelor of Business Administration in Entrepreneurial Leadership
- Langara College’s Small Business Entrepreneur Certificate Program and Recreation Enterprise Diploma Program
- Royal Road’s Bachelor of Commerce degree in Entrepreneurial Management

However, these programs appeared very similar to the programs offering an entrepreneurial concentration in that they were structured to include mostly business courses covering a broad range of topics with a few specific courses centered on entrepreneurship.47 Royal Roads deviated somewhat from the format found in other programs because it offered a foundation program held
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at the beginning of the term covering issues such as team building, financial statements, computer skills, problem solving and sizing up a business. Of the 12 courses offered in their program, two courses were specifically entrepreneurial in their focus, Entrepreneurial Expertise and Entrepreneurial Project.

After reviewing the program documents, my impression was that several of these programs could be categorized as small business, general business or even marketing programs versus entrepreneurship programs. This is because they were a compilation of business courses with a few specific entrepreneurial courses packaged as an entrepreneurial program and it did not appear that each course was developed from an entrepreneurial perspective. For example, the Marketing Diploma offered in the Faculty of Business at my institution, Okanagan University College, is very similar to many of the entrepreneurship programs described above, and with a modification of a few course titles, could be re-packaged in a similar format as an entrepreneurial program.

In terms of course subjects, there were over forty topic areas covered across the various programs that are too numerous to list. Worth noting, however, is that the majority of programs offered courses in the areas of marketing, financial management/accounting, management, business communication, and computers. Several programs also offered courses on topics such as business planning, sales, strategic planning, and economics. In addition, four of the programs offered courses in the area of ethics, morality and social issues, three programs discussed the topic of culture, one program offered subject matter on community involvement, and one program provided instruction in sustainable development.

Again, the program type appeared to dictate the diversity and broadness of courses offered. Certificate and diploma programs offered a more limited curriculum, with little reference to ethics or social responsibility. The degree programs had more diversity in their course offerings, including leadership, growth, new product development, power, and creativity.
which is more reflective of the meaning given to entrepreneurship that is found in the literature. They also placed a higher priority on incorporating ethical issues into the program. This could be a result of the additional space in the curriculum to cover more issues, and the broader perspective that educators took in approaching this subject.

**Program Outcomes**

Program outcomes were deduced from program descriptions and overviews stated in various program documents. Course objectives from individual courses making up the entrepreneurship programs were also reviewed to try to determine the intended outcomes of the curriculum. Broader objectives were included mainly in the degree programs, and more technical, skill-based objectives were the focus of shorter-term programs.

Many of the outcomes were broad based, such as the development of business skills listed for six programs, and the development of general success and employability skills listed for five programs. Other outcomes focused on the attainment of a specific skill such as the development of a business plan in five programs, how to attract financing in three programs, and how to develop selling skills in two programs. Several of the institutions stated very practical outcomes such as how to teach students the skills to start up and manage their own business in five programs, whereas other outcomes were more abstract such as how to become an expert in entrepreneurship in one program, how to practice entrepreneurial thinking in two programs, and how to develop a better understanding of human society and make a contribution, discussed in one program (see Appendix G, Table 7).
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48 Employability skills listed on course outlines in Kwantlen University College’s Entrepreneurial Leadership degree included: creative thinking and problem solving skills, oral skills, interpersonal skills, teamwork and leadership skills, personal management and entrepreneurial skills, writing skills, reading skills, visual literacy, mathematical skills, intercultural skills, technological skills, and citizenship and global perspective.

49 Part of the mission statement of the Bachelor of Commerce in Entrepreneurship Management at Royal Roads University stated that the program was “dedicated to enhancing the creation of wealth through thinking and acting in an enterprising manner, whatever the size of the organization or sector it represents.” A section of the program information from UVIC’s Bachelor of Commerce degree with an entrepreneurship concentration stated: “Our program is different because it is a cognitive approach, based upon solid theory, intended to influence behaviour. This approach is important in its recognition that entrepreneurship is both a way of thinking – and doing.”
The practical program outcomes appeared similar to the outcomes stated in the introductory courses. The broader program outcomes, however, seemed to be more reflective of how the literature defines entrepreneurship including characteristics of growth, creativity, leadership, and innovation.50

**Student Assessment and Teaching Methods**

Specific information about student assessment was missing from some of the course outlines, and three institutions did not identify any assessment information. For the assignments listed, there were similar findings to the individual courses discussed in Part A. For example, presentations, business plan, participation, individual assignments, tests, case analysis and group projects were common evaluation components utilized in both course and program documents. Unique to only program materials, however, were individual portfolios and applied research projects as components of the student assessment process.

It was difficult to provide a comparison of teaching methods used across the different programs because not all of this information was provided in the documents. However, it was apparent that educators used a wide variety of instructional approaches when teaching in this area. Using Hynes’s (1996) process model of entrepreneurship (see Appendix D), these teaching activities covered all three broad areas in the model: didactic, skill building, and discovery.

I made the assumption that there was a certain amount of lecturing and reading assigned by how the courses were laid out by topic area, course text and assessment procedures, and because of its explicit inclusion on course materials. Skill building was evident through an array of teaching methods including in-class exercises such as role-playing, case discussion, lab and
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50 The program information regarding UVIC’s Bachelor of Commerce with an entrepreneurship concentration stated that one of the key features of their program is full immersion “because entrepreneurship is creative behaviour based on a special way of thinking.” Further, their program concentration allowed students to “take full advantage of the growing number of entrepreneurial opportunities in the new millennium.” Royal Road’s Bachelor of Commerce in Entrepreneurship Management’s mission statement included: “Entrepreneurial activity is understood, in the context of the program, to include being innovative in large organizations as well as creating opportunities in small ones. The Entrepreneurship Management program develops strategic thinking, creative problem solving and decision-making that fosters a desire for action. The result is entrepreneurial leadership combined with management skills that translate theory into practice.”
simulation, videos, guest speakers and field trips, project teams and the use of technology and multimedia. Discovery methods were evident through techniques such as coaching, consulting, program and business advisors, experiential exercises, and the utilization of learning partnerships, a learning community, and student practicums. This area does warrant further exploration, though, to ensure all the relevant methods have been captured.

**Value**

Program documents were analysed in an attempt to determine the values embedded in the curriculum. This was accomplished by reviewing philosophies, principles, and mission and vision statements provided in program descriptions. As well, any benefit statements, learner outcomes, and course objectives were assessed to determine the intended purpose and significance of each course and the overall program to try to determine the use and worth to the learner. In essence, these statements were the selling tools used by the various institutions to convince learners of the merits and benefits of their entrepreneurship programs.

Similar to the discussion relating to outcomes and program definitions, six programs discussed the benefit of learning how to start up and manage a business. Seen almost as critical, five programs discussed the importance of learning technical and business skills, and four programs included entrepreneurial, leadership and employability skills. A few programs listed key components unique only to their program such as teaching one how to be an entrepreneur, provision of industry feedback, and post-program support. Only one program emphasized the business plan as a key benefit, demonstrating that although this may be an important course outcome, it is not described as a critical feature of an overall entrepreneurship program (see Appendix G, Table 8).

**Summary of Review of Programs**

The findings from the document review of entrepreneurship programs indicated that only eight institutions in British Columbia offered some type of entrepreneurship program, with the
stability of one the institution’s programs in question. In addition, many of the programs appeared to be business courses packaged together and marketed as an entrepreneurial offering, without a substantive or unique approach to separate it from other business areas. These findings indicate that the field of entrepreneurship education is not well established or well developed at the public post-secondary level in British Columbia. It may also indicate a lack of support or recognition for this type of programming at the institutional level. As well, the findings demonstrated a wide diversity in the approaches taken to teach this subject area, ranging from short-term technical programs, to broader-based and more integrated, long-term programs.

Main Themes

Once I completed the coding and analysis of entrepreneurship curriculum documents, I grouped the data into larger patterns. These themes were developed in reference to my original research questions and my research aims of documenting the current state of public post-secondary entrepreneurship education in British Columbia. Three broad themes are presented, in addition to issues that I have highlighted which indicated a need for further exploration, and were subsequently included in the interview research stage.

Repackaging or Substantive Difference?

Differences were apparent in how institutions approached the subject of entrepreneurship and what programming they offered. This was evident from all the different course and program names used in addressing the subject of entrepreneurship across the various institutions, and the variety in the format of the programming offered. It also made it difficult in certain situations to determine which courses or programs qualified for this study, the key criterion being that the primary focus including description, objectives, outcomes and assignments was to learn about entrepreneurship.

At the time of review, both entrepreneurial programs at Douglas College were currently “under review.”
For the individual entrepreneurship courses analysed in Part A of the study, I found considerable similarities to courses on small business management, despite some small business management courses being excluded from the study for not meeting the criterion. For example, of the 22 entrepreneurship courses reviewed, four courses had “Small Business Management” in their title, and one course emphasized management in its title of “Entrepreneurial Management.” Similarly, in the course descriptions, there was a common reference in five courses to small business management issues. In addition, several of the entrepreneurship courses used a textbook that also included “Small Business Management” in its title. I wanted to explore with institutions whether they saw a substantive difference between the subjects of small business management and entrepreneurship, and if they concurred with the distinction that I had used to select the courses and programs for the study. Additionally, I wanted to investigate how these broad topic areas were discussed and reflected in their courses and methods of instruction.

For the entrepreneurship programs I reviewed, I found many similarities to concentrations, specialties or programs in other business areas such as marketing, small business, or general business. Many of the entrepreneurial programs or specialties appeared to be a compilation of business courses with only a small number of specific entrepreneurial courses and packaged as an entrepreneurship program, even though each course did not appear to have been developed from a specific entrepreneurial perspective. I wanted to ask the educators whether they believed there was a substantive difference between their entrepreneurial programs as compared to business management programs, and if so, to identify critical areas of differentiation. The purpose was also to compare how educators defined and understood the area of entrepreneurship in comparison to the literature which argues that it is about more than
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52 The criterion I used for the study was that any activities involved in the “management” of a business were placed under the topic of small business management, and any activities involved in “starting up and operating” a business were placed under the topic of entrepreneurship.
starting a business, and other programs which discuss notions such as leadership, creativity, and culture.

**Purpose or Value of Entrepreneurship Education**

As I reviewed the course documents, I began the process of trying to interpret how the various institutions conceptualized and understood entrepreneurship education. I observed that this education appeared to consist primarily of skills training in very similar and limited areas as demonstrated across course definitions, outcomes, assessments, and curriculum materials. This was reinforced by the most significant benefit deduced from the entrepreneurship courses, which was to teach students the process and practice of how to initiate, plan, establish and operate a successful business. The other key benefit was providing the tools to complete a business plan, seen as the blueprint to run a company.

For the programs documents, the philosophy or value of this education varied across the institutions, although the majority of schools appeared to focus on skill-based training. For example, many programs discussed the benefit of learning how to start up and manage a business. Many programs also discussed the importance of learning key skills including technical, business, entrepreneurial, leadership, and employability skills. I wanted to explore with institutions my assumptions of entrepreneurship education as primarily a skill-based training process and discuss with educators to what extent they felt their programming fulfilled this fairly limited and mainly techno-rational role.

Although the majority of program and course documents I studied in British Columbia post-secondary institutions seemed to fall into this more technical, business-focused and skill-based category, a few options, mainly in entrepreneurship programs, appeared to espouse a philosophy that was broader. Would educators claim that entrepreneurship education goes beyond the acquisition of specific skills such as business plan development? Would they claim that it introduces a new way of thinking that is distinctive from other business training; a process
that presents a different perspective, perhaps a more critical and socially oriented view of entrepreneurship, akin to a form of socialization, as if the goal was to become an entrepreneurial citizen? And how would educators perceive the relationship between a broader view, and notions of risk-taking, creativity, innovation, and leadership as discussed in the literature?

The issue I wanted to pursue further with educators was whether this broader notion of entrepreneurship was shared and supported among educators and if the vision was realistic and achievable. For those few institutions that I believed were already adhering to a more expansive approach to entrepreneurship, I wanted to ask educators how they implemented this method and what rationale and philosophy was behind their notion of entrepreneurship.

Another issue pertaining to the value or purpose of entrepreneurship education was whether current practice reflected an “integrated” approach; a pedagogical approach that adhered to and incorporated both the liberal and vocational normative positions on education. Did educators see a responsibility or need to situate “entrepreneur” in a broader context, and to discuss the ethical, moral and social impact of this role in the community, society and beyond? I would claim from the information collected and analysed in Stage One that the majority of courses and programs (with a few notable exceptions) did not provide any reference to ethical, moral or social issues, or did so in a limited manner, such as by providing optional courses in the curriculum. For example, of the subjects listed in course documents only 3 of the 22 courses identified social and ethical issues as one of their topic areas.

There were examples of more integrated approaches in the program materials studied, which may also be the result of having more opportunity across a whole program to provide exposure to a greater breadth of topics. For example, four of the programs offered programming in the area of ethics, morality and social issues, one program provided a course subject on community involvement, and one program provided instruction in sustainable development. Yet, since many of these programs were positioned in a business context, I was interested in exploring
whether it’s institutional location limited or constrained the approach taken. Thus, I wanted to pursue with educators this notion of an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education, and whether practitioners adhered to and believed in this orientation. My aim with these discussions was to uncover the educators’ philosophies of entrepreneurship and what they believed the primary purpose or value of this education was for the learners.

A further issue I wanted to explore was the type of curriculum materials chosen to teach this discipline, as this is often a good indication of an instructor’s approach to the field. For the entrepreneurship courses, a few similarities emerged while reviewing these textbook materials. First, 9 of the 22 courses, used a textbook that also shared small business management in its title and content. Second, one of the most popular texts used in five of the courses, was a practical “how-to” workbook. Third, the newness of the discipline was not only evident in the lack of theory provided in curriculum materials, but in the observation that many entrepreneurship course outlines followed precisely the course chapters of the text, often narrowly defined and covering a wide breadth of introductory entrepreneurship topics with the purpose of helping the reader to start up a business. It, therefore, became the textbook that defined the course and emphasized what was important to cover in this field. Also, many of the courses used instructor-developed course packages and curriculum materials, which signified a lack of appropriate and available textbook resources. I wanted to discuss with educators their choice of curriculum materials and criteria they used, and how these materials were reflected in the learning objectives. As well, I wanted to explore their teaching methods since this information was not clearly provided on the documents, and discuss their views on how best to impart this material.

Finally, I wanted to explore my perception of entrepreneurship as a fairly new field, and explore how established this area of programming had become at the public post-secondary level in British Columbia. Findings from the document review which supported this interpretation included that the majority of courses were comprised of introductory-level subject matter of an
elective basis, that only eight institutions in the province offered some type of entrepreneurial program, the lack of curriculum materials, and the positioning of entrepreneurship as part of the business discipline because it had not been cemented as its own field of study. If this assumption was confirmed though participant interviews and the literature, I wanted to also investigate the implications this had for educators in the field.

**Constraints/Challenges**

It was difficult to determine from curriculum documents the programming challenges which educators faced pertaining to entrepreneurship. For example, what factors were driving these entrepreneurship programs and courses such as marketability, employability and performance measures? A review of course and program outcomes was one method of trying to determine what educators felt were important goals for the students to reach upon completion of this learning, but the documents did not reveal the issues which influenced these educational decisions. I therefore wanted to ask educators about the process of how courses and programs were developed and revised at their institution over time, and who was responsible for curriculum and program decisions.

Stage One also reviewed the positioning of entrepreneurship courses and programs to try to determine how the institution (or specifically the department or faculty) approached and supported this area and which students they felt should be exposed to this material. Entrepreneurship was a subject area that was identified in the analysis as being placed almost exclusively within business-related programming and did not appear to have applicability across other disciplines in addition to business. However, even within the business discipline, it was not a subject area that was required or even recommended for all students to complete. There was also wide variety in the structure and content of programs offered around the province with five institutions offering a degree, three offering a diploma and five offering a certificate upon completion. Additionally, several institutions provided a specific entrepreneurship degree, while
others offered entrepreneurial concentrations, options or specialties. I wanted to explore with educators why entrepreneurship was almost exclusively positioned in the business area, and the implications of this location on stakeholder support, and program development and growth. I also wanted to discuss further with educators how the specific course or program had evolved at their institutions, and whose interests were guiding this development. Also, what constraints or limitations the educators, individual departments and schools had to deal with in terms of offering this programming to their students.

Conclusion

I return here to the research question of whose interests or goals are being served by the entrepreneurial programming available in public, post-secondary institutions in British Columbia. The state of entrepreneurship education appears reflective of a conservative approach to education. Short-term, instrumental courses and programs offered at many of the institutions, fits well into a neo-liberal approach to worker education. The ideology of fiscal restraint, and the need for capital and a highly cheap and mobile workforce, is characteristic of a neo-liberal agenda and the demand for just-in-time knowledge workers. Entrepreneurship education is perhaps one response to this particular agenda as individuals are focused upon as a site of change through personal development and attitudinal adjustment. Interests and values that reflect this more conservative approach are well hidden under the auspices of “skill development,” and could be seen as more defensible to the stakeholder learning community who demand relevant and applied programs. In this context, I recognize that the constraints and struggles facing entrepreneurship educators as they attempt to offer programming within a resource-starved climate, would be similar to some of the challenges other areas of education also face.

I have discussed in this chapter my findings from the document review, and the major themes that arose out of this analysis. I have also highlighted issues that I wanted to explore further with the educators involved in these specific courses and programs to discuss, enhance,
and perhaps modify the assumptions I had made. Chapter Five discusses the findings from the
interviews I conducted with twelve educators, the major patterns which emerged from these
conversations, and how these themes relate to my Stage One findings and my original research
questions.
CHAPTER FIVE:
FINDINGS FROM INTERVIEWS

Entrepreneurship curriculum documents were first reviewed through content analysis to achieve a broad mapping of the post-secondary entrepreneurship education environment in British Columbia. By conducting 12 semi-structured, in-depth interviews, these materials were brought to life by the people who actually developed and used them in their educational practice. The purpose of talking with educators was to learn about their meanings and understandings of this subject area. Specifically, I wanted to discuss the goals and values that are reflected in their educational approach, how they believe the entrepreneurship field should develop, and the kinds of challenges they face in their practice.

To present a general picture of the participants of the study, and the institutional background where their practice is situated, each interviewee is described using demographic information, as well as entrepreneurial and teaching experience.\textsuperscript{53} Provided next are the findings from twelve in-depth interviews conducted with these entrepreneurship educators at the public post-secondary level, grouped into three major themes: political tensions, philosophical dilemmas, and implementation struggles. These conversations built upon and expanded earlier findings from the content analysis stage, but also illuminated new issues not apparent from the curriculum documents.

Description of Interview Participants\textsuperscript{54}

Mary is a single female in her early fifties who is currently completing a doctoral degree in Organizational Psychology. She is a full time, continuing professor and teaches at a university-college. She developed and taught the entrepreneurship course at her institution for over ten

\textsuperscript{53} Pseudonyms are used for each of the participants.
\textsuperscript{54} Partial information was available from two participants: one participant only the gender and teaching/business experience was specified, and one participant would not reveal their age. Several other participants did not reveal any ethnic and cultural background.
years, and taught another version at a previous institution in Saskatchewan for two years. She also has a part-time nutrition supplements distributor business.

Grant is a 51 year-old male of Scottish descent, who is married with four children ranging in age from 16 to 21. He has been working full time at his college since 1997 and took over the small business program in 1998. In addition to teaching, he is the current Assistant Department Chair for the Department of Business Management. He presently owns his own consulting and import and export business, and has previous experience working with small and large businesses.

Dan is a male who is a part time business tutor at the university he teaches at. He has also taught two entrepreneurship courses at a British Columbian college for several years. He started his own marketing consulting company in 1976, working mainly with small businesses, and operated this business for 16 years. In the 1980s he owned a mineral company for three years, and started up an entrepreneurship center in North Vancouver which he ran for several years. Currently he is running an internet business that has 21 employees.

Bill is a 53 year-old male who is married with three grown children. He has a Bachelor of Science and Law degree, and is currently working on his Master of Law degree. He has a full time, continuing position at a university-college. He has owned 17 businesses in his career and has been teaching entrepreneurship at his institution for over twenty years.

Bob is a 41 year-old male who is married with two young children and has a PhD in business. He has a full time, continuing position at a university where he has been teaching for over 11 years. He teaches in the area of marketing at the undergraduate and graduate level, and instructs the marketing component of their entrepreneurship program. He has been running his own part-time consulting business for seven years, and prior to teaching, worked in a variety of sales and sales management positions.

Laura is a 42 year-old female, who is married, with a mixed ethnic background of Greek and French descent. She completed a Master’s degree in Small Business Management in 1985 and
then operated her own consulting company for the next nine years. She became a full time, continuing professor at her university college in 1998. Prior to this, she worked for her institution on a part-time and sessional basis in the School of Business and School of Tourism teaching courses and developing programs. Currently, she is the Coordinator of the Bachelor of Tourism Management degree; a position she has been doing since 1997 when the new program was launched. She teaches the entrepreneurship course in the Tourism diploma program, and just completed the development of a nine-course entrepreneurship major in the Bachelor of Tourism degree program that will be launched in the fall of 2003.

Gary is a 52 year-old male of Chinese ancestry, who is married with two boys, ages 9 and 12. He has a Bachelor of Arts and a Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree. He worked for three years for a development corporation representing the Inuit of the Northwest Territories, and for three years operated a start-up venture, with a partner, in the wind surfing industry. He joined his university college in the marketing department as a full time, continuing professor in 1986 and was part of the program revision team that developed the entrepreneurship course in the early 90s. He has been the Dean of Business since 1996, and was involved in the development of the Entrepreneurial degree program that is currently offered at his institution.

Sandra is a 62 year-old female with two adult children. She has a Bachelor of Arts and Executive MBA degree, in addition to a Diploma in Business Management. She joined the university on a part-time basis as one of their first tutors, and was responsible for the entrepreneurship course. She also held the position of Manager of their business programs for ten years from 1991-2001, and has since retired. Her background also includes self-employment experience in the training and consulting field for many years, in addition to operating her own retail candle business. Her other experience has included positions with the provincial government helping small businesses, in the Continuing Education department for a community
college in British Columbia as a program developer, and in another university as the Alumni Director.

**Terry** is a 37 year-old male who is married with a MBA degree. He has been teaching full-time at a university in British Columbia for eight years, but has not been hired on a continuing basis. He has been teaching the entrepreneurship course for the last three years. His previous entrepreneurial experience includes a summer consulting business after graduating from the MBA program, and having a mother who has operated her own business for several years.

**Randy** is a male over 50 years old, married, with a university degree in Marketing and Management. He has been a full time, continuing professor at the college for 24 years, teaching the management and marketing courses. He developed the entrepreneurship course and small business management course at his college, and taught both courses for many years. He still teaches the business management course, but another professor has recently started teaching the entrepreneurship course. Prior to his teaching experience, he worked for 10 years in the marketing field.

**Tim** is a male in his mid-fourties with a British and Canadian background. He has an undergraduate degree in Engineering, a MBA and Master of Science degree, and is working on a doctoral degree. He is a full time, continuing faculty member at the institute he works at. He teaches courses in Policy, Strategy, and Information Technology, and developed and currently teaches a course in entrepreneurship. He has also taught entrepreneurial courses at a university in Alberta in the MBA program, in addition to teaching business at universities in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. He has operated a couple of businesses which he bought and sold, and currently runs a small engineering business and an electronic distance learning consulting business with another partner.

**Brian** is a single male, with a MBA degree in Entrepreneurship, and is currently two-thirds of his way through a PhD program in Entrepreneurship. He has been teaching at two universities in
British Columbia for six years. During that time he has taught approximately 24 courses, the majority of those being in the area of entrepreneurship. He is full time at one of the universities, but not tenured.\textsuperscript{55} Prior to his teaching experience, he started up three businesses in the telecommunications industry, and has consulted to approximately 15 start-up businesses. He was also the Controller for a relatively small telethon company in Vancouver that had 25 employees and annual revenues of six million.

The participants as a whole group included three females and nine males. Eight of the interviewees were full time, continuing faculty, two were full time faculty not on a continuing basis, one was part time, and one was retired. Five of the participants worked at a university, four participants worked at a university-college, two participants worked at a college, and one participant worked at an institute.\textsuperscript{56}

In summary, the participants ranged in age from late thirties to early sixties with five being in their fifties, three in their forties, one in their late thirties, and one in their early sixties. All participants had an undergraduate degree, nine participants had a Master's degree with one currently completing a Master of Law degree, and three participants were currently working on a Doctoral degree with one person having completed their PhD. In terms of marital status, two participants were single and the rest were married, with five having children ranging from adult age to preschool age. Only four participants specified any culture or ethnic background including Scottish, Chinese, British and Greek/French ancestry. All the participants had been involved with the teaching and/or curriculum development of the entrepreneurship courses and programs at their institutions, and nine people had taught entrepreneurship at other institutions or for other community organizations. Ten participants had run their own business, and six participants were still currently operating their businesses while teaching at their institution.

\textsuperscript{55} His institution does not offer tenure. Everyone that teaches is on a performance-based contract.
\textsuperscript{56} The retired educator taught at a university.
Political Tensions

The findings demonstrated that the participants work in political environments and have to navigate between many competing constraints which can impinge upon student success and the learning environment. What these educators are able to provide, and what activities and discourses they engage in depends, in part, on certain institutional and other factors. The major challenges which participants identified are grouped into three major areas: institutional limitations and curriculum politics, student tensions, and resource gaps. How these educators perceived these tensions, and their impact on what they have been able to achieve, is explored in this section.

Institutional Limitations and Curriculum Politics

*It tells me a lot about the fact that they don’t have a great deal of commitment for the course and also that they don’t have anybody with the real expertise required to do an excellent job of the course.* (Terry)

Terry was expressing concern about the lack of institutional support for the field of entrepreneurship which he perceives at his institution. His experience is that only sessional instructors (part time/non-continuing faculty) have taught this course which indicates to him that this is not an area of business which the department wants to focus on or encourage. It has also been my experience teaching in a post-secondary institution, that sessional instructors are paid for only the time teaching in the classroom and there is not the compensation or incentive provided for any significant curriculum development work. This development could involve redesigning the course, expanding the course, engaging in discourse with colleagues and experts in the areas about new directions in the field, and developing linkages with other courses, programs and/or community initiatives. This type of planning is often done during non-teaching paid time when the instructor has time to debrief and update their teaching areas. A course continually taught by non-continuing faculty would not be exposed to as rigorous a review process or have the same opportunities for improvement.
Sandra also commented on the lack of institutional and political support for entrepreneurship programming at her institution. "Nobody in the political realm thinks it is important to fund which is a real shame." This lack of support, according to Sandra, was evident in funding priorities and also in administration's lack of encouragement during the 1990's. "To have a decision maker at the top of the organization make that a priority never happened."

So, has the entrepreneurship education field changed, and if so, what factors have contributed to its development? Sandra pointed to the early seventies and how the whole philosophy and culture was changing around work. Educators and policy makers, she remarked, were discussing how the resource industries in British Columbia were showing signs of slowdown and non-sustainability which identified a need to develop programs where students were able to find and create work for themselves. Mary discussed how their department conducted a major curriculum review of their program in the early nineties and realized that it was extremely important to emphasize small business in their program in order to respond to and represent the local market they were serving:

*So we recognized that it was extremely important to have a small business focus in our program because 98% or more of the businesses in the Okanagan Valley are small businesses and even our biggest businesses like Western Star, are really medium-sized businesses, so virtually all of the Okanagan Valley is small business and we needed to respond to that market.*

Did the increased growth and support for entrepreneurship translate into better institutional conditions for the offering of this education? This study's findings illustrate how the delineation of resources and support for educational programs are often influenced by political and institutional needs, even to the exclusion of student needs. For example, there was the impression by three of the interviewees that the environment educators taught in actually worked against the development of an entrepreneurial culture, mindset and set of values. "*I think the educational system, including our institution, has a lot to answer for the damage it has done to entrepreneurial people*" (Bill). The need to follow institutional guidelines, such as uniformity
requirements across the institution, fitting the course into a specific time frame, other competing interests such as articulation requirements of certain programs, and the need to begin and end at certain places, all have constricted the format and methods which are available to these educators.

Mary discussed how decisions, such as placement of courses, who was required to take the courses, and the number of courses, was driven more by historical patterns and faculty workload issues, than by student needs. "So it's the expediency of the articulation that drove those decisions to drop entrepreneurship as a required course for the accountants more than any pedagogical reason." In a further discussion with Mary, she described how the entrepreneurship and small business courses at her institution compete for space in the business program with well-established courses in fields such as accounting and human resources management. For example, she identified the accounting faculty as highly organized with a couple of administrative champions (the Dean and Chair of the business program are both accountants). Further, this field has the additional support of the professional accounting associations who drive the credentialing of the accounting programs, which ensures the recognition and credibility of the institution's program, and ultimately translates into employment opportunities for accounting graduates. These factors, Mary believes, directs the development of new courses and programs in the accounting field, and results in less space, less time, and less students, for the entrepreneurial courses.

Restrictions on instructors, or unrealistic expectations, Bill asserted, undermines the quality of programming they are able to offer. "We teach entrepreneurship, but we do not allow anyone here to be entrepreneurial." This includes limitations on student activities such as operating actual short-term businesses or performing market research, and faculty workloads that

---

57 As mentioned in the methodology section, I chose one participant, which was Mary, to review the study's findings with to further validate my data and gain any new insight or reflection on the information that I had collected.
do not recognize the contribution of self-employment experience. For example, institutional regulations such as the research ethics board process, has meant that for some schools, their students cannot conduct the level of research needed to properly complete a project such as market research, because they do not have time within their course to manage students through the process. “We would never make it if we would have to go to the exec council or something to get it [research] done” (Dan). Mary also believes that the course her students get by distance education is not the same as they get “live” and feels that the drive by administration to have this type of delivery, to improve access and thereby revenues, is not appropriate for all courses:

*Developing a business plan on your own, with very little consultation from the instructor in a distance course, I think is quite tough to do, although probably doable, but I think the learning experience is very, very different. And, even in that distance course, I would like to see a more interactive part developed so they have to interact with real live entrepreneurs, and also with other students who are doing business plans at the same time. . . . I am strongly opposed to having the correspondence version course that we currently have. I think it’s done again as a cheap and expedient way to offer an alternative.*

**Resource Constraints: Finding Knowledgeable Instructors and Relevant Texts**

The lack of institutional resources is an issue that Terry alludes to in this chapter’s opening quote when he comments on instructors lacking the qualifications and interest to teach the subject. Terry himself has found it difficult to teach in this area because he has lacked the in-depth training in the area that he feels is critical and which he believes is recognized by the students. “One factor is I don’t have a PhD in the area, so particularly when I first taught, I was struggling to do a good job at it because I didn’t have the extensive background that would have been helpful.”

Four other participants expressed concern over the difficulty of finding instructors to teach these courses. Gary stated that it has been a challenge to find faculty who want to teach the course and have the required expertise. “To get the right faculty who have the background both the theoretical and practical background to teach these courses has been a challenge too.”
Mary expressed the need for this subject area to be taught in a multidisciplinary manner, and identified the struggle to find people who understand the different disciplines and how they all fit together. “I have thought for many years that we should do that [team teach] in this course, and the reason is that it is actually not that easy to find, in one instructor, the combination of skills necessary to teach this course well.” The integrative nature of the subject leads also to the discomfort level of educators. “A lot of them don’t ever want to teach entrepreneurship either, because they are too focused on one particular side of the business education and they can’t be a generalist and they can’t think about all things at once” (Dan).

The newness of this field creates other resource issues as Mary outlined:

Even being around for between 10-20 years, it’s a relatively new discipline and any new discipline takes time to develop, to gather the theory and the knowledge base and to become a little more standardized in the way that it’s taught.

Three participants referred to the lack of adequate Canadian curriculum materials and instructor resources. “I was looking for a Canadian text suited to undergraduate students, and there are not many good ones out there. It is a fairly young discipline” (Terry). Two participants commented on the lack of consensus on how to define this field, and one participant claimed that the educational materials available were too focused on big business with no local relevance, all relating to the challenges with an emerging area of education:

Our challenge on the curriculum side was that given that our focus was entrepreneurship and small-to-medium sized businesses, finding curriculum that would be appropriate to that... Most textbooks and most materials available tend to focus more on large business because that is what is taught traditionally in most universities... I also think there is still a challenge of finding local materials that we can use. (Gary)

The lack of relevant curriculum materials was reinforced by the finding that three of the interviewees currently use custom materials or course packages, written in part by these instructors, to teach their courses. Two others participants commented that developing one’s own curriculum materials was the ideal method if the time and expertise were available:
I think a lot of people develop their own material from scratch. The ideal situation would be if we put something together totally ourselves. Our real problem is no one here has had the energy or interest in doing that. It is a huge piece of work. We have some ridiculous student loads. And you need the time to do it right because you need to think from beginning to end. (Bill)

Resource gaps have also played a role in the marketing of the courses and tracking of graduates. Three participants discussed how the promotion of their courses and programs was dependent upon the faculty and department, and their limitations in terms of time and resources to market extensively to the broader community.

In terms of marketing our current programs, we [department] have been doing that the whole time. For the new program, grass roots marketing will have to come from us, and hopefully some institutional support. They have been good, but in terms of resources, it is quite limited. (Laura)

Similarly, in terms of tracking the outcomes and employment patterns of graduates from these programs, three participants discussed how this was only informally accomplished by individual instructors who kept in touch with their students, and there was no mechanism or funding dedicated to formally tracking the successes and activities of graduates. As Gary commented, “We haven’t measured how effective we have been except with anecdotal data.”

The findings from the participants of the study identified resource constraints at the micro level or institutional and department level, and in the field or macro level. These limitations have restricted the ability of these educators to provide the quality of programming the subject area deserves, and has consequently led to frustrations for the students.

**Student Tensions: Inadequate Preparation and Time Constraints & Expectations**

Many of the participants identified an alarming trend whereby students were coming into the course without the level of skills expected and needed to master the requirements. Instructors were then forced to adjust their teaching and provide more skill acquisition and knowledge development, or had to rearrange when the course would be offered to allow students to have finished further business courses in preparation. “People tended to not have the skills to be able
to do it. The major focus was always doing a business plan and they were just turning out very poorly. It got switched to second year” (Tim). Even at the second year level, three of the participants stated that their students did not have the skills to conduct market research which is an integral part of a business plan, and therefore the expectations of what these assignments would consist of had to be tempered to match the skill level of the student:

We avoid at the second year level having them do any primary research because they are not ready for it. They haven’t done the stats; they haven’t done a research methods course at that point. It would be pretty much going down a dangerous path. (Laura).

Even if the students demonstrated adequate research skills, it was apparent from nine of the participants that they did not have sufficient time to satisfactorily meet the key outcomes of the course. For Grant, primary research was a real problem area in his program because it is a complex process that is very time consuming:

Now again we go back to a conundrum. We can’t put everything into a small business course in two semesters. And market research is one that they don’t do. So I basically taught them the fundamentals of primary research in a week and then got them over the next month to do a primary research project. Did it more for the value than the results; the experiential value of doing it rather than the results.

For Brian, having a compressed and intense program meant that the students did not have sufficient time to link to and build relationships with the business community. According to Laura, trying to cover so much material with very little depth meant that it was not a very dynamic and interesting course. “As a second year course, this was not really a course that allowed you to explode with energy because it just gave the students a little bit of a taste.” For Mary, they were trying to do too much in one course and the components leading up to and building upon the business plan got less attention and detail than desired:

We are going through it [material] so quickly. Students are actually compromising on their idea and just picking something that might be expedient just to get through it, rather than going through a true process of developing an idea that might have a lot of potential that would take longer or that really interested them. So, again, it is very superficial because of the time constraints.
It appeared there were discrepancies between what the course or program purported to teach, and what was actually possible within the institutional frameworks, course timelines, and student skill levels. In Mary’s situation, they only offer one entrepreneurship course at her institution and are not able to cover topics such as entrepreneurial theories, history of the field of entrepreneurship, and ethical and social issues of entrepreneurship. “I think we are trying to offer so much right now in the entrepreneurship course as it is currently structured that we should split it out, and introduce more courses, and at higher levels.” She would like the Faculty of Business to offer more entrepreneurship courses and even favours an entrepreneurship specialty or concentration similar to what is offered at other institutions such as University of Calgary and York University. More courses, Mary believes, would also allow for the current objectives to be discussed in much more detail.

Pressure by students was also identified as contributing to time limitations. Three participants discussed the lack of demand by students for certain types of entrepreneurial programs, in part, because of the perceived time commitment:

*When I was doing what we call the program review, looking at the small business program back in 1998-99, there were indications there. And I said to myself, this is a dying offering in terms of post-secondary education because most of the post-secondary education colleges had got out of small business programs.* (Grant)

Both Grant and Sandra discussed the mature student market which they felt was not interested in small business designations. Rather, these students want short-term programs that provide them with the training to get their business up and running quickly. “They just wanted in, give me the tools, give me the skills, and let me get out as fast as possible” (Grant). Their younger student market is more interested in general management or the credential of a business diploma or degree. Randy commented how at their institution they could not offer an entrepreneurial option because it would split the students too thin across the options and not be efficient or financially feasible. Also, Grant believes the younger students are not experienced enough nor do they have
the resources to start up businesses immediately after graduation, so they come into courses and programs with different expectations:

And do you know, the more mature the student is, the more likely they are to succeed. The 19, 20, 21 year-olds can't hack it. Now that is a gross exaggeration, but there is too much and they can't do it [certificate program] in eight months. They have not been through the "university of life" to really understand what is involved in being an employee and in being in a business. Those mature students know, they've experienced it, they know what it is like to a degree. And that is why again, when we go to the two-year diploma with a small business stream, that is for the 19, 20, 21-year olds; the less mature students.

Consequently, the participants have adapted programming at their institution, by offering broad, stand-alone entrepreneurial courses, or short-term entrepreneurial programs, to satisfy the various student needs at the college level.

Educators face dilemmas in how they know and think about entrepreneurship. They have to fit their perspective within an institutional context that may be resisted by colleagues, by students, by the organization, or the marketplace their school serves; tensions which many of the participants revealed.

Philosophical Dilemmas

The participants indicated they wrestled with philosophical dilemmas as a result of the political tensions in their teaching environments. What is emphasized and available within their institutional context, and what is not possible, has to be reconciled with their beliefs and values of their own practice. So, how did these educators understand and speak about their teaching work, specifically in the area of entrepreneurship? Some participants described the learning process by what students did. Others described it by what they became. A few spoke to the theoretical framework which informed their understanding. And others discussed a process informed by history. The participants' educational approaches are examined in this section, as well as the process for how these philosophies were developed. This section also explores the
characteristics of the small business and entrepreneurship areas, and looks at how these educators appreciate and address the relationship between these two fields.

**Learning Objectives: To “Do” or To “Be”**

A distinction can be made between those participants who focused mainly on the practical, skill-based, “nuts and bolts” of the business operation when teaching entrepreneurship, and those participants who centred on the process of being an entrepreneur; a schism between “doing” and “being.” Nine of the interviewees discussed their students “doing” the business plan, such as creating the document or at least understanding the components of the business plan, as a key objective. Randy describes this outcome for his course:

Yes, when it is all over and done it is a well learned exercise on their part. At least they realize the value of preparing a business plan regardless of who the audience may be. They will know what they will have to do.

Dan refers to this business plan document as the planning tool for students to learn about starting up a business because it gets them to the point where they recognize how much they need to think about and learn before they practice and implement this skill. “So it is an integrated educational program related to starting and/or running a small business.”

This focus on the “practical” was a distinguishing characteristic reinforced by many of the participants:

To me, entrepreneurship education means giving those people skills that an entrepreneur will need to go out and successfully start or purchase. I see an entrepreneur as anybody who actually owns, and has their assets on the line, and is the single driving force behind the business. (Bill)

Gary sees the role of business schools as providing the theoretical foundation that allows students to apply practical tools to starting their own business, enabling them to perform the “nuts and bolts” of the operation. This was reinforced by four participants who clearly advocated for very practical curriculum materials that covered the basic fundamentals of the subject area.

“Our course is primarily the practical aspect of developing the business plan so we wanted the
workbook that gave them the greatest benefit in terms of leading them through the development of a business plan" (Mary). Tim uses a course text that actually provides check-lists of processes for doing the business plan in a very concrete and mechanical method. "He [author] actually says list your competition, list how big they are, how many employees, what kinds of sales; list this, list that, it is pretty fundamental. That is what I really like about it."

Another key objective stated by four of the participants that related to this notion of "doing" was the importance of exposing students to this career path, or what it would be like to "do" the things of an entrepreneur:

We are trying to introduce entrepreneurship as a means of engaging oneself in a challenging and rewarding career. . . . Expose them to this as an alternative, to get them thinking that there are other ways to earn a living than to go and work for someone else. . . . but we are not trying to turn them into entrepreneurs. (Mary)

This awareness of entrepreneurship as a career path, it was believed, would also highlight the complexity of the entrepreneurial role, due in part to its integrated nature. This complexity is what led six of the participants to claim that many students upon completing their entrepreneurial programming were not ready, because of age, resources, maturity or lifestyle, to start or "do" their own business. The result, as Gary has witnessed, is that many students take the skills they have learned and use them "intrapreneurially" in a workplace setting:

Most of them [younger students] will go and work for a company as opposed to starting their own business, although this is not always true. We have some very young people who graduated from the program and immediately went out and started or bought a business. Entrepreneurs tend to be older than 22. There are those exceptions; people who are brilliant and very entrepreneurial. It helps to have some experience and skills in business before you go out and do this.

For Randy, this means students have learned the skills they need to "do" the work within an organization:

I like to use the terminology entrepreneurial but also intrapreneurial; if you happen to not be your own employer but working for another business. Use to take that extra step or to take that little bit of extra risk to get something done.
Four of the participants differed in what learning they expected their educational approach to accomplish. They expressed that their students were capable, especially at the higher levels, to accomplish more than “doing” tasks such as the business plan. "A big part of what we are teaching our students is critical thinking skills. And on top of critical thinking skills is the ability to be able to discern in real time what is happening in the economic environment and how to respond to it, or what we call script queues” (Brian). These participants stated that they wanted their students to develop analytical skills, learn to think and become more confident, and understand how to integrate all the learning components together. For Sandra this entailed “combining the theoretical knowledge plus the practical knowledge and experience to help them learn how to think, and to mentor their needs. The whole idea was to enable them to be confident and know what they needed.”

These participants felt that learning to be an entrepreneur required the ability of students to think like an entrepreneur. "The difference between an expert and a novice is that the experts know more and that they do think differently from the rest of us.” Bob is describing the theoretical perspective that informs the entrepreneurship program at his institution. This approach, transaction cognition theory, looks at the basic building blocks of a business as a transaction. The conceptual framework basically states that it is not about traits or personality, as evidenced in past research literature, but rather what a person knows and what they do with that information. According to Brian, the philosophy of their program is one of a “learning community” created by having an intense and integrated format where the learners are kept together throughout the whole experience. Brian describes the philosophy underpinning their approach also as a way of thinking which is more than just about starting a business:

_The approach we take is really the fact that expertise is what we want to be teaching people and expertise in a sense of a way of thinking about the world and the economic opportunities in a way that will enable learners to respond to those opportunities quickly and with the level of competence to be able to manage it._
And Laura discussed the goal of their entrepreneurship program in terms of learning how to think about and take advantage of market opportunities, either by creating a new venture or by searching within existing firms. “Even if they went to work for an existing business, they ended up creating growth in that business and developing a position for themselves. This was something we always encouraged.”

For these participants, they were teaching students not just the process, but actually how to “be” an entrepreneur, and how to “be” entrepreneurial in different contexts. Bob’s program uses transaction cognition theory\(^{58}\) to help students develop expertise. They are put through a scripting process where they develop their own maps of what expert entrepreneurship looks like, and then complete exercises to help them practice this expertise. “Whereas we train people to be serial entrepreneurs. People that can start businesses, take them to a certain point, sell them off, and start another.” Brian also discusses a scripting process and agrees that expertise can be taught. He compares a doctor with an entrepreneur and asserts that you become a doctor only through specialized training and expertise, and ways of thinking about things using both theoretical and practical applications:

> You become better over time. The only difference between a medical doctor and an expert entrepreneur is that entrepreneurship is such a new field of study that there really is not a M.D. in entrepreneurship yet. That in fact people gain entrepreneurial expertise and entrepreneurial script through many different ways. That they don’t really need to have formal education. Just as it is certainly possible to become an expert physician without going to medical school if you learned it on your own, and you were able to find the avenue to be able to practice and take that risk.

The different philosophies these participants expressed are manifest in the values or goals they espouse for their learners. Part of these differences may be due to the various student levels the educators are teaching: skill acquisition at lower levels, and critical thinking and analysis

\(^{58}\) Transaction cognition theory (Mitchell, 1999) proposes that three sets of cognitions working together are sufficient for an individual to create a successful transaction: planning cognitions, promise cognitions, and competition cognitions.
more at the higher levels. Even so, there was a marked difference between the approaches which stressed the “practical” and the “doing,” versus the perspectives which emphasized “thinking about” and “being.”

**Packaging**

The interviews investigated how these educators perceived their own philosophy regarding entrepreneurship education, and what differentiated their perspective from other approaches to business education. Several participants discussed the practice of “packaging” courses into a specialty option, versus teaching from a unique perspective.

Grant claimed that institutions feel pressured to find a niche in the marketplace and try to differentiate their program from the many others that are offered in the region. As a result, he felt some institutions have placed “entrepreneurial” in front of their program title as a marketing technique to attract students, but does not think the program is fundamentally different than a general business option:

> And I am being a bit facetious or cynical when I say that as well, but I think the content is like general management but there is a slant towards entrepreneurial just to differentiate if from a BComm or BBA you generally get in University.

In describing the programs at his institution, Tim made reference to this notion of “repackaging” courses into various options with no substantive differences between these specialties:

> The difference between all the courses, all the programs, is maybe two or three courses. . . . It is really some name stuff and a few small options that give it a different tile. Through it all there is some core courses that are very, very common.

In contrast, Grant stated that he takes a fundamentally different approach when teaching in his program, an approach based upon a small business perspective:

> Small business, small business, small business; how would you apply this concept in a small business. In the other university transfer courses, I would be taking a more medium-to-large business approach, a more macro approach.
By including entrepreneurial or small business as part of the title of each course (for example, "entrepreneurial marketing"), Grant makes a clear distinction from a course without this emphasis. Although the curriculum materials may be similar, the delivery and slant are fundamentally different because the focus is entirely on small business. Dan also sees a difference between entrepreneurship education and general business education:

*In the education you have to find out what it is the student is trying to learn here, what makes this course different here than taking a marketing course or an accounting course; it has to be seen as an integration package.*

For Dan, integration is the complex process of starting up a business that requires knowledge and skills in many different areas, as well as lifestyle and attitude changes, and an immense amount of work, to make it successful.

Laura believes that a different approach is needed when incorporating entrepreneurship education into the post-secondary system and that there are two philosophies that institutions can choose. One movement is to develop a more generic entrepreneurship studies program and offer it across many different disciplines, and the other movement is to take generic courses within one's own discipline and expand them into an entrepreneurial focus. Her faculty chose the latter approach, because she did not feel she would be able to develop the interest and resources across the various program areas:

*Because there didn't seem to be too much support from other areas, we went on our own. That was one option. We could have gone a different way but then I would have needed a team that was across disciplines.*

The entrepreneurial program at Gary’s institution was a deliberate attempt, mandated by Education Council and reinforced by his department, to incorporate a liberal education component into each of the degrees offered. "*I think personally it is important to provide other perspectives on the world as part of any business education.*" For example, when business students study power relationships, they discuss political power and economic power as well as power utilized in a business context. Terry’s comments also support this philosophy of a broader
education. He stated that there is a fundamental problem with commerce programs in general, and that teaching entrepreneurship to undergraduate students is a mistake because students are not mature enough to understand the complexities and responsibilities associated with this role:

*I mean I have a problem to be honest with you, with the whole idea of having a commerce degree. I think it is a bad idea. I don't think we should be teaching 18 and 19 years-olds who just graduated, or 21 and 22 year-olds; I don't think we should give them a business education. I think we should give them a much broader education so they can understand society better before they start to become focused on greed and selfishness, which is really what commerce programs indoctrinate in their students.*

There is pressure in the business discipline, Terry stated, to provide students with the view that the world is a fine place with unlimited opportunities and that everything which is good for business is good for society. Students leave with a false sense of security, he believes, and a very narrow perspective.

The discussion of participants' philosophy regarding what approach to entrepreneurship educators should take, is a manifestation of the earlier debate discussed in the study between a liberal versus vocational orientation to education, and the competing interests and ideologies this encompasses. Some participants focused on the need for teaching practical skills, of learning to "do" the tasks and activities necessary for successful venturing to occur. Others described teaching the expertise of how to become an entrepreneur, even a serial entrepreneur, also with a strong emphasis on practical application. Yet, other participants spoke of the concerns of offering too narrow a view, and the need for a broader approach to entrepreneurship education, whereby liberal tenets are integrated into the perspectives offered.

*Entrepreneurship and Small Business: What is the Relationship?*

The document review in Stage One identified similarities in the curricula analysed between small business management and entrepreneurship. I wanted to investigate further with participants how they perceived these two fields, and clarify their approach to entrepreneurship programs to understand if they perceived major differences from other business areas.
Eleven of the 12 participants described substantive differences between how they perceived the fields of small business and entrepreneurship, using several key differentiating characteristics such as growth, start-up, and creation. Several of the participants identified how this distinction was handled and separated out in their courses along the planning and implementation stages. For many of these educators, the distinctness of each field also meant that different skills, competencies, and even temperaments would be appropriate.

A couple of the participants identified issues around the conceptual language used to describe this subject area, and how the perception of this terminology has changed over time. For example, the institution Sandra worked at in the 1970s used the title of “small business” for their courses because they did not feel there was a lot of public acceptance of the term “entrepreneur.” There was concern for how their target market would perceive education categorized as entrepreneurial:

*The word entrepreneur didn’t ring with our students. I found everywhere I was going in those days, entrepreneurship, like in our group of small business owners, women owners, you didn’t really call yourselves entrepreneurs, you called yourself small business owners. It didn’t really have the cache, any kind of cache. It sounded too theoretical or high fluting, what does it really mean?*

Dan also discussed how he found these two terms conjured up different perceptions. He felt that entrepreneurship is now the preferred term and is used more frequently because it provides greater clarity and generally a more positive response. “*I don’t think there is a big difference but I think the marketplace, the public, reacts better to the word entrepreneurship, because it means for sure I am likely going to own this business.*”

The participants were fairly similar in how they made the distinction between the two fields with entrepreneurship focusing on the creation and opportunity aspects, as well as the growth features. “*Let’s say if I want to learn to manage an organization that is small then I am not really focusing on growth. Really entrepreneurship has an undercurrent of growth. You are looking for market opportunities that will grow.*” Here Laura made the distinction between...
assessing the potential of business ideas and developing strategies to take advantage of these opportunities into a business formation (entrepreneurship), versus day-to-day management and operational issues (small business). Brian also focused on the issue of opportunities. For him, taking advantage of opportunities and resources through continual innovation and technology best describes entrepreneurs:

In my opinion, the biggest difference between entrepreneurial type activity and small business management activity is one of using resources; leveraging resources in the most efficient and effective way to yield returns.

Terry reiterated this emphasis on growth when he claimed that entrepreneurship focuses on high growth businesses that show a substantial potential to expand. He contrasted that with small business which is more often what he refers to as a “lifestyle” type of business. Bob concurred when he asserted emphatically that their program teaches entrepreneurship and not small business. Although many of their students end up working in small business, or choosing “lifestyle” businesses as he phrased it, this is not the focus of their entrepreneurship specialty because students can learn about this in general management. “Growth is really a focus. To me small business is basically buying a job.”

The process of entrepreneurship, involving taking the business to a certain point and then starting another, was a distinction made by other participants in the study:

For me, an entrepreneur is somebody who is more of a business creator. They get a business up and going and then they move on or get tired of it or bring it to a level that they sell it off or turn it over to other people to start another business. (Sandra)

Here the focus becomes not only on the growth potential but also on the start-up stage:

So the demarcation point between entrepreneurship was we would look at studying the characteristics of entrepreneurs and generating business ideas, evaluating business ideas, and doing the business plan up to the point that the business would start. Then the small business management course, theoretically, would kick in for a business that was already started and in operation and we would talk about the issues of growth, and family business, and then look at all the functional areas. (Mary)
Grant also identified this division between the assessment and planning portion that he feels is part of the entrepreneurship domain, and the managing of the business which becomes part of the small business area.

There appears to be a fundamental difference, as seen by the participants, between the transition from conception and planning, to implementation. "The transition from entrepreneurship to small business happens, in my opinion, as soon as you begin to take on the trappings of an established business" (Bill). To Tim, small business is when you start to employ and manage a number of employees. And Sandra refers to a small business owner as someone who starts and grows a business to a level they are comfortable with, similar to the lifestyle reference described by other participants.

This transition also determines where some participants saw the need for different skills. This was translated in their courses by what they chose to cover (for example, only up to start-up for entrepreneurship). According to Gary, managing a business requires different skills and often a different kind of personality makeup than a start-up:

People who want to be entrepreneurs are somewhat different from people who want to be managers of businesses. My view of it is they are two distinct things and one of the challenges, we did some of this kind of study at Western back twenty years ago, is that entrepreneurs are sometimes really lousy managers. . . . Some people do make the transition, but often you have to bring in professional managers and it is a little bit of a different thing.

Similarly, Sandra believed in different types of entrepreneurs such as the start-up "pitcher" type and the manager "administrator" style. People are skilled and interested in doing different things and it is very hard to find one business owner who is capable of running the whole process. "Quite often the people who start something are not the people who can make it grow or can even manage it properly." Randy went even further to claim that certain options within the business discipline were more appropriate for entrepreneurship, while other options attracted students who were more likely to exhibit characteristics aligned with small business:
The entrepreneur is more of a mindset of a non-accountant. I don't want to try and put down accounting. What I am trying to say is that the mindset is different. Accounting is like for small business; the reason why it's so good for accounting is because many of the accountants get a designation and hang up the shingles somewhere and become a small business, not an entrepreneurial business.

The participants clearly identified a distinction between the areas of small business and entrepreneurship. Many commented on the demarcation point between the start-up component (associated with entrepreneurship), and the management component (associated with small business). The participants also described entrepreneurship using characteristics such as growth, creation, and opportunity, and small business was referred to as stable, implying little growth, and synonymous with the category of "lifestyle" businesses.

**The Development Process: Weaving in Institutional, Market and Student Knowledge**

The participants revealed different strategies and processes for how they incorporated their philosophies and approaches into course and program models. This included using pre-existing processes in place, consulting industry partners or the marketplace for niche strategies, reviewing student needs, and assessing other institutional models. Some of the participants accepted the historical practice without questioning or understanding its root and development. For other participants, the experts were prominent decision-makers in the marketplace who listed their expectations of what outcomes they would like produced. Several others engaged in a deliberate and conscious process of creating a method conducive to their desired results.

Two participants indicated that the course was developed in accordance with an already established calendar description and course title, and through discussions with administration (such as the Faculty Dean or Department Chair) about previous experiences and current expectations of the course:

*Because the title was what went into the calendar and I went 'Oh my gosh, we did some of that but I better make sure I do a little more especially when it is in the title.' I have to make sure that becomes part of the focus. Some of it was by accident. It wasn't totally by design. Another part of how I would design a course*
and have designed one, I would say that I have an idea in my head and I've got the course description as kind of what I am aiming for from the school itself. Then I look for the method of teaching. And to be truthful a lot comes from the textbook. (Tim)

This process indicates that established philosophies by those already in the field, such as authors or previous instructors, determined for some participants the direction and intent of the subject area.

Four participants commented that they surveyed key players in the local industry and marketplace to determine what was needed and what would be supported within their own resources. For Gary, there were political and economic factors impacting his institution’s decision because they needed a program that maximized faculty productivity, utilized a minimum number of resources, and would be supported by the needs of the local community:

_The issues of initiative and accountability and leadership and so on are attributes that are useful for everyone who is going to work in business and industry whether it is small, medium or large. That seemed to be a better approach than saying well let’s have an organizational behaviour/human resources specialty, marketing specialty and so on. We could do it with fewer resources; we could do it with a kind of a lock-step program that didn’t have electives and that was cheaper to do at the time._

Both Mary and Tim talked about responding to the market and industry desires, and the strength of this influence in designing their courses. "_The school is pretty good at responding to industry desires_" (Tim). Laura, too, discussed how her faculty conducted a market study of potential areas to pursue, and entrepreneurship was identified as a possibility that would allow them to be competitive and offer an excellent product.

_We are not going to compete with the well-established universities or colleges that have long-serving programs. We wouldn’t have those resources and we are a smaller institution in central BC. What is it that we have the potential to be good at?_

Sandra also described the process at her institution that utilized the experience of the business community. They used a design team and course experts, in addition to bringing in small business owners, to tell the institution what they felt the students needed to know.
Sandra also believed their method was very student-centered because they looked at the whole profile of the student and their needs so that the people taking small business were able to identify with the course and take the learning and adapt it to their own business. "Total profile of a student, we had a lot of criteria around that. You designed the curriculum for that profile. When our courses were finished, the students could really identify with it." Mary and Dan both emphasized the importance of developing programming around the needs and levels of their students and assessing what prior experiences they would be bringing into the classroom.

One of the things about entrepreneurship courses is it depends on what their knowledge base is that you are starting with as to what you can put into the curriculum and how you can handle it. It is very important that this course is adapted to the target market you are trying to reach. (Dan)

At Laura’s institution, they found the experiences of their students led them to make significant adjustments and changes to their program. Most of their students who graduated ended up creating their own jobs and were staying away from the traditional hospitality and tourism areas they had been exposed to in their studies. "We never had enough subject areas in the program to actually help them get their feet wet before they left." And they continued to offer further programming based on student feedback until eventually their department decided to support a full entrepreneurship major.

The process that Laura used to develop a new program included a thorough scan of what other schools were doing around the world, as well as a major literature review. She surveyed broader education programs and entrepreneurship concentrations, majors and minors, and was very informed about the different philosophies guiding this type of programming. Bob revealed a similar process at his institution involving two professors conducting a scan of approximately 34 different entrepreneurship programs around the world, assessing what worked and what did not work, and what could best be developed for their particular situation:

But the background was they attended an academy meeting where Carl Vesper had a panel of the top people in the U.S. together that said if you want to design
Looking at best practices was the process Randy followed as well, although he confined it to the local region. At the annual British Columbia Colleges Competition, he would discuss with other instructors their experiences with small business courses and then continue to update and revise his courses after further consultation. It was the process of using the expertise of others, and then adapting it to his own context, that he utilized.

The findings demonstrate that the philosophy of educators is intrinsically tied to their developmental approach. However, this process is also influenced by faculty expertise and foresight, time and resources, and stakeholder support, demonstrating the inextricable linkages between the political and philosophical environment. The practice of using pre-established texts in place or other institutional models, as described by some participants, is perhaps viewed to be more politically defensible in what may be argued as a somewhat less supported or more tenuous career discipline. For Mary, she did not feel the encouragement, or that it was worth the challenge to expand the entrepreneurial programming at her institution, even though she has acknowledged over several years the incredible time and pedagogic limitations of offering only one course. The participants identified other perceived risks and struggles they encountered as they engaged in their practice of teaching entrepreneurship. These challenges are explored in the next section.

**Implementation Struggles**

The participants described political and philosophical tensions they have wrestled with which are lived through their practice. How they modified their teaching and assessment methods, and the personal distress and risks they experienced, is in part, a result of the complexities of implementation in a highly political environment.
Treatment of Ethics: Finding the Time and Making it a Priority

Although there was general agreement by all participants about the importance of developing an ethical consciousness in students, there were limitations identified which hampered the adequate treatment of this subject matter in their classrooms. The constraints meant that for these educators, they were unable to achieve in their practice what they valued as an important principle of their doctrine.

The greatest impediment identified by the participants was insufficient time to cover all the required course material in the framework available. "Yes, there is a lot of material in the textbook and we need to spend more time on something else. I am not saying it [ethics] is not important; all I am saying is that we would skim the surface, touch on it, of course" (Randy). For Grant they do talk in his courses about ethics, social responsibility, and contributing to the community, but it is not a major focus. "They've got so much else to cover. I guess it is prioritizing more than anything else. But you know, it is important."

So why is this topic not a priority when it is considered so valuable? Gary discusses two approaches to the treatment of ethics, which is to integrate the subject into every course or to offer an individual course that focuses entirely on this area. His preference is that ethical issues be addressed within every course of the program:

We do work at making sure there is integration in the courses. There is different ways of doing this and I am not sure there is a perfect way. With this complexity and our curriculum design, we need to reflect the different objectives that we have and we try the best we can to come up with a mix that is going to work.

However, Gary believes this makes the inclusion and teaching of ethics less consistent, because it is subject to instructors’ variations as faculty workloads and course responsibilities change over time.
Due to their inability to treat ethics as a main focus or critical topic in their class, eight of the participants commented on the best alternative being a reinforcement of it through every course or other key courses in their program:

Oh it is important, very important. And, I do see a place, but with the limitations we have right now, it's just not enough time. . . . So there are other places to include it, and I might be more in favour of ensuring it as a thread in terms of an across-the-curriculum type of idea, than just try to only deal with it in one particular course. (Mary)

Here the experience is that ethics is informally discussed in day-to-day conversation as an integrated subject rather than as its own stand-alone chapter or topic for discussion. Again, its inclusion is dependant upon instructor initiative and also student interest to bring up the area for exploration. For Dan, instruction in ethics is even less likely to happen in a distance education delivery format:

In the distance course it is really only what they are going to read about in the book. There is nothing specific about it [ethics] in the whole package. I would say that it happens a lot more in live delivery because you get students asking these kinds of questions. It is more when you have live discussion.

Another constraint identified by the participants included a lack of relevant curriculum material to help guide the instruction in this area. For those who adhere to a text-based education system, they are dependant on the author's evaluation and coverage of the subject. "For example Walter doesn't have a chapter on ethics. But if I use a different textbook, I would probably cover that in a lecture" (Tim). However, even if there are resources and the time to cover the topic, Terry believes the students are too immature and disinterested to properly understand the area, and there is not the political will to enforce its inclusion:

Even when I talk about ethics, its negativity, they don't want that, they want to become rich. That is why I say it is so sad to see this connection with education that we provide hand in hand with the pursuit of selfishness because that is exactly what it is. They don't want to have any restrictions placed upon them. They want to know how brilliant they are, they want to know how they can achieve anything they want to, and they don't want any limits in their way. It goes hand in hand again with the political structure and the process.
The experience for some of the participants, who, faced with limited time, resources, expertise and support, has been to provide little more than a cursory nod to the discussion and integration of ethics into the curriculum.

For four participants, however, time was not identified as a major constraint, perhaps partly attributed to their program length which provided more opportunities for the teaching of ethics. "I think it is important that ethical issues be addressed in each course within the program where that is useful" (Gary). Two participants referred to a course in their program where a key portion of its focus was dedicated to this subject area:

In our third year core program all students take a global business and society course. I would say at least one quarter of the content is business ethics and social responsibility. We also reinforce this material in every other course but it is not the main focus. (Bob)

For the other two participants, there was a deliberate process in place that incorporated ethical elements into assignment requirements. "In fact, I have integrated sustainability elements right into the project where that is a requirement. They plan for it, they think about it, and they analyse that part of it" (Brian). For Laura, they start these discussions right at the beginning:

By the way, social responsibility, sustainable development, those issues are a very strong undercurrent in all of our programs. It is kind of a theme. When we introduce the course at the beginning, especially when we are looking for opportunities and reading changes in the environment and when students are coming up with their potential business ideas, we always test them against the principles of sustainability. We want to look at whether they are ethically or environmentally responsible. Not just environmentally but socially, culturally. Does their business idea have the potential to harm any group or thing or other organizations in ways that are unethical? That is something that runs through and is not one separate topic.

Discussions with participants of the study seem to indicate that in practice, ethics seems for the most part to be left up to the initiative and will of the educator, who either feels armed with the tools to integrate this into their approach, or too limited and unsupported to make it a priority. The issue of ethic's role in entrepreneurship education, therefore, highlights some of the tensions and risks educators face with their students or colleagues, marketplace or institution,
when they are implementing their practice. For example, how agreeable are students to instruction in ethics, especially at the undergraduate or short-term level? And, regardless of buy-in from the student and collegial population, do educators feel competent enough to defend and teach this area against the threat of opposition and challenge?

**Pedagogical Challenges**

The participants acknowledged that working within the educational system has provided limitations on what methods and practices they are supported to use. This has created personal distress for some of the participants who found these constraints hampered their individuality in the classroom, and provoked them to question their effectiveness at teaching and assessing this material. Their lived experience reflects that entrepreneurship can be a difficult subject area to teach and assess, and it is a challenge to find qualified instructors interested in this area.

**Institutional Frustrations.** For one participant, the institutional and political process of professor evaluations has tempered the teaching approaches and critique of business that he would like to bring to the instructional process:

> The main criteria for survival as a sessional as far as getting your contract renewed, is student satisfaction in the course. I do everything I can as long as I can live with myself to take it to that popularity aspect of the course which means changes are based on feedback I received from the students. . . . I can't even do my students a favour of bringing in a reflective business that failed because they would connect it with me and it looks negatively on my course. I can only give them good news. (Terry)

Terry was alone in his critique of faculty evaluation processes, perhaps in part because of his unique position as a non-tenured, sessional instructor. Student evaluations, in his experience, are used as a tool by management for political purposes, to ensure faculty are not too critical or negative of business, especially during interaction and discussion with the students. He believes that with more than 50% of the instructors at his institution as sessionals, there is immense pressure to “tow the party line” if people are going to get rehired. The critical and reflective view
Terry would like to bring to business practices is stymied by a culture that encourages conformity and positive perspectives.

Yet, despite catering to student and faculty demands, Terry described his evaluations for entrepreneurship as very poor compared to the other courses he taught. He attributes this partly to the discomfort students have with his style of teaching, which consists less of lectures, and more of one-on-one coaching time with student groups assisting them with their business plan projects. "And one comment that sticks out in my mind is 'does the instructor do anything in this course?' It is an extremely painful process. The most painful course to be honest with you that I have ever taught." Other participants echoed the difficulty in teaching entrepreneurship, which is also consistent with my own experience. "I am not pleased with the course. I am getting more pleased with it. But this is the fifth time I have run it. As I said I have done several courses at another institution as well and I am not quite pleased with them either" (Tim).

So why do educators find this subject difficult, and why is there reluctance from faculty to teach in this area? Is entrepreneurship a subject that is amenable to teaching? This topic has been heavily debated in the literature as Mary confirms:

And it goes back to the debate about is an entrepreneur born or taught or do they learn it? And I think there is a little bit of both, but a lot of them are being taught. You can teach anything if you devote enough time and energy and resources to it and if the individual has the motivation and interest to learn it.

Tim believes students can learn about entrepreneurship, and demonstrate these competencies through academic classroom exercises, if they simulate business situations such as case study methods. "Yes I do believe the skills can be taught and the knowledge can be taught. We are getting into competencies I believe. How do they demonstrate it? That is what I use the cases for." Bob believes it is all about learning expertise and then having the environment that allows you the opportunity to practice and refine that expertise. "So deliberate practice is the key to
becoming an expert at anything.” Although Gary also believes it is possible to teach entrepreneurship, he feels academic programs are usually ineffective:

"You had a question about, do you feel it is possible to teach entrepreneurship. I think it is. There are lots of examples where it is done successfully, not as many in academic programs. They tend to be more the practical programs like our program where we teach people to start their own businesses. We went through the process of identifying what makes an entrepreneur, what skills should an entrepreneur have, what kinds of things can be taught, and how can students learn them. They are not learned through textbooks; often they are experientially learned. It is important for us to put in the right kind of learning activities, like the learning experiences that would support that kind of learning.

So personal distress for educators may result, in part, from feeling that what they are doing is ineffectual and hampered by factors outside of their control. For example, several participants indicated that the usefulness of the business plan as a learning tool was severely limited by their inability to navigate the research ethics process in a timely fashion that would allow students to conduct primary research, which is a key component of the assignment. Others engaged in risk-taking practices in order to circumvent established policies so as not to compromise the quality of learning. “You wouldn’t have the time and by the time it takes you four weeks to review something the course is over. . . . I say it is okay in a sense that it is easier to get forgiveness than permission” (Bob). For Bob, they have been able to navigate successfully around the institutional process and review the research themselves, only because their achievements and recognition in the field have allowed their organization to turn a “blind eye” to their practices. “We are kind of operating on ‘if they really care about it, they will tell us’ and then we will tell them that if they want an award winning entrepreneurship program that is going to bring money to the university, then cut us some slack.”

The participants have identified an interesting dilemma where on the one hand, institutional regulations such as the research ethics process is hampering their teaching time, and the type of projects they can administer in their classroom. Yet, by circumventing the process, or identifying their resistance to its requirements, they are also communicating that this ethical
review process is not viewed as a priority in their teaching. Once again, as in previous discussions about ethics, time seems to be indicated as a key constraint that does not permit adequate treatment of this topic. And perhaps another issue, as discussed by a couple of the participants, is the frustration these educators feel because they are not permitted to control and monitor their own process, so as to fit it within the parameters of the curriculum.

Other participants stated that they do not even attempt activities, such as market research, because of fear of reprisals. For Bill, entrepreneurship needs to involve very practically-oriented, hands-on, exercises, such as students running their own businesses during class, and then shadowing other businesses to learn how difficult the realities of actually starting a venture can be. He has seen this at other colleges in the United States, but feels it would draw criticism from administration if he were to engage his students in similar activities:

_I realize, at my institution, that would create horrendous problems because most of the things I have seen people do at other colleges in their report are things like operating a hot dog stand on campus or writing research papers for downtown people, all of which would run afoul of some committee or another here._

Another stressful organizational issue that two participants discussed as challenging to teaching entrepreneurship, was the complexity of teaching this subject by distance education. Dan commented that you need to adjust your course when teaching for a distance format. Certain topics are hard to cover, such as ethics, and certain exercises are hard for the students to do, such as research, because you are not available in person for discussion and assistance. _"Maybe they are not going to do much research, because in a live class you can push that, but in a correspondence course you can’t, not easily."_ And Mary states that distance education is not her preferred delivery method because there are certain live activities, such as interacting with entrepreneurs, that the students do not have the opportunity to do. However, there is potential to provide good learning opportunities for entrepreneurship in a distance format, if resources are committed. _I don’t think it’s a good alternative, but there is room, and it takes a bit of money for_
development, but there is room for great innovation, if the time is taken. The pressures of their educational context and the limitations on their practices, have caused frustrations for many of the participants who felt constrained within the organizational system in which they operate.

**Teaching Frustrations.** The field of entrepreneurship requires instructors with expertise in many subject areas as seven of the participants identified. Yet this is difficult to find in one instructor. The ideal format, Bob believes, is an integrated delivery by a teaching team, yet very few institutions support this practice because of the expense of faculty time it requires, both in coordination and teaching time. "It is expensive to the faculty because we get together for about two hours a week as a teaching team just to coordinate." At Brent’s institution, they use external entrepreneurial advisors to supplement the team teaching approach, who work together with student teams and share their experiences:

> Generally, the external entrepreneurial advisor is someone who either has been involved with the venture capital funding community or the banking community for small business. It helps learners understand what ought to be in the business plan; it helps them connect with people in the community in terms of contacts, and they can find more information about certain aspects of the industry.

Even without a team, four participants emphasized the critical need for instructors to engage in a consulting, mentoring, and coaching teaching style, with a significant amount of one-on-one contact time and feedback, in contrast to a didactic and lecturing style that may be a more comfortable practice for some educators. "And a lot of consultation on the part of the instructor; that the instructor is more a coach and a consultant than they are the traditional stand-up in front of an audience and lecture at them" (Mary).

There was also widespread agreement from the participants that “traditional” assessment tools, such as exams, were not very effective in evaluating student learning. Experiential exercises were the best type of learning activities, Gary claimed, to teach entrepreneurship. Bob’s program also includes a number of exercises in their portfolio course that allow students to demonstrate their abilities and competences to other stakeholders. "That ‘practice’ component of
it is built right into our portfolio course. We have developed a number of experiential exercises in our portfolio courses.” Bill also advocates for experiential learning and practical exercises so students have the opportunity to act entrepreneurially within a teaching context:

I would like to duplicate what I see being done at Whitworth College in Spokane whereby students are given a thousand dollars, go to class, and actually during their term must start a small business. At the end they have to turn back a thousand dollars plus a profit; a very practical hands-on oriented assignment. It is a two-term course. They do that in the first term and then the second term they go out on a mentoring shadowing project with people whose companies are a little bit bigger in size, once they now understand the reality and the difficulties of actually starting a business.

Mary feels that exams have severe limitations and are used mainly because they are a traditional tool that is more efficient for instructors to mark. Yet, other non-traditional forms of assessment, such as self-assessment exercises or the business plan, which are much more onerous to evaluate, are, she believes, better measures of entrepreneurial learning:

So those types of in-depth ways of assessment and getting them to write about themselves, are way beyond the level you could ever achieve with a pen and pencil test. Mind you they are much harder to mark, but that's the tradeoff, the learning is so much greater.

Tim has also stopped using a mid-term exam in his entrepreneurship course. Instead, he uses other assessment methods, such as case studies and presentations, and structures the business plan project as the critical part of the evaluation process. “Now they know it [business plan project] is really important. They can't blow it off and I stress it all year long. That meant that I didn’t really have time for a mid-term.” And Bill sees merit in using financial success as a measure of entrepreneurial success:

I don't think an exam is the right way to do it. I don't think these are examinable skills. Business plans, interview with an entrepreneur, insights they are able to get, those all help. The one thing, though, is if you go out and measure them by how much money they make – there is not a lot wrong in that. I know a lot of academics don’t like that idea but I have come out of the business world, believe you me that is why Jimmy Pattison makes more money than anyone else because in the business world that is the score. Keep score by that money. For anyone who is serious about being an entrepreneur, there is a basic amount of money you
have to make. Up to that point you are in a hobby that may be partially subsidizing itself.

This discomfort with the teaching and assessment process may be confounded further because of the lack of instructor resources to help guide entrepreneurship educators. Several participants talked of a “trial and error” experience of trying to learn what methods proved most effective, and how this has created other issues during this process such as poor student outcomes and instructor evaluations. “I have changed quite a number of aspects of the course from the way that the previous professor was teaching, and also from the way that I started teaching it. . . . Basically I am feeling my way with the students.” (Terry). Seven participants believed the textbook needed to be Canadian, but that this criterion really limited their choice of curriculum materials. “I was forced to find a new book [when it went out of print] and I wanted Canadian content. I have tons of books on my shelves here that are all U.S. based and it means nothing to me” (Randy).

Participants, such as Laura, also stated that the curriculum materials needed to be suitable for the level of student in their courses, finding many texts too advanced and geared for the Master’s level, or too fundamental for an upper level undergraduate student. This has forced educators to use materials that are less than ideal. “It [course text] is American and that is the problem. There is no Canadian text; I have looked high and low” (Laura). The problem with American-based materials, Brian stated, is that a lot of the information is not applicable to the Canadian situation. However, it was sometimes the best alternative available:

The reason why I use the Harvard case studies is because the Ivey case studies have very few on entrepreneurship. I don’t know if you have seen any Ivey stuff but lots of spelling mistakes and things like that in Ivey material that is published which we make students pay for and they get very annoyed at that. Harvard has some really good ones. Unfortunately, most of them are American type businesses, but that is just the way it is.

The lack of educational resources has also meant that several of the participants have developed their own curriculum materials. “We use a combination of textbooks and course packs
that we put together ourselves. And we are writing our own text” (Bob). Two other participants stated this was the ideal way to solve the curriculum issue, but that they currently lacked the expertise and time in their department to carry out such a complex and intensive task.

I identified the constraint rather early on and that is the curriculum, finding the material to teach. I think we still have to address that as well as we can. I think that will come as we develop our own research capability as part of the research strategy that is developed here. The way I see research developing in the School of Business is that part of it will be focused on creating materials that we can use in classes that are relevant and local and specifically focused on small-to-medium sized business and entrepreneurship. (Gary)

A final issue identified by six of the participants was the critical need for instructors to have the relevant entrepreneurial and business experience in order to teach this subject area. Dan believes that student success in the entrepreneurship course depends to a great extent on the personality and experience of the instructor and whoever develops the course, and that is why a lot of faculty do not want to teach entrepreneurship. Grant states that you cannot teach the entrepreneurial courses unless you have relevant business experience. “Whatever we call the courses, we cannot teach it unless you have small business experience, run your own small business, or you have been extensively exposed to small business.” Bill believes that the way to unlock student creativity is to talk about your entrepreneurial experiences and to lead by example. “I think entrepreneurship is one of the few courses that the energy, experience, and enthusiasm of the professor makes a huge difference.” This experience, Tom described, can be passed on to students and provides them an opportunity to learn from past entrepreneurial practices. “Because I have not been successful in some of my endeavours and it smacked me in the face. Maybe I can pass this on to them.”

The findings indicate that participants have engaged in non-traditional teaching and assessment methods, perhaps even perceived as risk-taking activities, as well as found ways to supplement existing curriculum materials, in order to provide the learning tools necessary for
their students. For some, this has resulted in resistance and discomfort from administration, colleagues, students, and even entrepreneurship educators themselves.

**Summary of Findings**

Out of this map of issues facing entrepreneurship educators, four key findings stand out. Firstly, it is evident that entrepreneurship is not yet well-established in the public post-secondary undergraduate context in British Columbia, despite the recognition that entrepreneurship is an emerging area of education. There was a lack of offerings at the program level, and in some cases, a lack of differentiation with other types of business programs, in addition to a fairly low-level and basic selection of programming at the course level. The growth of the entrepreneurship education field appears to be influenced and stymied by political issues, specifically, a lack of institutional support, and resource constraints.

Secondly, this study revealed a diversity of philosophies of entrepreneurship education. Some participants discussed a very practical, "nuts and bolts," doing approach to entrepreneurship education, while others argued for a broader perspective that included not just the process of entrepreneurship, but also the concept of being an entrepreneur. The former is associated with a more limited, skill-based, technical approach, in contrast to the latter orientation that encompasses a more expansive philosophy. The limitation of time was a key factor in realizing this goal of a broader view of entrepreneurship.

Thirdly, participants identified entrepreneurship as its own field of education, distinct from closely related areas such as small business. The participants did recognize that there were certain dilemmas they faced in their practice that exist at the market, institutional, collegial and student level, and discussed how the development of the field was influenced by the way it is positioned and supported in the public post-secondary context in British Columbia.

Fourthly, these tensions have created implementation struggles and pedagogical challenges for educators, including student expectations and demands, lack of resources,
institutional limitations, teaching frustrations, time constraints and the inadequate treatment of ethics, and a lack of faculty willing to work in the field.

In the next chapter, I discuss these key issues, in relation to the literature and my original research questions.
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

I began this study with the purpose of investigating the current state of undergraduate entrepreneurship education in public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia. I reviewed curriculum documents and spoke to educators to determine how established this field was, and what type of programming was being offered. I wanted to explore what needed to happen to bring an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education. This chapter reviews the key findings of the study in regards to current entrepreneurship scholarship and an integrated approach.

Current State of Entrepreneurship Education

Factors Limiting the Growth of the Field

There is well-documented growth of the entrepreneurship field as a whole, especially in areas such as the United States (see, for example, Katz, 2003). This study, however, indicated that entrepreneurship education was not yet well-established in the British Columbia public post-secondary context. The entrepreneurship field has grown in this region, as indicated by the document review which found that 24 of the 28 public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia offered some type of entrepreneurship programming. Yet, this growth appears to be limited, as the majority of institutions offered introductory-level entrepreneurship courses that were not a required part of the curriculum. As well, of the 28 institutions reviewed, only eight offered some type of entrepreneurship program, including one college whose two entrepreneurship programs are "under review" and currently not available. Additionally, several of these programs did not appear to be substantively different than other types of business programs.

Resource Issues. So why is the growth of entrepreneurship education more limited in British Columbia public post-secondary institutions, in comparison to the global scene, as
documented in the literature? Some of the participants in the study identified that the area of entrepreneurship was not supported at the institutional level as indicated by the resources allocated to this area. Terry claimed that using sessional instructors (non-continuing/non-tenure, part-time) to teach in this area was one indication of this lack of support. This finding is supported in the literature as a key factor constraining the development of the field (see, for example, Finkle & Deeds, 2001; Katz, 2003). Scholars argue that entrepreneurship educators often do not have the preferred background (e.g., PhD in business) or a secure position (e.g., tenured university faculty position) which are incentives that will attract new academics to the field.

The lack of faculty expertise or interest in entrepreneurship education was also discussed by several of the participants. Educators have found this a difficult subject to teach participants claimed, partly attributed to the lack of resources, another indicator of insufficient institutional support. Poor curriculum materials were listed as a factor, as well as insufficient time or expertise to develop custom-oriented, relevant and local materials. Participants also claimed that the unique requirements of this area made a case for more resources, such as the recognition that the optimal teaching delivery method was team teaching. However, except in a couple of cases, this did not occur because of the additional teaching costs it would require.

There was some discussion in the literature arguing for special resources for entrepreneurship (see, for example, McMullan & Long, 1987). There was more discussion in the literature, however, about the lack of qualifications of entrepreneurship academics as a significant factor limiting growth of the field. Only Terry brought up doctoral qualifications as an issue of concern, despite only one participant in the study having completed a doctoral degree in business (three other participants were currently working on their doctorate). Instead, the participants appeared to place more importance on relevant entrepreneurial or small business experience, which they all had acquired. This, too, was discussed in the literature (see, for
example, McMullan & Long, 1987), but not emphasized to the same extent as academic qualifications. There was also not the emphasis in the literature on the lack of curriculum resources, particularly the poor Canadian resources, partly a result of many scholars working in an American environment where this would not be an issue. Thus, both the participants and literature discussed the resource constraints limiting growth of entrepreneurship education. Relevant to the participants was the lack of faculty or disinterest to teach in this area, and limited institutional support and resources, whereas the literature argued more about the need for academically qualified educators, and tenured, career-track opportunities as critical factors for its development.

Institutional Environment. Participants, such as Bill, felt restricted by the institutional context in which he worked, as he believed it stymied the entrepreneurial approach he was able to use. Other participants, like Mary, felt the institutional environment supported other priorities and areas of education, often to the neglect of entrepreneurship.

Almost all of the courses and programs offered at public post-secondary institutional in British Columbia were positioned in business-related departments or faculties. The constraining and inadequate method of business schools was heavily discussed in the literature (see for example, Chia, 1996; Gibb 1993; Gibb 2002; Johannisson et al., 1998; Laukkanen, 2000; McMullan & Gillin, 2001; McMullan & Long, 1987). Scholars argue the business context perpetuates competing interests and inappropriate frameworks for entrepreneurship, regimentation and inflexibility, and institutional regulations and management styles which hamper creativity and teaching approaches.

The criticisms leveled at business schools in the literature, were similar to issues identified by a few of the participants. There was no discussion, however, by the participants, except for one, about the need to move entrepreneurship programming out of a business context to garner improved resources and help support its growth. For Laura, they moved the
entrepreneurship course out of the School of Business because the only interested educator in entrepreneurship had retired. They re-positioned the entrepreneurship course in the School of Tourism where there was interest from educators and administration, and saw the programming grow to include additional courses as well as a new entrepreneurship program scheduled to start in the fall of 2003.

The participants and literature were in agreement that the business context was an inappropriate environment for entrepreneurship. The literature argued for a broader interdisciplinary paradigm which would be more conducive to a holistic and integrated approach. The participants did not specifically discuss the need for a new paradigm, but they did identify limitations, particularly time, which impacted their ability to offer a broader approach. Because many participants spoke about the lack of time allotted in the curriculum for entrepreneurship programming, their inability to engage in an integrated approach, is, in part, related to what could be perceived as insufficient institutional support.

The growth of entrepreneurship education also appears to be related, to some degree, by “champions” in the institution, and administrative backing. Laura found collaboration in a different department, and was provided support to research other program models around the world, and saw the programming at her institution develop and flourish. Bob discussed how two professors engaged in a similar extensive research process which has since led to the development of an innovative entrepreneurial degree program which has garnered international attention and awards and created institutional recognition and support. And Gary described how as Dean of his department, he had been intimately involved in the conceptualization and development of an entrepreneurship degree program at his institution. For the majority of participants, though, they appeared to be the only entrepreneurship educator at their institution which may greatly influence the type of institutional support they are able to gain. This could be
another reason why the literature so strongly argues for the need to have more academically trained entrepreneurship educators positioned in the institutional arena.

Although the situation in British Columbia public post-secondary institutions appears to lag behind the global picture, both participants and scholars argue that the growth of the field of entrepreneurship education is constrained by factors such as limited institutional support and resource gaps. As a new field, entrepreneurship is struggling to find its position amongst more entrenched and well recognized other areas of business, and its development is hindered by a lack of faculty and administrative support. This has influenced the approach and comprehensiveness of the programming educators are able to offer.

**Diversity in Approaches to Entrepreneurship Education**

The beginning of the study identified tensions between liberal and vocational orientations to education, with entrepreneurship education often located under the latter category. The extreme positions on this debate included a liberal perspective where the pursuit of knowledge or intellectual excellence is the priority, and a vocational and entrepreneurial perspective which argues that the pursuit of competence or practical utility is most important. Many of the participants discussed the value of teaching students the practical and technical skills of how to plan and establish a business, which is more aligned with vocational values. Broader objectives were also emphasized by several participants who utilized approaches that also included liberal ideals and values.

The literature also discusses diversity in educational approaches when teaching entrepreneurship. Although Chia (1996) claims that positivistic science is still the dominant perspective used in business schools, many scholars (see, for example, Johannisson et al., 1998) in the literature have endorsed an action-oriented approach. This philosophy is similar to the those described by participants who stressed the importance of focusing on the “practical” elements of entrepreneurship education, and the notion of “doing.” There were a few of the
participants who discussed another approach which focused on “thinking about” and learning to “be” entrepreneurs, in addition to learning the skills of how to venture. Their conceptual approach was aligned with scholars such as Fiet (2000a; 2000b) who argues for the importance of teaching theory to entrepreneurship students.

The variation in approaches discussed by the participants may also be significantly impacted by the level of student, and placement of programming in the curriculum, as the more technical method was almost exclusively described at the diploma or course level, and the more expanded method at the degree or program level. The role of ethics in the curriculum is a useful way to illustrate this difference. At the diploma and course level, ethics was not given significant emphasis or priority in the curriculum, due to many factors such as time, resources, and expertise constraints, whereas at the program level, ethics was incorporated as a more fundamental component of the educational framework. The literature, though, does not discuss how, or even whether, the type of program or level of student, impacts the approach encouraged by scholars in the field.

There is variability in the educational approach to entrepreneurship, as depicted in the literature, and by the study’s findings. Many of the participants described a practically-focused philosophy which has commonalities to the action-learning approach discussed by entrepreneurship scholars. The broader approach discussed by a few of the participants who mainly taught in entrepreneurship programs, is more aligned with the academics in the literature who argue about the need to find new institutional frameworks and a broader entrepreneurship paradigm. Specifically, Brian encouraged team teaching with other disciplines. Gary claimed that incorporating other perspectives into entrepreneurship was important and the program at his
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institution required students to take liberal education courses as part of their core curriculum. These participants, did not talk about the need to take entrepreneurship out of the business context, as scholars discussed in the literature. Perhaps they have found enough support, opportunities, and flexibility in their current environment. They did, however, talk to a greater degree of the importance of ethics, social responsibility and sustainability as part of their broader approach. Although Gibb (2002) talks about the critical need to incorporate cultural, social, and contextual aspects of learning into entrepreneurship education, this discussion is noticeably absent in the literature amongst entrepreneurship scholars.

**Future Development of a Distinct Entrepreneurship Education Field**

The document review identified a lack of differentiation between entrepreneurial programs and other types of business programs. In-depth interviews with entrepreneurship educators further explored this issue. A couple of participants did concur with this finding that many entrepreneurial programs were “repackaged” business programs, branded and marketing as a specialty program. However, several participants did claim that their entrepreneurial offering was fundamentally different than other business options and taught with a unique entrepreneurial perspective. This finding was further reinforced by the clear distinction that nearly all of the participants made between the fields of entrepreneurship and small business.

The participants in the study associated entrepreneurship with “start-up” and “growth” characteristics and small business with “management” and “stable” features. This was similar to the academic literature (see, for example, Solomon and Mark-Weaver, 1994) which discussed entrepreneurship as connoting high growth and profitability potential, comparable to Bob’s notion of the “serial” entrepreneur, and Sandra’s notion of the start-up “pitcher” type. The participants, like the literature, also seemed to think it was important to make this distinction between these two areas, as this impacted the teaching approach used by the educator.
The participants in the study, and the literature, appear to support the recognition of entrepreneurship as its own field of study. The participants did not go as far as the literature in calling for a separation of entrepreneurship from the business context. They did, however, recognize the limitations to the progression of the field because of how it is currently positioned and supported in the public post-secondary context. They discussed how their approach was also mediated by the political and historical context in which this teaching took place, and the competing institutional, market, student, and collegial demands, which affected the extent of an integrated perspective they were able to provide.

**Challenges for the Entrepreneurship Educator**

The participants spoke of issues in their practice that posed challenges as they tried to meet both personal and organizational goals. This included the difficulty incorporating a prominent role for ethics in the curriculum, responding to student issues, and meeting teaching expectations. Entrepreneurship scholars also referred to dilemmas that educators must face as they work in this field.

**Role of Ethics**

The discussion on ethics brings us back to the earlier debate about approaches to entrepreneurship education, broadly framed in the liberal and vocational orientation, and highlights different beliefs about what is important to educators to include. For example, do educators see a moral and ethical dimension to entrepreneurship education beyond skill acquisition?

While participants acknowledged the importance of ethics in the area of entrepreneurship education, many identified several limitations that prevented adequate treatment of this subject area. Inadequate time appeared to be the greatest barrier, in addition to a lack of resources or expertise to teach this topic area. These participants identified insufficient space in the
curriculum for entrepreneurship that hampered their ability to cover areas such as ethics and primary research techniques. There was also discussion about dependence on curriculum materials for guidance with ethical topics, and how their approach was influenced by the educational materials they selected for their courses. For these participants, their ability to provide an integrated approach was limited by institutional and resource constraints.

There have been studies that have identified gaps in the treatment of ethics for the area of business education (see, for example, Finlay, 2002; Harding, 2002). These reports point to market influences, such as the business community, which do not place enough importance on this issue, and insufficient training and resources for faculty which makes them less likely to teach this material. The discomfort with this subject area may also be another factor discouraging educators from teaching in this field.

The entrepreneurship scholarship, though, is noticeably absent on this issue. There has only been limited discussion (see, for example, Ronstadt, 1990; Laukkanen, 2000) about the need to incorporate ethics into entrepreneurship education. Four participants, however, did identify a prominent role for ethics in their entrepreneurship curriculum. This was a result of instructor initiative, space and time in the curriculum, and administrative support which encouraged it as a core part of instruction. These participants have been able to pursue an integrated approach because they have not faced the same constraints as some of the entrepreneurship colleagues at other institutions. Although this broader approach can be compared to scholars who argue for a wider interdisciplinary approach to entrepreneurship education outside of a purely business framework, it is not clear what role notions of ethics, social responsibility and sustainability would play in this new paradigm.

**Student Demands**

There was some discussion by participants about pressures and expectations of students for certain types of entrepreneurship programming. Younger students were identified as needing
longer-term programs because they were not ready, emotionally and financially, for an entrepreneurial lifestyle. The mature student market, on the other hand, wanted technical, shorter-term programs so they could begin the entrepreneurial process as quickly as possible. The role of ethics in the curriculum is useful to illustrate an example of student tensions. Students’ demands for very practical, skill-based education that allows them to begin the process of starting up their own venture as quickly as possible, may result in the resistance of any instruction, such as regarding ethics, if it is not perceived to be directly related to their educational objective.

Scholars, Gartner and Vesper (1994), found some support for students’ pragmatic and action-oriented perspective, and Harding’s (2003) study of students demanding more ethical instruction in business, referred to older graduate students. Mohan-Neill (2001) also found similar markets for entrepreneurship programs. Yet, there was little other discussion in the entrepreneurship literature about curriculum demands and expectations of entrepreneurship students. The importance of understanding and responding to students’ needs cannot be understated, especially in a region such as British Columbia, which has the majority of entrepreneurship programming offered on an elective basis, and dependant upon student choice and interest. As participants identified, students wield considerable influence through their demand for programming and the instructor evaluation process.

**Teaching Expectations**

Institutions have regulations and processes that are not always amenable or accepting of unconventional pedagogic methods. The entrepreneurship literature identified dilemmas for educators who recognized the field’s need for distinct resources, teaching methodologies, and assessment procedures (see, for example, McMullan & Long, 1987; Solomon & Mark-Weaver, 1994). Yet they battle organizational procedures and collegial perceptions that challenge the rigour and validity of these methods and make educators reluctant to engage in new pedagogy.
(see, for example, Gibb, 2002). This may also create a less welcoming and attractive environment for new entrants, and limit the effective growth and development of the field.

Many participants also identified the need for non-traditional teaching and assessment methods. For example, several of the participants indicated a preference for teaching methods such as coaching, mentoring, and consulting, which were in contrast to a more lecturing and didactic approach. They discussed different pedagogic approaches such as experiential and active learning, and non-traditional assessment tools, similar to the informal methods of skill building and discovery, discussed by Hynes (1996).

Participants did identify, however, similar to the research literature, constraints that have limited the effective use of these pedagogical approaches. It takes more time for preparation, teaching and evaluation, and if not recognized by the organization, is more likely not to be adopted by the educator. Unconventional teaching practices, such as operating mini-businesses or shadowing entrepreneurs in the community, contravenes institutional regulations and prevents educators from engaging in these activities. And delivery methods such as team teaching, is more expensive and time-consuming, and not commonly supported by administration.

Although not discussed in the entrepreneurship literature, or by the participants, it is important to assess how students perceive and relate to non-traditional teaching and assessment methods. As well, it would be useful to investigate what other stakeholders, such as practicing entrepreneurs, view as legitimate and applicable educational practices.

The impact of competing tensions on the practice of entrepreneurship educators I spoke with was apparent. One participant engaged in risk-taking behaviour, because he felt backed by a supportive administrative environment and recognized program history. For others, the perceived risks were too high and they had to modify their educational approach to fit within the
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organization's limitations. For example, participants modified their course content to exclude primary research because the institutional ethics approval process was considered too onerous. Others reported following a curriculum strategy dictated by the text they had adopted, perhaps more defensible to students and colleagues and within their comfort level of expertise. And one participant refused to discuss ethics and the negative consequences on business practices for fear of reprisals if anything not positive, or not "pro-business" was communicated in his classes. The literature also reinforced the political context educators work in and the influences, such as market pressures, they have to navigate.

It was also apparent from the participants that there were needs and expectations for teaching in this field that were often unsupported through institutional and educational resources. Using the ethics example to illustrate this point, one participant revealed that he only taught ethics if it was covered in the course text. This practice illuminates, perhaps, his discomfort with the subject area, which the literature also reinforced. Or, covering material included in course texts and considered valid by the "experts," could also be a strategy that is more defensible and acceptable to students, which acknowledges the role of student expectations in the educational process.

It was also communicated by the participants that unconventional teaching and evaluation methodologies were preferred. However, the difficulty in developing and assessing these tools was discussed. The literature also identified the lack of recognition by colleagues and their organizations of these non-traditional methods, and how this may prevent educators from using them in their practice.

**Summary**

The participants and literature identified resource constraints, such as an insufficient number of entrepreneurship faculty, as factors limiting the growth of entrepreneurship education. The participants discussed the constraints of the institutional environment, while scholars
specifically referred to the limitations of entrepreneurship in a business context. Variability in educational approaches to entrepreneurship was described by the participants and affirmed in the literature. The practical approach endorsed by many participants was similar to the action-learning approach argued for by entrepreneurship scholars. The broader approach adopted by some of the participants had commonalities with the new integrated paradigm suggested for in the literature. Only the participants discussed the impact of student level, or type of program, on the educational philosophy, and the important role of ethics in a broader approach.

The participants were similar to the entrepreneurship scholarship in how they defined small business and entrepreneurship, and their claims for a separate entrepreneurship field. As mentioned already, the participants did not go as far as the literature in arguing for a new paradigm for entrepreneurship outside its current business context. Both the literature and participants acknowledged dilemmas for entrepreneurship educators in their practice, especially related to their recognition for non-traditional and unconventional teaching and assessment practices that may not be endorsed within the institutional context they work. The participants discussed to a much larger extent the expectations and demands of students, and the difficulties of incorporating ethics into the entrepreneurship curriculum.

Finally, the participants in this study, as well as the literature, referred to the difficulty in finding faculty who are adequately trained, and willing to teach in this area. They identified the high expectations of the field including that educators serve as “role models” for their students, the need to have both general business and entrepreneurial experience as well as academic qualifications, and that an integrated approach would also require faculty to have experience or knowledge of how entrepreneurship can be applied in different contexts such as the public and non-profit sector. Without institutional support and resources, the participants and the literature argue this is a key factor limiting growth of the field of entrepreneurship education.
These challenges and dilemmas produce distress and anxiety, even risk, for some educators, and creates an unpredictable and unfriendly situation that prevents others from getting involved. The ultimate effect is what Welton (1995) refers to as the “damm bursting its walls” whereby educators could become so frustrated that they disengage from their practice, or they leave teaching and this field altogether. And hooks (1994) warns that if professors are wounded, damaged individuals, they will seek asylum in the academy, rather than work to make the academy a place of challenge and growth (p. 165).

The final chapter explores strategies and recommendations, growing from this study, to enhance and broaden the approach to entrepreneurship education at the public post-secondary level. My experience as an educator and how this study has informed my own practice is also revealed. In addition, recommendations for future research are outlined.
CHAPTER SEVEN:  
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to document and critically analyse the current provision of public post-secondary undergraduate entrepreneurship courses and programs in British Columbia. A major objective was to learn about the understanding and experiences of educators involved in the entrepreneurship area. Two key questions guided this study: What is the state of undergraduate entrepreneurship education in public post-secondary institutions in British Columbia? This issue included other associated questions: How established is entrepreneurship education and what kinds of programming are currently being offered? What are the explicit and implicit goals of these offerings? What liberal and/or vocational goals and values are evident in the curriculum under study? The other key question directing this study was: What needs to happen in order to bring an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education? Other questions associated with this issue included: What form/shape should this take? How can such an approach be implemented? What are the challenges for educators?

Entrepreneurship curriculum documents were first reviewed through content analysis to achieve a broad mapping of the undergraduate post-secondary entrepreneurship education environment in British Columbia. By conducting 12 semi-structured, in-depth interviews with educators working in the entrepreneurship field, these materials were brought to life by the people who actually developed and used them in their educational practice.

Four major findings emerged from the study. As evidenced by the programming offered at the undergraduate level, the entrepreneurship area is not yet well-established in the public post-secondary context in British Columbia. The growth of this area appears to be influenced and hindered by a lack of institutional support and resource limitations, issues common to the development of any new program even during times of government cutbacks to educational institutions. There is diversity in the educational philosophies used to teach entrepreneurship,
from technical, skill-based approaches, to those approaches that include critical thinking and sustainability issues. Educators in this study do identify entrepreneurship as its own field, distinct from closely related areas such as management and small business. They also recognize there are challenges in their practice that exist at the market, institutional, collegial and student level, which influence the development of the field and how it is supported and positioned in the public post-secondary context in British Columbia. These issues have created dilemmas for educators: how to respond to student expectations and demands, how to work effectively given the lack of resources, and how to attract other teachers. These educators spoke of personal distress as they struggled to meet their own goals within these institutional restraints.

The underdeveloped state of entrepreneurship education in British Columbia has created significant challenges to creating an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education involving a wider paradigm that recognizes broader goals and forms of learning. Again, I return to the question of whose interests are being served by the state of the entrepreneurship field that I found? Integrated programs require more time and different resources, and it is an approach that does not fit well within a conservative neo-liberal agenda. A climate of fiscal restraint, and the movement of education from the public domain to individual responsibility, puts additional pressure on the educational system to meet stakeholder expectations of relevant, practical and appropriate programming. I recognize these issues have applicability in other contexts, and these struggles are shared by many educators, who try to balance competing demands in a resource-starved public, post-secondary environment.

**Implications For Entrepreneurship Education**

The consequences of these frustrations and perceived risks are that educators may be compromising their pedagogical practices to fit into an organizational system that does not recognize the unique requirements of this field, and hence, compromising the quality of education the students are receiving. If there is limited support in the post-secondary context for
this area, it will hinder the growth and development of the field. Educators will feel it is a tenuous and less credible career path, and its research needs will go unsupported because of a lack of validation and credibility in the academic environment.

**Strategies to Support Educators**

The global picture of entrepreneurship reflected in the literature shows a more promising picture than depicted in the British Columbia public post-secondary undergraduate context. Other scholars have argued that the entrepreneurship field is achieving significant growth and seeing new entrants into the field as entrepreneurship programming expands; PhD programs to train academics are being developed; and entrepreneurship research is being recognized and published in an increasing number of journals. Educators know they are competing for resources and recognition with well-established fields in the business area and other disciplines in the post-secondary context. Thus, implementation of any new field is going to take time, energy, and dedication. Listed below are six strategies to support educators positioned in this field.

1. **Administrative Support:** Gaining the support of administrative champions in the institution will help to dissuade skepticism and encourage the development of the area within their organizational spaces.

2. **Experiential Approach:** Entrepreneurship educators need to be encouraged to bring their voice and their experience into the classroom. They need the support of administration and colleagues to experiment with non-traditional teaching and assessment methodologies that fit with their learning objectives.

3. **Links with Stakeholders:** Educators need support to create linkages and partnerships with key stakeholders who contribute to the learning community.

4. **Communicating with other Educators:** Educators must work towards the creation of workplaces that allow open communication regarding their practice and the organizational
context in which they work. They also need to work towards supporting institutions and systems which are open to dialogue, purposeful discussion, and debate.

5. Critical Reflection: Educators in the entrepreneurship area must engage each other in discussions about pedagogy, and create public spaces for these conversations to take place. They need to share what is working and what is not, and to encourage others to reflect upon and critique their own practice.

6. Interdisciplinary Conversations: Educators need to open up the debate and encourage further reflection by discussing these issues with colleagues and decision-makers from other disciplines.

Recommendations to Support an Integrated Approach

Through this study I hope to encourage entrepreneurship educators to reflect on their notion of entrepreneurship, question the inclusiveness of their approach, and examine whose interests are being served. I have articulated my support for an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education. Having talked to other educators and examined the current state of programming in British Columbia, I now realize the possibilities as well as the challenges to achieving this goal.

What follows is a set of recommendations to help guide the creation of an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education in public post-secondary education in British Columbia. I recognize there are tensions in the orientation of my recommendations. The institutional system can be characterized by limited flexibility and a lack of support for entrepreneurial thinking. However, I think it is important to start from where entrepreneurship education is currently positioned, so we can understand how people make sense of it, and the level of support and resources they are provided. And to give the educators working from this location the opportunity, and the encouragement, to apply entrepreneurial solutions to meet some of the challenges that they face.
1. Interdisciplinary

Applying this learning across various contexts and encouraging educators from multiple disciplines to collaborate, will help create support and resources for this field, increase demand for the programming, and ensure application is widespread. The traditional placement of entrepreneurial programs, namely in business schools, may be too restrictive and constraining to permit a more holistic model. Educators need to consider and hopefully embrace a broader interdisciplinary paradigm that recognizes the contribution and application of entrepreneurship across many different fields.

2. Entrepreneurship and Social Responsibility

Students of entrepreneurship need to be taught beyond the narrow, technical, skill-based approach. They need to recognize and understand the cultural, social, environmental, and political context in which entrepreneurs operate. And they need to study different types of entrepreneurial practices including for-profit, non-profit, and socially responsible organizations, so they can be exposed to different types of entrepreneurial initiatives.

An integrated approach to entrepreneurial education confronts notions of morals and attitudes by discussing issues of personal values and measurements of success, and concepts of fairness and equity, ethics, and the notion of social and community responsibility. An integrated approach needs to incorporate these principles, so students are taught beyond a narrow, corporate approach and recognize how their role is part of a broader society. As educators, we have the power to ensure our students are exposed to these principles in the curriculum.

Educators need to view ethical discussions, and regulations such as the research ethics process, not as impediments to their entrepreneurial practice, but rather as a fundamental component of what they teach. Students need to be shown the value of this learning, and educators need to start thinking creatively about how they can incorporate topics such as ethics.
For example, the inclusion of ethics into the entrepreneurship curriculum could be used to create market differentiation, which may also help to garner increased institutional and student support.

3. Recognize the Different Roles and Locations of Entrepreneurship Educators

Educators need to continue to engage in, and push for credibility in the variety of teaching practices that they use, challenging the view that learning from practice is not academic. They also need to continue to use the stakeholder network as a core component of their teaching through the use of practitioners whose experiences and expertise can be incorporated into the learning, and through project partnerships with the community. To build support for these practices, educators need to promote these initiatives within their academic environment and the community, involve educators from other disciplines through multidisciplinary projects or events, and dialogue about their outcomes and student successes in public spaces.

It is important to recognize, however, that not all educators may feel comfortable, or even respect, non-traditional teaching approaches. For example, team teaching requires support and cooperation between educators, perhaps even across disciplines. Adopting various roles may require loosening of control in the classroom, especially if students engage in much more active participation, and may cause some students and colleagues to challenge the legitimacy of these roles. Allowing others a role in the classroom, opens up a very private space for an educator, causing more scrutiny of the educator’s practices, and thus creating feelings of vulnerability. This is why it is important that educators feel safe in their organizations to experiment with these practices, and have public spaces created where they can dialogue with others to gain ideas and support.

4. Create the Expectation of Student Participation

If entrepreneurship educators are going to engage in unconventional teaching and evaluation pedagogies, such as experiential-based activities and active learning, then they need to create the expectation of collective participation and dialogue in the classroom. To encourage
this active participation, educators need to find meaningful ways to engage the student in their learning which invites dialogue, encourages critical thinking and collaborative problem-solving, invites questions, and offers opportunities for original decision-making and research.

However, educators need to realize that non-traditional teaching practices may be viewed as inappropriate, or threatening, within the academic environment. These methods may create anxiety for students who are apprehensive to take on a more active role in the classroom. They may also cause students and colleagues to question the legitimacy of these practices, and the credibility of the teacher. It may, therefore, require time and education to inform the learning community why these are sound and relevant pedagogical practices, and to train the students in how to affectively respond to and learn from these methods. So educators need to understand that demanding a more active role of students in the learning process may require modification of their teaching practices, and challenge traditional methods that may be resisted by some in the academy.

5. Commit Resources and Support

The final recommendation is geared towards entrepreneurship educators and administrators. In order to continue the development and growth of the field, educators need to be supported and resources need to be committed. For example, educators need to be encouraged to attend professional development initiatives, such as conferences, where they can interact with entrepreneurship colleagues and get exposure to practices and initiatives at other institutions. In addition, they need to be supported to join formal networks, such as the Canadian Council for Small Business and Entrepreneurship, which provides its members opportunities for participation and dialogue with other academics, researchers, and practitioners in the field.

Furthermore, the institution needs to commit to hiring full-time, tenure-track faculty to teach in the area, instead of “scavenging” educators from other fields who are not interested in the area or its progression. This requires recognition of the field and its research capability, so
educators can feel valued and recognized for both the teaching and research work that they do.

As well, both the educator and administration needs to explore strategies to develop the programming in the entrepreneurship area, and find a way to position it in the institution which acknowledges its potential, and provides accessibility across different contexts.

**Possibilities for Future Research**

Although there continues to be debate about whether entrepreneurship education can be taught, the focus in the literature seems to have moved away from this issue, and instead is concentrating on the documentation and discussion of "what" is being taught and "how" it is being taught. The participants in the study all recognized the importance and benefit of teaching entrepreneurship, yet there was wide disparity in the learning objectives, outcomes, and approaches used across the curricula. Phenomenological research needs to explore the philosophies and approaches of entrepreneurship educators, in order to move past this limited interpretation of entrepreneurship education, and general survey/mapping work of entrepreneurial offerings.

If one supports the notion of a broader approach to entrepreneurship education, then research should be encouraged which explores new ways of teaching that are distinct from the mainstream approaches associated with a purely business and market liberalization philosophy. For example, the movement away from the functional organization of knowledge has already been argued in this study. To implement a wider and more integrated approach, it would be useful to conduct research about how to teach from this perspective, such as Hynes's (1996) process model of entrepreneurship. Additionally, research could focus on what learning outcomes would be appropriate to achieve, and what conditions and environments would support this development.
A broader entrepreneurship paradigm, I have argued, requires the integration of ethical issues into the curriculum. There needs to be more focus in the research area as to the role ethics should take in entrepreneurship education. And there needs to be more phenomenological research on what ethics means to educators and others. I also feel educators could benefit from learning about innovative practices their colleagues are engaged in to support the development of these skills, values, and competencies. Further discussion in the literature about ethics may also support more instructor resources to aid educators who feel they do not have the expertise in this area and need to rely on text-based tools to guide their practice.

As the discussion about ethics with participants illuminated, more research, including phenomenological studies, could be conducted on the perceived risks and constraints educators are faced with in the implementation of their practice. Although research has been conducted to help understand the state of the field and to encourage strategies for its continued growth, such as trends in the market for entrepreneurship faculty (see Finkle & Deeds, 2001), and doctoral education in entrepreneurship (see Brush et al., 2003), I found little focus in the literature about educators’ lived experience. I do not believe the constraints and challenges the participants relayed are unique to their context. However, these issues need an appropriate forum for identification and discussion so educators can legitimize their concerns and develop strategies for effective coping. Otherwise, the efforts at the front-end to encourage new entrants into the entrepreneurship area will be minimized if the experienced educators do not remain to help mentor and guide the progression of the field.

Finally, more research needs to be carried out that investigates other stakeholders’ views of entrepreneurship education, including students, administration, and practicing entrepreneurs. This research could examine what are the expectations of this learning from these groups, how is this learning perceived and applied outside an educational context, and what resources are available to support this learning.
Implications for My Practice

The EdD program in Educational Leadership and Policy aims to engage students in critical reflection on their practice. I began the program knowing that I wanted to study, critique, perhaps even change my practice, however, I was not expecting the transformation that occurred. First, I radically changed the location of my practice. Second, and specifically related to my research, I dramatically altered the lens I use to view this practice.

In this study I occupied both researcher and educator roles. The implications for teachers in the field of entrepreneurship education, therefore, also have application and relevancy for my practice. The pervasive role of ethics in this study is inextricably linked to the conceptual framework of the EdD program and to my career changes throughout this educational process. While the ethical struggles in two of my positions during this process focused at the organizational and policy level, this study provided a “spotlight” also at the individual educator level.

As a relatively new entrant into entrepreneurship education at the post-secondary level, I saw many parallels with the experiences of the participants. For example, my teaching in entrepreneurship was initially guided by an historical and institutional process that included the acceptance of course descriptions, course outlines, and course teaching materials, with little critical reflection. My instruction followed closely to the material in the course text, and utilized a fairly limited and technical approach with the aim to teach the operational steps in starting a business. I did not challenge the inadequacies of the support and position of this area in the business discipline at my institution, nor comprehend the political process which has seen the importance of this field for students diminish as it has shifted from a required component in our program to an elective subject, in order to make room for other priorities. And I failed to realize that although I found a mentor who initially helped to launch my teaching practice in this area,
due to other commitments and priorities, I would become the only person intimately interested
and engaged in its development at my institution.

So how has this study informed my practice? How has this educational journey
encouraged me to “travel with a different view “ as Peters (1973) describes. I believe I have
acknowledged the need for non-traditional and engaged pedagogy that hooks (1994) encourages,
and accepted that altering my teaching practices in the classroom is a necessary requirement. For
example, I have modified my teaching and evaluation methodologies to include the integration of
ethics as a core component of the curriculum, and I have engaged in new teaching approaches
including the adoption of a team teaching format with a colleague in the accounting field. I have
also begun to use and develop different types of curriculum materials to supplement the areas of
weakness in the texts I use, and I have incorporated new evaluation methods, such a portfolio
learning, to try to get at broader forms of learning.

I believe that my practice will continue to evolve and change as a result of this new
perspective. Although pleased with the progress of my most recent teaching efforts in this field
(spring 2003), I was also incredibly frustrated by some of the inadequacies and limitations of my
approach. Through this study, I have begun to map out what an integrated approach to
entrepreneurship would look like in a particular course. First, case studies of different types of
entrepreneurial organizations would be used to expose students to the practice of
entrepreneurship in a variety of contexts, including for-profit, non-profit, and public
environments. I would also ensure the guest speakers I used represented a cross-section of these
different locations. Second, assignments such as “the interview with an entrepreneur,” and “self-
assessment,” would be modified to promote discussion on personal values and attitudes, and
include questions on issues of ethics and social responsibility. The business plan project would
require students to test their ideas against principles of sustainability – ethically, culturally,
socially and environmentally responsible standards – similar to the process Laura described
occurred in her programs. And students would be encouraged to develop business plans for a variety of different types of ventures.

Third, entrepreneurship would be considered outside of a purely business context, by linking students to the community through experiential activities that required them to apply problem-solving and analytic techniques to a range of community issues and problems. Fourth, collaboration across disciplines would be encouraged through team teaching arrangements with colleagues from other business areas, and other disciplines. As well, students would be encouraged to enroll from fields outside of business to try to achieve an interdisciplinary student population. Finally, real-life case examples of scandals across different environments would be incorporated into discussions of ethics, such as the corporate world (e.g., Enron, Worldcom), public sector (e.g., Government of Canada department of human resources), and private sector (e.g. Bridgestone/Firestone tires) in addition to local examples. This would ensure students recognize the responsibilities they face, and the implications of their actions, on the community in which they live and work.

I remain hopeful and optimistic of the continued improvement of the entrepreneurship area at my institution. Yet, I recognize that substantial change will require extensive lobbying efforts for increased programming space and additional “interested” educators at my institution that will provide crucial momentum and support. I also recognize the critical importance of building networks, to keep myself and other entrepreneurship educators linked and communicating with each other, recognizing the relative isolation that many experience in their practice. Additionally, I believe the wider and more integrated approach I now embrace has possibilities in many contexts, and opportunities in other areas of my practice.
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## APPENDIX B: British Columbia Public Post-Secondary Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Entrepreneurship Program</th>
<th>(BCIT) BC Institute of Technology</th>
<th>Camosun College</th>
<th>Capilano College</th>
<th>College of New Caledonia</th>
<th>College of the Rockies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No course/s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CO = course outline provided)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CD = only course descriptions provided)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Several Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 255: Entrepreneurship (CO)</td>
<td>BADM 268:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUAD 236:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EntrepreneurSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneurship &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Business Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUSA 3800: Business &amp; Entrepreneurship (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPMT 4438: Entrepreneurial Management (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Certificate: Venture Program (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Certificate: Entrepreneurship (CD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialty/Option</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise Development Certificate Program (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 255: Small Business Mgmt (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MGT 256: Entrepreneurial Development (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mktg Mgmt Diploma of Technology – focus in entrepreneurship (CD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business: The Next Generation (not included in study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

61 Program consists of one course: Vent 1000
62 BUSA 2005: Management 1; BUSA 2205: Entrepreneurial Management; COMP 1223: MS Office 2000 Applications; FGMT 1152: Accounting for the Manager; MKTG 1102: Essentials of Marketing; MKTG 1112: Customer Relations 1; MKTG 1219: Professional Sales 1; MKTG 1324: Small Business Development (preparation of business plan)
65 4-mos entrepreneurial program where students run a real-life venture, and counts as six credits towards the Mkt/Mgt Diploma program. This program was excluded from the study because of the lack of information available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Entrepreneurship Program</th>
<th>Douglas College</th>
<th>Emily Carr Institute of Art &amp; Design</th>
<th>Institute of Indigenous Government</th>
<th>Justice Institute Of BC</th>
<th>Kwantlen University College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No course/s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUSI 2425: Enterprise Development &amp; Business Planning (CO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUSN 250: Exploring Business Ownership (CD) (not included in study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Several Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUSN 404: Entrepreneurship &amp; New Venture Dev. (CD) (not included in study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Specialty/Option

---

*These courses have not been offered since 1996 and therefore were not included in the analysis.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Entrepreneurship Program</th>
<th>Langara College</th>
<th>Malaspina University College</th>
<th>Nicola Valley Institute of Technology</th>
<th>North Island College</th>
<th>Northern Lights College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No course/s</td>
<td></td>
<td>MGMT 411: New Venture Development (CO)</td>
<td>BUSM 255: Small Business Development (CO)</td>
<td>BUS 152: Entrepreneurship &amp; Small Business Management (CD) (not included in study)</td>
<td>MGMT 219: Entrepreneurship: Start-Up (CO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty/Option</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Business Entrepreneur Certificate Program (CO/CD)</td>
<td>Recreation Enterprise Diploma Program (CO/CD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68 Includes the entrepreneurial courses of: BUSM 1115: Entrepreneurship; BUSM 2316: Entrepreneurial Financial Management
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Entrepreneurial Program</th>
<th>Northwest Community College</th>
<th>Open Learning Agency(^69)</th>
<th>Okanagan University College</th>
<th>Royal Roads University</th>
<th>Selkirk College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No course/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course</td>
<td>MGMT 201: How to Start a Business (CO)</td>
<td>BUSM 104: Something Ventured: Starting Your Own Business (CO)</td>
<td>BUAD 293: Entrepreneurship (CO/CD)</td>
<td>ADMN 297: Developing a Business Plan (CO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty/Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BOOM in Entrepreneurial Management(^70) (CO/CD)(^71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{69}\) Open Learning Agency (OLA) is categorized under "university" because The British Columbia Open University is a division of OLA, and is a public institution and member of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.

\(^{70}\) A one year condensed program with 13 courses: Communications; Information and Technology Management; Entrepreneurial Expertise; Finance and Investments; People at Work; Sustainable Development; Marketing; Organizational Change; Strategy; International Business; Entrepreneurial Project.

\(^{71}\) Also included is program's mission statement, philosophy, outcomes, learner profile, program structure, how learners benefit and learners culture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Entrepreneurial Program</th>
<th>(SFU) Simon Fraser University</th>
<th>(Tech BC) Technical University of BC</th>
<th>(UBC) University of British Columbia</th>
<th>University College of the Cariboo</th>
<th>University College of the Fraser Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No course/s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One course</strong></td>
<td>BUS 477: New Venture Planning (CO)</td>
<td>COMM 497: New Enterprise Development (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Several Courses</strong></td>
<td>BUAD 259: Entrepreneurship (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 227: New Business Development (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BBUS 477: Entrepreneurship (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 415: Venture Initiation (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialty/Option</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor of Science, Mgmt &amp; Technology, in High Tech Entrepreneurship?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


73 Course outlines available for Tech One, Tech Two and Tech Three. Tech Four still under development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Entrepreneurship Program</th>
<th>(UNBC) University of Northern BC</th>
<th>(UVIC) University of Victoria</th>
<th>Vancouver Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Course/s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Course</td>
<td>COMM 302: Entrepreneurship (CO)</td>
<td>ENT 302: Entrepreneurship &amp; Small Business for the Non-Specialist (CD) (not included in study)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty/Option</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce degree with an Entrepreneurship Concentration (CO/CD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C:
Interview Questions

1. Do you have any questions about the research study before the interview begins?

2. A) Demographic information: before we proceed would you mind telling me a bit about yourself such as your age, educational background, family status and cultural or ethnic background? This information will be used to describe the interviewees and present a general picture of the participants in the study. B) Entrepreneurship and teaching experience: would you mind telling me about your teaching and/or curriculum development experience in the field of entrepreneurship, and any business experience you feel is relevant (such as running your own business).

3. What does entrepreneurship education mean to you? How is this philosophy reflected in your current entrepreneurship course/program?

4. What is the relationship, in terms of similarities and differences, between the fields of entrepreneurship and small business management? How is this perspective reflected in your course/program?

5. What is the decision-making process for choosing curriculum materials for your course/program? Why were these materials chosen for this entrepreneurship course/program? Are any other supplementary materials utilized?

6. Do you feel it is possible to teach entrepreneurship? What are the challenges (additionally, in a distance education format, if applicable)? What instructional methods do you believe are most effective in teaching this material?

7. What skills, knowledge and entrepreneurial characteristics does this course/program purport to teach, and where is the emphasis provided? What is the role of social, moral and ethical issues in this course/program? Characterize the learner you are hoping to attract to this program/course.

8. What do you feel are the most effective methods for evaluating this learning?

9. Is your current format (e.g., content, length, position in the curriculum) how you would ideally like to offer this course, why or why not? What constraints impinge on your ability to offer the ideal format of your course?

10. Is there anything further you would like to add or comment upon that has not been discussed in this interview?
APPENDIX D:
Process Model of Entrepreneurship Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs Students</th>
<th>Content Focus</th>
<th>Teaching Focus</th>
<th>Outputs Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Prior knowledge base  
• Motivation  
• Personality  
• Needs/Interests  
• Independence  
• Attitudes  
• Parental Influence  
• Self-Esteem  
• Values  
• Work Experience | • Definition of entrepreneurship  
• Intrapreneurship  
• Innovation  
• New product development  
• Idea generation  
• Market research  
• Feasibility of idea/s  
• Finance  
• Production  
• Regulations  
• People management  
• Teamwork  
• Business  
• Marketing  
• Management | • Didactic (reading/lectures)  
• Skill building (case studies, group discussions, presentations, problem solving, simulations, teamwork, projects)  
• Discovery (brainstorming, personal goalsetting, career planning, consultancy) | • Personal (confidence, communication)  
• Knowledge (enterprise, initiative, self-employment, business, management and market skills, analytical, problem solving, decision making, communication, presentation skills, risk taking)  
• Career (improved knowledge, broader career options, broader less structured career perspective) |

---

APPENDIX E:
Information Letter

I am requesting your consent to be interviewed regarding the entrepreneurship courses you have been involved with teaching and developing at your institution. My name is Kyleen Myrah and I am completing my EdD in Educational Leadership and Policy in the department of Educational Studies at the University of British Columbia. I am also an Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Business at Okanagan University College teaching in the areas of entrepreneurship, marketing and management, and President of KyCo Management, specializing in entrepreneurial and small business training for youth and adults across the Thompson-Okanagan area. I have been involved with entrepreneurship initiatives in my region over the last six years through post-secondary and private instruction, membership on various local boards and committees, conferences and speaking engagements, awards programs and mentorship.

The information from these interviews will be used as part of my doctoral research thesis project. I am examining entrepreneurship curriculum as it is currently being practiced at public post-secondary institutions across BC. I am interested in how your entrepreneurship curriculum and materials are structured and your intended goals of these programs and courses. Specifically, I would like to ask you questions about what entrepreneurship education mean to you, what is the relationship between entrepreneurship and small business management, how and why the curriculum materials are chosen for your entrepreneurship course/program, do you feel it is possible to teach entrepreneurship and if so, what are the most effective instructional methods, what are the key objectives of this course/program and who is the learner you are trying to attract, what are the best techniques for evaluating entrepreneurial learning, and what constraints impinge on your ability to offer the ideal format of your course/program?

The benefits of the proposed research include a comprehensive examination of the entrepreneurship curriculum as it is currently being practiced in BC and the generation of a set of principles used to guide an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education which can be shared with post-secondary institutions across BC. This information will also be very useful to the enhancement of the entrepreneurship programming in my own faculty and institution.

The interview will take approximately 45-60 minutes to complete, and will be tape recorded with your consent. All information will be kept confidential and you or your institution will not be identified in any of the research findings unless you give prior consent to being identified. Access to individual data and to the names of participants is restricted to my research supervisor and myself as student researcher. You have the right to refuse to participate or to withdraw at any point during this interview with no consequences.

I will be contacting you in the next week to see if you have any questions about the research project and to determine your interest in participating in the study. However, please do not hesitate to contact me at anytime at (250) 868-2562 or kmyrah@shaw.ca. My research supervisor, Dr. Shauna Butterwick, is also available to answer your questions and can be reached at (604) 822-3897.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to discussing your involvement with entrepreneurship.

Kyleen Myrah, UBC Graduate Student Researcher
APPENDIX F:
Consent Form


Student Investigator:
Kyleen Myrah, Doctoral Student, research will be utilized for degree completion in the EdD Program in Educational Leadership & Policy
Department of Educational Studies, University of British Columbia
Ph: (250) 868-2562 Fax: (250) 862-5432 Email: kmyrah@shaw.ca

Research Supervisor:
Shauna Butterwick, Assistant Professor, Adult Education Program
Department of Educational Studies, University of British Columbia
Ph: (604) 822-3897 Fax: (604) 822-4244 Email: shauna.butterwick@ubc.ca

Purpose:
The purpose of the research study is to examine entrepreneurship curriculum as it is currently being practiced at public post-secondary institutions across BC to determine how entrepreneurship curriculum and materials are structured and the intended goals of these programs and courses. The benefits of the proposed research are the development of a set of principles used to guide an integrated approach to entrepreneurship education which can be shared with post-secondary institutions across BC. This information will also be very useful to the enhancement of the entrepreneurship programming in my own faculty and institution.

Study Procedures:
The research project involves a telephone interview of approximately 45-60 minutes that will be tape recorded. Specific questions include what entrepreneurship education mean to you, what is the relationship between entrepreneurship and small business management, how and why the curriculum materials are chosen for your entrepreneurship course/program, do you feel it is possible to teach entrepreneurship and if so, what are the most effective instructional methods, what are the key objectives of this course/program and who is the learner you are trying to attract, what are the best techniques for evaluating entrepreneurial learning, and what constraints impinge on your ability to offer the ideal format of your course/program?
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**Confidentiality:**
All information will be kept confidential. I and the institution I represent will not be identified by name in any reports of the completed study (and will be given a pseudonym) unless I give consent on this form to being identified in these research findings. All interview data will be kept at the student investigator's home in her locked filing cabinet, including all data stored on hard disk.

**Contact:**
If I have any questions or desire further information with respect to this study, I may contact Kyleen Myrah at (250) 868-2562 or her Research Supervisor Shauna Butterwick at (604) 822-3897.

If I have any concerns about my treatment or rights as a research subject I may contact the Director of Research Services at the University of British Columbia, Dr. Richard Spratley at (604) 822-8598.

**Consent: Please choose Option A or Option B**

**Option A:**
I understand that my participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time with no consequences.

I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

I consent to participate in this study and do not wish my name or the name of the institution I represent to be identified in any reports of the completed study.

Name: 

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

**Option B:**
I understand that my participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time with no consequences.

I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

I consent to participate in this study and agree that my name and the name of the institution I represent can be identified in any reports of the completed study.

Name: 

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Please fax consent form back to (250) 862-5432 Attention: Kyleen Myrah
APPENDIX G:
Findings From Documents

Table 1:

Number of Required versus Elective Entrepreneurship Courses by Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>Recommended Elective</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2:

Most Common Subjects Taught in Entrepreneurship Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Number of Courses Teaching the Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing your business</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business plan</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchising</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Marketing plan</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations/Operations plan</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification/Evaluation of business idea</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources/Management plan</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying a business</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of small business/Small business decision</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing growth</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: What is entrepreneurship</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Most Common Course Outcomes Listed on Entrepreneurship Course Outlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Outcomes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of a business plan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to launch a successful business</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to identify and examine viable business ideas</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand role and opportunities of small business in society</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to make business decisions (avoid business mistakes)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to deliver presentations and identify financing sources</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasp traits of successful entrepreneurs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn/Practice the management of a company</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand small business management issues</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Type, Frequency and Average Value of Student Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Average Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business plan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams/Tests/Quizzes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class participation/Seminar</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual assignments and reports</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

**Identification and Frequency of Program Descriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to start-up and run a successful business</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop practical entrepreneurial/planning/leadership Skills</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce a realistic/focused business plan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop fundamental business/technical skills</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/Excel in an entrepreneurial company/environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage a small business/Career in small business management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop expertise on how to value and finance a business</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach you how to be an entrepreneur</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

**Identification and Frequency of Program Prerequisites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Prerequisites</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school math (10/11)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year business related diploma or courses</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business experience, co-op work term, work experience</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully developed business concept/plan/portfolio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer literacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology, Physics, Chemistry &amp; Geology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7

**Identification and Frequency of Program Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcomes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop technical business skills</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to start up and manage a business</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop general success/employability skills</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand/Develop components of a business plan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to attract financing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand accounting and financial management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain a working knowledge of computers as a business tool</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop selling and human resources skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a career in managing a small business</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice entrepreneurial thinking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse new business opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a better understanding of human society and how to contribute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become an expert in entrepreneurship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop interdisciplinary skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about the new economy and the high technology field</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8

**Identification and Frequency of Program Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Benefits</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to start up and manage a business</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop business and technical skills</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop practical employability skills</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop entrepreneurial and leadership skills</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to manage a (small) business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compete in the global marketplace</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand/Develop components of a business plan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive industry feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain access to resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive post-program support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX H:
Summary of Entrepreneurship Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>BCIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Venture Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>Associate Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Part-time (delivered in a full-time format over 12 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Venture Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Structure</td>
<td>1 course covering 5 broad areas: Vent 1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>BCIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>Associate Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Marketing Management, School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Structure</td>
<td>8 courses (23 credits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>BCIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Diploma of Technology, specific focus in entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Full-time (2 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Marketing Management, School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Structure</td>
<td>Common core: Level 1 (7 courses, 15 weeks), Level 2 (9 courses, 20 weeks). Entrepreneurship program: Level 3 (6 courses, 15 weeks), Level 4 (10 courses, 20 weeks).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Camosun College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Enterprise Development Certificate Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Full-time or part-time (8 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Structure</td>
<td>11 courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Douglas College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>New Venture Management Certificate Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Full-time (8 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Structure</td>
<td>10 courses (over 2 semesters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Program Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas College</td>
<td>Business Management Diploma Program, New Venture Mgmt Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen University College</td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration in Entrepreneurial Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantlen University College</td>
<td>BBA in Accounting, entrepreneurial leadership area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langara College</td>
<td>Small Business Entrepreneur Certificate Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Royal Roads University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Name:</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce degree in Entrepreneurial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential:</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery:</td>
<td>Full-time. Organized on a quarter system that condenses 3rd and 4th year curriculum into one calendar year. Each quarter consists of 5-week and 10-week courses. Program begins with a foundation program of 3 wks in Sept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area:</td>
<td>Faculty of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Structure:</td>
<td>12 courses, plus the 3-week foundation program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Technical University of BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name:</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science, Management &amp; Technology, in High Tech Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential:</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery:</td>
<td>Trimester system, full-time or part-time, each term lasting 15 weeks, courses offered in a modular format with each module lasting 5 weeks. Four-year degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area:</td>
<td>Management and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Structure:</td>
<td>Common core (Tech One): Term A (6 modules, 18 credits), Term B (6 modules, 18 credits). Tech Two: Term A (5 modules, 15 credits), Term B (7 modules, 15 credits). Tech Three: Term A (9 modules, 15 credits), Term B (10 modules, 15 credits). Tech Four: Term A (9 modules, 15 credits), Term B (9 modules, 15 credits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>University of Victoria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name:</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce degree with an Entrepreneurship area of concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential:</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery:</td>
<td>A 16 month program including a core of commerce courses, followed by an entrepreneurship core module during summer term (5 courses taught as one unit) followed by 2 co-op work terms, and a final academic term the following summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area:</td>
<td>Faculty of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Structure:</td>
<td>Year 3: Commerce core (12 courses, 15 units). Year 4: 15 units by area of concentration (including core summer module of 5 courses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>