

National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship Working Paper 011/2006

This series is intended to promote discussion and to provide information about work in progress. The views expressed are those of the authors.

'Teaching Pigeons to Dance': Sense and Meaning in Entrepreneurship Education

Professor Paul D. Hannon
National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship
3, Priestley Wharf, Holt Street,
Birmingham
B7 4BN, UK
Tel: +44 (0)121 380 3545
E-mail: paul.hannon@ncge.org.uk
Website: www.ncge.org.uk

January 2006

© Prof. Paul Hannon.

All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission, provided that full acknowledgement is given.

Purpose: *At ISBA2004 the author presented a paper titled 'Philosophies of Entrepreneurship Education' that has subsequently been published (JEl, May, 2005). This conceptual and exploratory paper attempted to ground entrepreneurship education within the dominant adult education philosophies of modern education development to provide a framework for making sense of what, as entrepreneurship educators, we do and why. This led towards an illustrative typology of entrepreneurship educators. In the paper for ISBE2005 the author further explores our philosophical and conceptual understanding of entrepreneurship education through borrowing and applying conceptualisations of education from education theory in order to bring deeper meaning to approaches to entrepreneurship education in UK HEIs. From this stance the paper argues for a more sophisticated development of entrepreneurship education provision and discusses the implications for educators. The paper title is adapted from Carr (2003). This paper will be of interest to educators and institutional policy-makers wishing to develop entrepreneurship education as a robust and strongly underpinned part of the higher education experience.*

Design/Methodology/Approach: *This paper identifies existing theoretical and conceptual frameworks from adult education and applies to the phenomenon of entrepreneurship education as a sense-making tool from which deeper insights and understanding are gained. The paper overall is conceptual in nature, grounded in the existing education theory and is not empirical.*

Findings: *As a conceptual paper the 'findings' relate to the unearthing of the inherent drivers and values to the design and delivery of entrepreneurship education in UK HEIs. Applying education theoretical frameworks enables the presentation of a purposeful and guiding framework for effective curricula design in entrepreneurship thereby enabling coherence and cohesion of approach and achievable outcomes. Furthermore, the paper maps the purpose and role of educators against a segmented framework to draw out distinctions across contexts and to present to need for a clarification of the role of the educator in the entrepreneurial learning process. This enables a discussion of the development needs of entrepreneurship educators for the UK.*

Implications: *Overall the paper presents implications for: HE institutions in how they conceive of and introduce entrepreneurship education; educators and the role they perform in effective entrepreneurship education; curricula designers in developing meaningful 'fit for purpose' offerings across the diversity of the entrepreneurial opportunity environment.*

Originality/Value: *This paper further builds on a significant gap in the extant knowledge and literature for enhancing understanding in the development of the field of entrepreneurship education within higher education in the UK*

Key Words: Entrepreneurship Education Philosophy; Entrepreneurship Educators; Entrepreneurship Educator Development

'Teaching Pigeons to Dance'¹: Sense and Meaning in Entrepreneurship Education

ABSTRACT

"The fact is that although the rat or pigeon achieves the goal of securing food, attaining food certainly features here as its goal, we can hardly count finding its way about the maze or playing table tennis among its goals – for insofar as these activities are concerned, the animal can have little idea what is happening to it." (Carr, 2003, p91)

Teaching pigeons to dance requires the pigeons to learn a set of skills. The pigeons do not know what it means to be a dancer.

The challenge is to create dancers, not only individuals who can dance.

The recent article 'Philosophies of enterprise and entrepreneurship education and challenges for higher education in the UK' (Hannon, 2005) offered a conceptual and exploratory approach to grounding entrepreneurship education within the dominant adult education philosophies of modern education development. Its aim was to provide a framework for making sense of what, as entrepreneurship educators, we do and why. This led towards an illustrative typology of entrepreneurship educators.

This paper further explores our conceptual understanding of entrepreneurship education through borrowing and applying further philosophies and conceptualisations of education from education and learning theory in order to bring deeper meaning to approaches to entrepreneurship education in UK Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). From this stance the paper argues for a more sophisticated development of entrepreneurship education provision and discusses the implications for educators.

This paper begins by exploring existing theoretical and conceptual frameworks from adult education and then applying these to the phenomenon of entrepreneurship education as a sense-making tool from which deeper insights and understanding may be gained.

As a conceptual paper, the 'findings' relate to the unearthing of the inherent drivers and values to the design and delivery of entrepreneurship education in UK HEIs. Applying education theoretical frameworks enables the presentation of

¹ The title for this paper is adapted from the work of David Carr (2003).

a purposeful and guiding framework for effective curricula design in entrepreneurship, thereby enabling coherence and cohesion of approach and achievable outcomes. Furthermore, the paper maps the purpose and role of educators against a segmented framework to draw out distinctions across contexts and to present the need for a clarification of the role of the educator in the entrepreneurial learning process. This enables a discussion of the development needs of entrepreneurship educators for the UK.

Overall the paper presents implications for:

- HE institutions in how they conceive of entrepreneurship education;
- educators and the role they perform in effective entrepreneurship education;
- curricula designers in developing meaningful 'fit for purpose' offerings across the diversity of the entrepreneurial opportunity environment.

Further, this paper will be of interest to educators and institutional policy-makers wishing to develop entrepreneurship education as a robust and strongly underpinned part of the higher education experience. This paper aims to partially fulfil a significant gap in the extant knowledge and literature and contribute to an emerging debate on the robust development of the field of entrepreneurship education within higher education in the UK.

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship development is now central to many government policies for building a knowledge driven economy and an entrepreneurial culture. Clearly the role of education is important in building entrepreneurial capability in tomorrow's entrepreneurs and leaders. In the UK, higher education (HE) has been a recent focus of government initiatives to support entrepreneurship development – Science and Enterprise Centres, Cambridge-Massachusetts Initiative, Higher Education Innovation Funds, plus investments through Higher Education Academy subject centres, Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Enterprise Insight, National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship, Young Enterprise, etc.

Entrepreneurship education is now part of the HE landscape. It's insertion, but not necessarily its integration, into HE has taken place over a number of decades and for different reasons and as a result of a range of political, ideological, institutional and educational drivers. It is part of a broader aim to embed the notions of enterprise and entrepreneurship throughout the education system from primary, secondary and through tertiary levels.

- Politically: the UK Government emphasises the link between enterprise, entrepreneurship and its economic and social agendas. Globalisation forces the need for increasing competitiveness and productivity; a knowledge-economy demands educated, high-skilled and entrepreneurial leaders, managers and organisations; and, a socially-inclusive enterprise culture provides opportunities for individuals and communities.
- Ideologically: entrepreneurship as a way of life envisions a state of being (or becoming) not as a sub-set of notions of employability or careers; critically, entrepreneurship is also viewed as the problem and not the solution in higher education as part of the broader process of marketisation and commodification of education; entrepreneurship is viewed as a 'heroic' model of individual development.
- Institutionally: entrepreneurship provides access to funding streams and can support infrastructure development and capacity building; an emphasis on entrepreneurship may enhance competitive positioning in the latent student market and may help in student retention; entrepreneurship may be a process for the commercialisation and exploitation of research, science and technology.
- Educationally: entrepreneurship meets a growing demand of learners; can act as a cross-faculty and multi-disciplinary teaching opportunity; challenges learning environments, cultures and practices; challenges the role of educators; demands a philosophical and conceptual clarity and underpinning.

Developments in entrepreneurship education have been a recent phenomenon in the UK. In 2005 most UK universities will be offering a course of some description related to enterprise or entrepreneurship. One could conclude then that the graduate entrepreneurship agenda in HEI is addressed. Unfortunately, the current experience in the UK merely highlights the immense need for further support and development. For example, the current offering raises some fundamental questions:

- how relevant is the current offering to the development of future graduate entrepreneurs?
- how do curricula design and development processes enhance the entrepreneurial learning experience of students?
- what foundations underpin the design and delivery process?
- what evidence supports the utility of the current provision?
- what is the role of the educator in the development of graduate entrepreneurs?

Such questions present a number of challenges to HEIs and educators alike – ranging from deeply rooted beliefs and philosophical debates about the nature and utility of enterprise and entrepreneurship within higher education, to the conceptual and definitional contradictions related to notions of enterprise and entrepreneurship, to the pragmatic aspects of curricula decision-making and educational andragogy and pedagogy, and to the challenges of measuring impact on individuals, organisations, communities and society.

For example,

- *Embedding across and within different subjects* – the codification of knowledge into distinct ‘subjects’ (24 are listed by the UK Higher Education Academy) creates challenges for cross-disciplinary notions of entrepreneurship as a state of being, or as a process of change or development. When subjects are translated into formalised courses for teaching they are often ‘full’ of subject ‘content’.
- *Location and ownership* – institutional infrastructure and policy requires entrepreneurship to be located and owned. The decisions of where and how impact on the ability and ease of engagement across the wider learner community and impact on access to resources and opportunities.
- *Purpose and outcomes* – the conceptual diversity of entrepreneurship education and a lack of clarity in integrating with education philosophies lead to mixed and confused purposes and outcomes.
- *Educators’ roles and approaches* – educator approaches and understanding vary; teaching preferences and experiences affect learner exposure; educator beliefs affect curricula design and processes.
- *Benefits* – the growth of entrepreneurship education in UK HEIs demands an understanding of, and method for, demonstrating the impact and outcomes of learner experiences on aspirations, behaviours, skills and capabilities.
- *Coherence and cohesion* – the explosion of provision across UK institutions has led to a diverse array of offerings within HE. Conceptions of entrepreneurship vary, approaches to teaching and learning vary and it is not always clear how these fit together
- *‘Quality’* – the rapid expansion of the provision of entrepreneurship and the growth of providers and teachers demands an assessment of good practice in design, delivery and impact

Clearly, a number of related factors need to be better understood and future developments need to be grounded in sound foundations of entrepreneurship

education within an adult learner context within a higher education environment. This paper argues that the starting point is the linking of entrepreneurship and education through the well-founded philosophies of adult education. This need was raised and explored earlier (Hannon, 2005). Main arguments are highlighted and further explored below.

The Importance of Philosophies

Hiemstra (1988) asks why we should have a personal philosophy and offers four points for an 'adult education professional':

1. 'A philosophy promotes an understanding of human relationships'
2. 'A philosophy sensitizes you to the various needs associated with positive human interactions'
3. 'A philosophy provides a framework for distinguishing, separating, and understanding personal values'
4. 'A philosophy promotes flexibility and consistency in working with adult learners'

Hiemstra (1988), citing the work of Merriam (1982), notes that 'philosophy can inform practice, provide guidelines for policy decisions, and guide administrators, teachers, and counselors in their everyday practice: "Philosophy contributes to professionalism. Having a philosophic orientation separates the professional continuing educator from the paraprofessional in that professionals are aware of **what** they are doing and **why** they are doing it. A philosophy offers goals, values, and attitudes to strive for. It thus can be motivating, inspiring energizing to the practitioner" (pp. 90-91)'.

Although Boggs (1981) suggests that philosophy provides "the means whereby adults ... not only get information but also interpret it, organize it, and use it making decisions and in taking action" (p. 4) (cited in Hiemstra, 1988), Cunningham (1982) goes on to identify the challenges for adult educators:

"What is worrisome is that continuing educators develop and operate programs without a clearly visualized set of values in which the adult learner and societal well-being are central concerns" (p. 85).

Hiemstra suggests that 'it is this need for a clearly identified set of values that may be most important for the busy professional' (Hiemstra, 1988). Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) neatly summarise the challenge for educators:

"Many adult education practitioners engaged in the daily tasks of program planning, administration, or teaching have little time to reflect

upon the meaning and direction of their activity. The educator is generally more concerned with skills than with principles, with means than with ends, with details than with the whole picture. Yet all practitioners make decisions and act in ways that presuppose certain values and beliefs. Whether or not it is articulated, a philosophical orientation underlies most individual and institutional practices in adult education". (p. 37)

It is then important that educators understand the need for underpinning philosophical frameworks to enable a greater understanding of why they do what they do in the way that they do it. Furthermore the underlying philosophy determines the learning theory that dictates the practice and method of delivery that creates the desired learning outcomes (Mayfield and Weaver 1997). The philosophy of pragmatism (as posed by Morris and Pai 1976) is argued as being central to entrepreneurship (applying Bygrave's 1989 notion of entrepreneurship) and is influenced by three parameters: the view of the learner; the role of the teacher; and the type of learning (Mayfield and Weaver 1997).

Philosophical Systems for Educators

As educators we know what outcomes we want to achieve for the learner and the institution. We therefore need to ensure our personal philosophy aligns with how we go about our practice. This starts with understanding philosophical systems of education.

From the perspectives of entrepreneurship educators not grounded in the philosophical traditions of education it is clear that many systems of educational philosophy exist as highlighted in Hiemstra's (1988) summary of 'philosophical guidance for educators': Brubacher (1969) provides the 'most comprehensive system' offering no less than 'a dozen distinct schools of thought', or 'schools of educational philosophy'. 'Apps' (1973) monograph describes five categories as bases for viewing and understanding the purposes of adult education'. Conti and Kolody (1988) provide an overview of key philosophies of education and is represented in Appendix A to this paper.

Elias and Merriam (1980) 'discuss the difficulties in attempting to understand the various schools of thought and make some sense out of them for adult education' and describe 'six distinct systems they believe have relevance for study and understanding by adult educators':

"The problems of classifying different philosophers into schools have long been recognized. Nevertheless, the systematization of the discipline

continues and schools of thought develop because similarities and affinities do exist among theorists" (p. 1)."

It is also noted (Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982; Elias & Merriam, 1980) that philosophical schools differ in:

- (a) 'their view of what constitutes knowledge',
- (b) 'the nature of the learner',
- (c) 'the purpose of the curriculum', and
- (d) 'the role of the teacher'.

"While variance may exist among individuals within a philosophical school based on their degree of commitment to these various concepts and to the combination of these different degrees of commitment, the differences among those within a philosophical school are not as great as the differences between the philosophical schools" and any instrument for identifying educator's philosophical underpinnings "is not designed as a label for stereotyping a person; instead, it is designed to stimulate critical thinking and reflection about the teaching-learning transaction" (Conti & Kolody, 1998, p. 137). Accessed from http://www.conti-creations.com/phil_guide.htm 25-07-05.

Zinn (1983, 1990) further developed a 'self-administered, self-scoring, and self-interpreted instrument for measuring the extent to which a person values five of the six systems.' McKenzie (1985) 'carried out a study using the instrument and suggests that his findings "could be the basis for the conclusion that many adult educators merely accept patterns of practice (and corresponding theoretical assumptions) to which they have been exposed without testing these patterns critically" (p. 20). He suggests further that adult education practice should include theoretical reflection and a critical examination of some philosophical grounds for that practice'.

The work of Elias and Merriam noted above formed the basis for the author's earlier article (Hannon, 2005), which is highlighted later in this article in Table One. The aim is to explore its value in addressing the points raised above by McKenzie. However, it is also noted that developing a philosophical underpinning to one's work as an educator is not free from challenges:

"Clearly, human potential programs based on a philosophy emphasizing the autonomy of the learner [such as with the humanism model] are in conflict with empowerment programs [derived from the radicalism model] whose goals are based on altering social arrangements, even though the

anti-institutional analyses on which both these practices are based appear similar" (Cunningham, 1982,p. 84).

"They can prevent analysis and original thought. Once one reads through a description of these various philosophers, the tendency is to try to fit one's own philosophy into one of these established philosophy fields. Once one has done so the inclination is to become comfortable with the new-found intellectual home and stop questioning and challenging and constantly searching for new positions" (Apps, 1985, pp. 72-73).

"In this approach one chooses certain elements from different theories and operates according to those principles" (Elias and Merriam, 1980, p. 206).

To determine some insights into the many challenges facing entrepreneurship educators it is then useful to go back to first principles. The way we act and behave is driven by the way we think which in turn is formed from our deeply held sets of values and beliefs - our philosophy. In terms of our personal philosophy of education, our values and beliefs may comprise of what we believe is the fundamental purpose of education, and as an educator, what is our role? Such values and beliefs are not static. Over time they change as do societal values and beliefs. So whereas a view of higher education being focused around an elitist access to liberalist education may have applied to the early years of universities and ensued across decades, a more recent view may be more market oriented with HE being servicing the needs of business, commerce and society.

It is not the aim of this particular paper to attempt to resolve these thorny and challenging contradictions, conflicts and debates but more to present them in recognition of the challenging context within which those engaged in enterprise and entrepreneurship education within higher education operate and perform.

This paper continues by reproducing the table from Hannon (2005) by means of a building block for making sense of differing approaches to entrepreneurship education within UK HEIs and for the further development of a typology of educator roles and their implications.

	<u>Liberalist</u>	<u>Progressive</u>	<u>Behaviourist</u>	<u>Humanistic</u>	<u>Radical</u>
Purpose	To develop understanding and insights from an intellectual multi-contextual exploration of the world of entrepreneurship	To understand individual entrepreneurial potential and the related capabilities to fulfil individual potential within an entrepreneurial society and economy	To acquire a pre-determined set of entrepreneurial capabilities at a specified standard of application	To self-develop and achieve personal growth within an entrepreneurial context	To determine how entrepreneurship is applied as a tool for socio-economic and political change for individuals, communities and society
Educator Role	The 'Suru': Provider of access to leading experts and successful entrepreneurs for transmitting knowledge and insight	The 'Guide': Creating experiential learning environments and processes	The 'Controller': Monitoring and directing learners towards achieving intended entrepreneurial capabilities	The 'Helper': Facilitating a co-learning process with peers and entrepreneurs	The 'Coordinator': Learning through collective action. Equality between learner and educator.
Learner Aspirations	Intellectual stimulus and challenge about entrepreneurship. Seeking academic recognition and peer engagement.	Making a successful contribution and maximising entrepreneurial opportunity. Recognition from the external environment.	Becoming the specified entrepreneurial type. Independent recognition and award.	Continual personal and professional growth and development. Peer recognition.	Changing the status quo (e.g. re. gender, ethnicity, social status). Recognition through successful policy change.
Learner Profiles	Researchers Professionals Academics Commentators Successful entrepreneurs	Latent entrepreneurs New and existing entrepreneurs Educators Intrapreneurs Professionals	Latent entrepreneurs New and existing entrepreneurs Educators Professionals	Academics Professionals Researchers Successful entrepreneurs Intrapreneurs Educators	Politicians Policy-makers Activists Professionals Researchers Entrepreneurs

(Source: adapted from Gilley et al.'s (2001) adaptation of Zinn's (1999) Inventory and presented in Hannon (2005))

Table One: Indicative Applications to Entrepreneurship Education Approaches

Table One (taken from Hannon 2005) applies the five dominant philosophies of adult education, as also established by Conti and Kolody in Appendix A, adapted from Elias and Merriam's framework cited in Gilley et al (2001) to entrepreneurship education. This offers a strong connection between the dominant philosophies of education, the purpose of entrepreneurship educators, the desired learner outcomes and the role of entrepreneurship educators.

This paper now considers additional influencing factors on the context, process and environment for entrepreneurship education within the UK HEIs. These extend to theoretical and conceptual aspects of entrepreneurship education and learning. From this platform the paper draws conclusions and implications for (i) capability building; (ii) educator development; and, (iii) institutional policies.

INFLUENCING FACTORS

Additional related challenges in the literature highlight other influencing factors:

1. Concepts and conceptualisations
2. Integrating theories of entrepreneurship and education
3. Theoretical understandings of effective adult learning environments

1. Concepts and Conceptualisations

Another perspective is to consider concepts and conceptions of education and how these may apply to entrepreneurship education. Winch and Gingell (2004) have undertaken this for education in general and made clear distinctions between concepts and conceptions. They propose that concepts of education are about preparation for life, whereas conceptions would be concerned about preparation for what life.

In considering concepts of education Winch and Gingell (2004) propose three options of preparation for life: a liberal concept, a civic concept, and a vocational concept. In broad terms, the former focuses upon the development of the individual, the second upon the role as a citizen in society and the latter upon agents of economy activity. Such concepts can be contextualised for entrepreneurship education where a liberal concept would focus upon the entrepreneur, a civic concept upon social enterprise and the role of entrepreneurship in society, and a vocational concept of education would focus on self-employment and growth businesses and their economic impact.

Conceptions of education are more complex and are value driven and would concern the complications of societal, organisational and individual values and beliefs on education. What is important and to whom and for what purpose? Clearly the nature and role of vocational education is one aspect of this. Government, business, educationalists, parents and students may all have differing and potentially conflicting conceptions of entrepreneurship education and what is valued and when and how. The aim of education is then driven by the values of those influencing its purpose and is not neutral. One only has to consider aspects of culture, faith, freedom, ethics and power to realise the complexity. Entrepreneurship education needs to have an aim and a purpose but what and for whom and who decides?

One challenge for educators can lie in balancing the aims of economic activity and that of education. What are the implications of considering a market approach to entrepreneurship education and creating an entrepreneurship education market? In this context consumers of entrepreneurship education have the right to resources to set up the kind of system they want (i.e. the state gives up the right to plan/control). This conception of entrepreneurship education will live or die by its popularity (Winch and Gingell 2004).

A number of conceptions challenge the role of entrepreneurship educators within a broad context of learning, although some writers suggest that theoretical developments in this field have led to 'half-baked ideas' (Winch and Gingell 2004, p39). Conceptions may include notions of learner readiness; behaviour and cognition; andragogy and pedagogy; effects of culture and power; the conception of a job or occupation and continuing professional development; and self-efficacy in learners. How do these affect entrepreneurship educators? Their impact is potentially significant and drive an educators philosophy and theoretical underpinning to their practice. Some of these are further explore below.

In exploring 'principled conceptions of education' Carr (2003) considers our understanding of behaviour, perception and cognition, and reviews the leading empirical investigations of learning highlighting the problems of generalising the definition of learning as 'modification of behaviour'. For example from the famous Pavlovian dog's ability to 'do something it could not previously do' we cannot say that the dog has 'learned to salivate to the sound of a bell' 'subsequent behaviourists sought to show that genuine learning occurs only when behaviour adapts to environmental pressures in the interests of furthering the survival-related *ends* and *goals* of the conditioned life-form' (Carr 2003). He then discusses Thorndike's 'pivotal experiments on 'instrumental conditioning' with cats' that emphasised the role of motivation in learning 'it is not just that if responses are not reinforced they will not be entrenched in behaviour, but that if the reinforcement is negative (disappointing or punishing) rather than positive (congenial or rewarding), responses are liable to inhibition or extinction' (Carr 2003). The effects of positive experiences in school of entrepreneurship on entrepreneurial intention in later life have been demonstrated.

Finally Carr (2003) reinforces the challenges by highlighting the work of Skinner whose 'own experimental achievements in the field of behaviour shaping were hardly less bizarre than they were novel. Thus, in one famous experiment, Skinner taught pigeons to play a game of table tennis by reducing the game to a series of molecular skills and systematically reinforcing each and any movement of the pigeons (picking up bats with beaks, hitting a ball over a net with bat in beak, returning the ball in like fashion, and so on) that resembled or approximated the human execution of this or that table tennis skill' (p90). Carr concludes that

although '.... the pigeon achieves the goal of securing food, attaining food certainly features here as *its* goal, we can hardly count playing table tennis among its goals – for insofar as these activities are concerned, the animal can have little idea what is happening to it' (p91).

In other words there is not any 'meaningful grasp of what is learned'. 'The conditioned pigeons are no more performing the skills of table tennis than a spider is exercising weaving skills or a honey bee is dancing. Indeed this point is of the utmost educational and pedagogical significance – since it is all too tempting, for example, to suppose that if one's goal is to teach a particular ethnic dance to a class of pupils, and an ethnic dance is just a particular pattern of physical *movements*, then one has successfully taught that dance when the children can physically perform that pattern of movement' (p92).

Clearly there is more to *being* a dancer than efficiently performing dance steps as routines. It requires understanding, insight, purpose and emotion about what one is doing, why and how, and not merely academic knowledge and practice, i.e. there is an appreciation of intention and outcome in what it means to be a dancer. Similarly, in becoming an entrepreneur there is a need for learning steps and routines and practice in the early stages but *being* an entrepreneur requires attaining affective and conative feelings of intention and purpose.

As another example, notions of andragogy have existed since the 1920s and 1930s (Lindeman 1926; Anderson and Lindeman 1927; Kapp 1933) and 50 years later, in the 1970s and 1980s, were the focus of much research and writings as the understanding of adult learning and teaching developed. The works of Knowles (1968, 1975, 1980) and Rogers grounded in philosophies of humanism proposed concepts of self-directed and independent learning and the distinctiveness of adult versus child education and gave rise to many publications. See Hiemstra and Sisco (1990) *Individualizing instruction* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Accessed from <http://www-distance.syr.edu/andraggy.html>) for a comprehensive and annotated bibliography some of which is highlighted below.

The field has proposed additional terminology: 'synectics' the restructuring of knowledge to bring about new ideas (Brown 1985); 'humangogy' as a conceptualisation of human theory of learning based on a holistic approach to adult education based upon notions of identity and emergence (Knudson 1979, 1980); 'gerogogy' as a way of recognising the chronological stages of development of human learning (Lebel 1978).

This has led to considerations of the impact of and on educators (Sheridan 1989; Beder and Carrea 1988; Candy 1981; Elias and Merriam 1980). Andragogical

principles are related to Kelly's Personal Construct Theory and support notions of cooperative and collaborative learning recognising the drivers and changing modes of learning. Consideration of our future motivates us to learn, i.e. to seek knowledge through a 'need-to-know'. Mezirow's notion of transformative learning (from Habermas theory) explores how our learning processes transform the ways we think and act and the affects of triggers and barriers to this process, such as cultural and societal factors and relationships with others (Mezirow 1991, cited in Hiemstra 2001).

Winch and Gingell (2004) discuss the distinction between a job and an occupation and suggest this is important. Simply, a job may engage an individual in a range of tasks and throughout life different jobs may change the nature of the tasks but these jobs can remain within an occupation (p113). In this sense can entrepreneurship, or the application of entrepreneurial behaviours, skills and mindsets, constitute an individual's 'occupation' which may endure through life and within which a number of 'job' opportunities may be exploited – as self-employed, as entrepreneur, as intrapreneur, as social entrepreneur, etc? Winch and Gingell (2004) suggest that an 'occupation is a formerly recognised social category' and that as such would have 'a range of knowledge, both practical and theoretical, that is required to undertake the range of tasks that fall within it.' The authors suggest that although someone may change jobs several times within their lifetime they are less likely to change occupations 'more than once or twice'. Occupations are described as 'being the kinds of ways in which people earn their living, they also serve the needs of and have impact on the rest of society' – as a function of entrepreneurship.

Clearly the field has put forward many concepts for educators to understand as partially illustrated in the above discussion. Contradictory evidence from research does not always clarify a way forwards in practice. However it is argued that educators should be aware of the research, the debates and their implications for the policies and practices of entrepreneurship education within a higher education context.

2. Integrating Theories of Entrepreneurship and Education

Bechard and Gregoire (2005) undertake a content analysis of entrepreneurship education articles. Their discussion suggests that the preoccupation 'with documenting the penetration of entrepreneurship courses and programs in institutions of higher education' and the encouragement of 'the development of a variety of teaching practices' has addressed earlier concerns noted in the research literature. However the authors suggest 'three education research preoccupations appear to remain underaddressed: social-cognitive, psycho-cognitive and spiritualist or ethical preoccupations'. Their results suggest 'that the implications of these dimensions for entrepreneurship education are yet to

be drawn'. This means that 'the corpus of entrepreneurship education research is not as "complete" as it could be'.

The authors go on to suggest that, from a theoretical viewpoint, this suggests 'that by and large, the teaching of entrepreneurship ignores the lessons learned from entrepreneurship research focusing on these social-cognitive, psycho-cognitive, and other ethical dimensions.' This leads to the authors suggesting that the 'net result is that the teaching of entrepreneurship may be ignoring important elements that could foster its effectiveness and ensure that we avoid pedagogical stagnation'.

This discussion raises the question as to whether there are particular 'obstacles that prevent scholars from considering the educational implications of their research, as well as the import of educational theories for this same research?'. Bechard and Gregoire (2005) propose five obstacles:

1. '..... many researchers have been preoccupied with questions of theoretical development as well as with the field's institutional legitimacy', relegating other questions to a 'secondary place'. The authors cite the example of a recent special Journal issue devoted to entrepreneurial cognition (in which no) author in the special issue considers the implications of his or her propositions or findings for entrepreneurship education'.
2. '..... education-related projects are often perceived as less legitimate, even when they have direct research implications (and as a result) research at the interface of education and entrepreneurship is not likely to generate as much interest and professional rewards as an equally rigorous research centering on core theoretical developments, and through the study of real-life business situations'.
3. '..... most scholars have received little pedagogical training (if at all) during their doctoral education (and) the training that is offered to future professors is generally silent on the educational foundations of pedagogical practices.' Even though recommendations for addressing this in 'the design of doctoral programs in entrepreneurship' have been proposed (see Brush et al., 2003), the authors suggest that even then, 'nowhere in their text do they consider the possibility of highlighting, even minimally, the education research that anchors these pedagogical practices'. They conclude that 'considering the model of teaching that characterizes most faculty's practice, as well as their general lack of any foundations in the theoretical underpinnings of education, it is no surprise then that scholars do not naturally draw the implications that their disciplinary research might have for education.'

4. '..... we observe that many of the agencies and organizations granting research funds operate on the same disciplinary basis, again making it difficult to pursue interdisciplinary projects.'
5. '..... we observe that a number of entrepreneurship scholars are not even teaching entrepreneurship-specific courses, leaving the teaching of these courses to non tenure-track adjunct instructors. As a result interest for pedagogical innovation and research in entrepreneurship education can only fall out-side the preoccupations of those very scholars building the field of entrepreneurship'. The authors continue by considering Katz's (2003) view about the future growth in entrepreneurship education likely to be outside of business schools, and conclude that 'scholars based in those institutions could find it even more difficult to play an active role in the development of entrepreneurship education research – and practice.'

These are clearly far-reaching and significant obstacles with substantive implications for the development of entrepreneurship education within a higher education context. Bechard and Gregoire's study is US-centric but this probably identifies that from a UK perspective we have yet to fully address those preoccupations that the authors suggest are 'completed'.

The challenge then is how to address such obstacles and move beyond 'teaching pigeons to dance'.

Bechard and Gregoire have two institutional-level elements that 'could foster efforts to change the current situation':

1. the increasing importance of the scholarship of teaching within faculty's careers 'offering a counterweight to the traditional paradigm anchored on research expertise within a single discipline or field of application.'
2. the recent development of new journals in the field could provide 'high-profile forums in which to publish research at the interface of entrepreneurship and education'. The authors emphasise the importance of the challenge in ensuring that 'these journals count as legitimate and rewarding venues in tenure and promotion decisions.'

Bechard and Gregoire propose however that the 'single most important challenge for the future 'lies in developing a scholarly expertise in the dual fields of entrepreneurship and education. Without a minimal expertise in education, the literature on entrepreneurship education is likely to remain driven by practical and contextual concerns alone – without references to what is already

well established theoretically and empirically what we are saying is that addressing these concerns might benefit substantially from a closer integration of the relevant knowledge already developed and established in education'. Clearly this is one of the aims of this paper, or at least, to explore a starting point.

3. Theoretical Understandings of Effective Adult Learning Environments

Such discussions above clearly extend to the fundamental aspect of learning spaces as demonstrated below:

"When I began my university teaching career I was basically unprepared for the task. Using as my frame of reference the mainly didactic teaching approaches modeled for me in my formal education, I did lots of lecturing to and testing of learners who I "arranged" in straight rows of chairs facing me. It would actually be more accurate to say that the institution "arranged" the physical setting for me, as the "tradition" against rearranging rooms was very strong due to time constraints, learner expectations, and expectations of colleagues who also used the spaces. I survived that first year but did not feel very successful as a teacher. The evaluation forms completed by the students in my classes confirmed this judgment. The result for me was a sudden awareness that I must think about the learning environment in a much broader way" (Hiemstra (1991). "We recognize that an environment includes social, cultural, and psychological elements as well as physical features" (Hiemstra and Sisco, 1990, p. 245).

Hiemstra (1991) notes that there are a number of ingrained views and that "part of the problem is that many people fall back on or find comfort in what they already know, and some of the issues raised (here) are very complex and can cause painful self-reflection".

"Our behaviors and attitudes are shaped by the paradigms we know, believe in, or have directly experienced. In essence, our paradigms are the way we see, perceive, or understand the world around us. For example, my accumulated knowledge and experience in relation to learning environments--my paradigm or, more accurately, collection of paradigms--informs part of my view of myself as an adult educator, explains in part why I embrace the educational approaches that I use, and serves in part as the basis of my advocacy of the cause of improving our learning environments".

Hiemstra (1991) proposes that "what is required of many people is a "paradigm shift." Knowles (1989) refers to this phenomenon as flashes of insight or episodes that can change a life. Kuhn (1970) introduced the notion of a paradigm shift by demonstrating how most significant advancements in scientific endeavors are the products of breaks with old or traditional ways of thinking. Covey (1989) describes how paradigms affect the way we think about or see things. I know

that my own instructional approaches have changed through my paradigm shift to the broader view of learning environments described above”.

“I contend that an individual's philosophy, whether it is explicated or not, affects personal instructional styles or approaches in various ways. Thus, I suggest another task is to think about, analyze, and use their own respective philosophies: "Philosophy contributes to professionalism. Having a philosophic orientation separates the professional continuing educator from the paraprofessional in that professionals are aware of what they are doing and why they are doing it" (Merriam, 1982, pp. 90-91).”

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This paper has introduced the context within which entrepreneurship education is conceived and implemented within HEs in the UK – politically, ideologically, institutionally and educationally. In so doing the paper raises a number of key challenges relating to: embeddedness, location, ownership, purpose, roles and coherence. The paper has emphasised the importance of philosophical underpinnings and systems and highlighted selected conceptual and theoretical influencing factors such as the array of conceptions of education, the integration of entrepreneurship and education, and the importance of learning environments. This has raised the importance of the need for gaining deeper understanding of our practice as entrepreneurship educators.

The author of this paper is not an educationalist nor a philosopher but is an educator and an entrepreneur and this has been a journey of exploration into discovering the roots that create the foundations for what is practised in the name of entrepreneurship education. It is a sense-making process for providing coherence and, in a developmental sense, for finding opportunities for building on experiences and growing in understanding and capability.

This is important for recognising the limitations of ‘teaching pigeons to dance’, metaphorically. Finally the paper concludes by highlighting three key implications for entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurship educators:

1. capability building and entrepreneurship education
2. professional educator development
3. institutional policies

1. Capability building and entrepreneurship education

The philosophical and theoretical points raised in this paper potentially have significant meaning for entrepreneurship educators and capability building within higher education.

Firstly, it is important to recognise the complexity and diversity of the field and as

such no single philosophy, conception or model of entrepreneurship education is likely to meet the broad scope of the field.

Secondly, aligning philosophy or purpose with learner expectations, needs, and intended outcomes is likely to enhance the learner experience and educator effectiveness.

Thirdly, defining the purpose of the education offering affects the role of the educator. Different roles are likely to be relevant to different purposes. The typology presented above is an indicative insight into educator roles.

Fourthly, institutional capacity building and individual capability development will need to recognise educator roles and types and understand the affect of diverse philosophies and conceptions of entrepreneurship education on the institution and on educators and those that provide support and advice.

This further raises the need for a more sophisticated segmentation of the entrepreneurship educator environment to enable focused needs identification and development opportunities.

2. Professional educator development

Clearly the role of entrepreneurship educator in HE is challenging and teaching entrepreneurship is conceptually and pedagogically challenging. The need for different roles across the diverse contexts for entrepreneurship education has been proposed in this paper. In developing this, the need for professional educator development is evident. There is little evidence of HEIs in the UK providing substantive professional support for educators to enhance and develop their craft. Related to each proposed role will be a set of skills and learning needs.

Hannon (2005) offered an indicative typology of entrepreneurship educators as the foundation for considering their roles in specific contexts for particular purposes or outcomes and to explore, within this framework, illustrative capabilities and challenges from which development needs and opportunities can be derived.

Developing Entrepreneurship Educator Typologies

Table 2 offers an overview of the key characteristics of the entrepreneurship educator types (adapted from Hannon (2005) and Ozman and Craver (1981)). Such a framework and typology has potential utility in its application. For example, it aids the conceptualisation of entrepreneurship education within HEIs and thus can assist in the design of course frameworks by providing clarity and coherence of rationale; structure; outcomes; and the setting of programme learning objectives.

Educator Type	Guru	Guide	Controller	Helper	Coordinator
Dominant Education Philosophy/Theory	Liberalist, or Idealist	Progressive, or Pragmatist	Behaviourist, or Realist	Humanist, or Constructionist	Radicalist, or Re-constructionist
Entrepreneurship Education Objectives	Academic knowledge and insight	Maximise individual entrepreneurial potential	Capability development	Unlocking personal potential	Affecting social and economic change – critical enquiry
Entrepreneurship Educator Roles	Expert, Judge Strongly-defined	Facilitator Seeking understanding Resource base	Leader – Manager	Coach – Mentor	Challenger Change-catalyst
Relevance – Context	Nascent entrepreneurs, Academics. Policy-makers	Nascent entrepreneurs	Nascent entrepreneurs	Enterprising individuals	Activists, policy-makers
Andragogic approaches	Didactic Broad, Holistic, Content-centred	Pragmatic Learner-centred	Active Inquiry Practical, Systems	Experiential, Personal development	Social Activism
Indicative programme examples	Understanding entrepreneurship; theories and models of entrepreneurship; entrepreneurship policies	Starting a business; new venture creation; intrapreneurship	Becoming a successful entrepreneur; behaviours of entrepreneurs; Effective business plans	Being entrepreneurial/enterprising ; achieve your personal potential;	Social and community entrepreneurship; entrepreneurship and local regeneration; Futures
Educator capabilities	Knowledge Judgement Expertise	Flexibility Individualism Discovery Making it happen	Managing learning environments Scientific method	Motivation and coaching Self-understanding	Freedom, Releasing control Problem-posing Critical thinking Empowering
Educator challenges	Keeping up to date Seeking truth Judging what is important	Democracy Diversity Coordinate all environments	Providing diverse learning environments Systematic Objectivity Accountability	Operating within and outside of institutional constraints Always in transition Options	Letting go; no boundaries Futuristic Getting involved Taking action

Table 2: indicative characteristics of entrepreneurship educator types

This is then helpful in determining relevant assessment modes linked to

appropriate andragogic approaches. The typology also aids the role of the entrepreneurship educator in: identifying key tasks; articulating skills/development needs; emphasising CPD and training; and the selection of entrepreneurship educators. Finally the framework supports the differentiation of entrepreneurship educator roles/programmes from each other and from non-entrepreneurship programmes.

It is worth noting at this point that in the UK we are not starting with a blank piece of paper regards the development of entrepreneurship programmes and educators. For instance, efforts are being made to address this through:

- the Higher Education Academy working with educators across specific subject centres
- CMI working with enterprise facilitators in supporting student enterprise
- UK Science Enterprise Centres supporting educator development in SECs
- National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship is working toward ensuring a national approach to professional entrepreneurship educator development

The context within which we practice our craft is constantly changing and there is a need to recognise and be prepared for the impact of such change on our role as educators. This could be affected through a number of drivers and influencers:

- the cultural and faith diversity of learners
- the globalisation of education
- societal and individual values
- institutional policies
- widening participation and the nature of students
- the deeper integration of technology
- distance education and the role of institutions
- learner control in the learning process
- the widening of the 'educator'

3. Institutional policies

Challenges to policy are many. Indeed there is an underlying fundamental challenge to the overall purpose and role of higher education viz a viz entrepreneurship. Additionally, barriers can affect policy implementation and can impact on approaches to entrepreneurial learning. For instance, in the context of self-directed learning Cross (1981) suggests there are at least "three types of barriers that inhibit adult learning: *Situational barriers* are those arising from one's situation in life at a given time; *Institutional barriers* consist of all those practices and procedures that exclude or discourage participation in educational activities -- inconvenient schedules or locations, full-time fees for part-time study, inappropriate courses of study, and so forth; *Dispositional*

barriers are those related to attitudes and self-perceptions about oneself as a learner" (p. 98).

"For example, an inadequate place to study in the home setting, a situational barrier may prevent a person from taking on an independent learning project. Some learners will have had past negative experiences in educational settings and will believe they are incapable of independent study -- a dispositional barrier. In addition, many administrators have traditional views about education and how courses must be taught, an institutional barrier that prevents them from understanding the potential value for learners of opportunities for self-direction. Sometimes such views are compounded by a desire to "do it the old way" or a feeling that regular, credit courses are the only means of programming that are permissible. In addition, there may even exist a variety of policies or procedures that prevent independent decision-making on the part of the learner regarding such issues as needs, goals, content, and evaluation approaches. Facilitators, program designers, and administrators need to work constantly in attempting to remove or lessen such barriers".

Cross (1981) proposes four situations to overcoming barriers:

1. 'Administrators who can affect decisions regarding education be helped to understand the theory, research, and teaching-learning approaches related to self-direction in learning'

"A related institutional problem centers on the many administrative policies and procedures that may inhibit or even prevent implementation of approaches designed to foster self-direction in learning. For instance, many formal organizations have fairly rigid policies regarding registration, attendance, and the format for classes. Similarly, a number of grading traditions may be in place that penalize adult learners who wish to set their own pace or level of achievement, such as limitations to the use of learning contracts, pass/fail grades, and incomplete grades. In addition, budgetary limitations or standardized approaches to the use of supportive materials in the classroom may make it difficult for teachers to provide a variety of resources for the self-directed learner"

2. 'The teacher of adult learners must spend considerable time and energy fostering change in those institutional policies and procedures that inhibit self-direction in learning. At times this will require courage, persistence, and fortitude in the light of heavy institutional pressure to resist such change.

"A larger problem within educational institutions or even organizations like businesses who sponsor a variety of training programs sometimes exists. This problem is that negative attitudes of inadequately trained educators

frequently become a barrier in the decision-making process. For example, some trainers in an organization may employ only traditional approaches to teaching where the instructor is used primarily as an authority who passes on certain information to trainees. Then, when another trainer attempts to use self-directed learning approaches that call for involving the trainee in the educational process, this becomes threatening to the normal way”

3. All educators of adults receive adequate preparation in adult education principles, beliefs, and instructional approaches. It may be necessary for some beginning adult education teachers to undertake considerable graduate or in-service training so personal philosophies, teaching approaches, and beliefs regarding adults as learners can be reexamined.

“Many adults approaching a learning situation bring to it a variety of negative ideas about education. Some of the institutional obstacles described above have helped to create many of these, but so have the variety of situational barriers that each adult must face from day to day. Thus, a fear of something unknown or different, suspicions about what that so-called facilitator really is trying to do, and a general lack of understanding about personal potential as a learner are factors with which most adult education teachers will have to deal..... some learners will resist such an approach initially because of low self-concepts or past negative learning experiences”

4. Adult education instructors prepare for a wide variety of attitudes about and willingness to participate in self-directed learning. This will require patience, the ability to communicate clearly to learners about the teaching approach being used, and a recognition that the rate of acceptance of self-directed approaches will vary from learner to learner.

In summary,

The understanding of philosophy "does provide a valuable base to help us think more clearly" (Ozmon & Craver, 1981, p. x) about professional practice. In this context, this paper has aimed to highlight a diverse and challenging range of influences on the entrepreneurship educator's role and practice for the purpose of arguing the need for the development of entrepreneurship educators in providing a solid foundation – philosophically, theoretically and conceptually – to their profession. Its aim is not to prescribe any single model but more to suggest the need for foundations and principles that drive our understanding of what we do and why we do it in this way. Many contextual factors will determine the content and appropriateness of particular approaches.

There is a need for continuing development in the field and avoidance of

curricula stagnation which can derive from institutionalised constraints. Keeping pace with other professional educators across a wide range of disciplines will be valuable. Providing leadership in the development of the field of entrepreneurship education will be essential.

1. a need for first principles and understandings of personal philosophies to enhance decision-making and practice
2. a more sophisticated approach to EE design and delivery that acknowledges the wide educational philosophical and conceptual base and the complexity of the learner environment
3. going beyond learning to dance to becoming dancers
4. integrating theory with practice, teaching with research and learning, entrepreneurship with education
5. a national focus on educator development as a priority

Finally, this paper aimed to highlight the need and the challenges for developing our understanding and foundations to our practice as entrepreneurship educators in order to maximise the opportunities for developing students and graduates who feel and are enterprising and entrepreneurial individuals and not only individuals capable of undertaking learned steps and routines, as in Skinner's famous experiment of teaching pigeons to play table tennis. In this sense it is hoped that this personal journey is helpful to others engaged in the practice of entrepreneurship education.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, M. L. and Lindeman, E. C. (1927) *Education through experience* New York:Workers Education Bureau.
- Apps, J. W. (1973) *Toward a working philosophy of adult education* Syracuse, N.Y.:Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education.
- Bechard (1995) Bechard, J.-P. (1995), *Theoretical Foundations of Entrepreneurship Development Programs: Exploratory Study*, Working Paper 95-03-01, HEC, Montreal.
- Bechard and Gregoire (2005) *Entrepreneurship Education Research Re-visited: the case of higher education*, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4:1, 22-43.
- Beder, H. and Carrea, N. (1988) *The effects of andragogical teacher training on adult students' attendance and evaluation of their teachers*, *Adult Education Quarterly*, 38, 75-87.
- Boggs, D. L. (1981) *Philosophies at issue* in B. W. Kreitlow (Ed.) *Examining controversies in adult education* (pp. 1-10). San Francisco:Jossey-Bass.
- Brockett, R. G. and Hiemstra, R. (1991) *Self-direction in adult learning: perspectives on theory, research and practice*, Routledge.

- Brown, H. W. (1985) Lateral thinking and andragogy: Improving problem solving in adulthood, Lifelong learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research 8(7), 22-25.
- Brubacher, J. S. (1969) *Modern philosophies of education* New York:McGraw-Hill.
- Brush, C.G., Duhaime, I.M., Gartner, W.B., Stewart, A., Katz, J. A., Hitt, M. A., Alvarez, S. A., Meyer, G. D. and Venkataraman, S. (2003) Doctoral Education in the Field of Entrepreneurship, Journal of Management, Vol. 29, No. 3, 309-331.
- Bygrave, W. D. (1989) The entrepreneurship paradigm (1): a philosophical look at its research methodologies, Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 14(1), pp7-26.
- Candy, P. C. (1981) *Mirrors of the mind: Personal construct theory in the training of adult educators*, Manchester Monographs 16. Manchester: Department of Adult and Higher Education, University of Manchester.
- Carr, D. (2003) *Making sense of education: an introduction to the philosophy and theory of education and teaching*, RoutledgeFalmer.
- Conti, G. J. and Kolody, R. C. (1998) Development of an Instrument for Identifying Groups of Learners, Proceedings of AERC, San Antonio, Texas. Accessed from http://www.conti-creations.com/phil_guide.htm 25-07-05.
- Covey, S. (1989) *Seven habits of highly effective people: Powerful lessons in personal change* Simon and Shuster:New York.
- Cross, K. P. (1981) *Adults as learners* San Francisco:Jossey-Bass.
- Cunningham, P. M. (1982) Contradictions in the practice of non-traditional continuing education, in S. B. Merriam (Ed.) *Linking philosophy and practice. New directions for continuing education*, No. 15, pp73-86. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass.
- Darkenwald, G. D. and Merriam, S. B. (1982) *Adult education: Foundations of practice* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Elias, J. L. and Merriam, S. (1980) *Philosophical foundations of adult education* Huntington, NY: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company.
- Gilley, J. W., Quatro, S., Hoekstra, E., Wittle, D. D., and Maycunich, A. (2001) *The manager as change agent: a practical guide for high-performance individuals and organizations* Cambridge Mass:Perseus Publishing.
- Habermas, J. (1971) *Knowledge and human interests* Boston:Beacon Press.
- Hannon, P. D. (2005) Philosophies of Enterprise and Entrepreneurship Education and the Challenges for Higher Education in the UK International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation, 6:2, pp105-114, IP Publishing, London, UK
- Hartshorn, C, and P. Hannon, (2002) 'Paradoxes in entrepreneurship education: chalk and talk or chalk and cheese?' Proceedings of the 25th ISBA National Small firms Policy and Research Conference, Competing Perspectives of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, Brighton.
- Hiemstra, R. (2001) *Lifelong Learning: An Exploration of Adult and Continuing Education Within a Setting of Lifelong Learning Needs*, 2nd edition, Fayetteville, New York. HiTree Press.

- Hiemstra, R. (Ed.). (1991) *Creative environments for effective adult learning* (New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, Number 50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Available electronically: <http://www-distance.syr.edu/leindex.html>
- Hiemstra, R. (1988) [Translating personal values and philosophy into practical action](#) in R. G. Brockett (Ed.) *Ethical issues in adult education* (pp. 178-194). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hiemstra, R., & Brockett, R. G. (Eds.) (1994) *Overcoming resistance to self-direction in adult learning* (New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, Number 64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Available electronically: <http://www-distance.syr.edu/ndacesdindex.html>
- Hiemstra, R., & Sisco, B. R. (1990) [Individualizing instruction: Making learning personal, empowering, and successful](#). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kapp (1933)
- Katz (2003)
- Knowles, M. S. (1990) *The adult learner: A neglected species* (4th Ed.). Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Knowles, M. S. (1989) *The making of an adult educator: An autobiographical journey* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Knowles, M. S. (1980) *Modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. Revised and updated. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, Association Press
- Knowles, M. (1975) *Self-directed learning*. New York: Association Press.
- Knowles, M. S. (1970) *Modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus pedagogy*. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, Association Press.
- Knowles, M. S. (1968) Andragogy, not pedagogy! *Adult Leadership*, 16, 350-352, 386
- Knudson, R. S. (1980) An alternative approach to the andragogy/pedagogy issue. *Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years*, 3(8), 8-10.
- Knudson, R. S. (1979) Humanagogy anyone? *Adult Education*, 29, 261-264.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970) *The structure of scientific revolutions* 2nd edition. Chicago. University of Chicago Press
- Lebel, J. (1978) Beyond andragogy to gerogogy. *Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years*, 1(9), 16-18, 24-25.
- Lindeman, E. C. (1926) Andragogik: The method of teaching adults. *Worker's Education*, 4, 38.
- McKenzie, L. (1985) Philosophical orientations of adult educators. *Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research*, 9(1), 18-20.
- Mayfield, W. M. and Weaver, R. Y. (1997) The determination of the teaching methodology of entrepreneurship as established by the underlying philosophy of pragmatism, Proceedings of USASBE Conference.
- Merriam, S. B. (1982) Some thoughts on the relationship between theory and practice. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *Linking philosophy and practice* (New

- Directions for Continuing Education, No. 15, pp. 87-91). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1978) Perspective transformation. *Adult Education*, 28, 100-110.
- Mezirow, J. (1991) *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morris, V. C. and Pai, Y. (1976) *Philosophy and the American School* Boston:Houghton Mifflin
- Ozmon, H. A. and Craver, S. M. (1981) *Philosophical foundations of education* (2nd. Ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Co.
- Sheridan, J. (1989) Rethinking andragogy: The case for collaborative learning in continuing higher education. *Continuing Higher Education*, 37(2), 2-6.
- Winch, C. and Gingell, J. (2004) 'Philosophy and educational policy', RoutledgeFalmer.
- Zinn (1999)
- Zinn, L. M. (1990) Identifying your philosophical orientation, in M. W. Galbraith (Ed.) *Adult Learning Methods*, pp39-77. Malabar, Fla.: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Zinn, L. M. (1983) Development of a valid and reliable instrument for adult educators to identify a personal philosophy of education, Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 1667A-1668A.

Appendix A

The following are based on descriptions of the philosophies in *Philosophical Foundations of Education* by Ozmon and Craver (1981). Accessed from http://www.conti-creations.com/phil_guide.htm 25-07-05.

Idealism holds that *ideas* are the only true reality. This philosophy goes back to ancient Greece and claims greats such as Socrates and Plato. This school seeks to discover true knowledge rather than create it. The aims of the philosophy are to search for truth and further the character development of learners. The role of the teacher is to serve as a guide for immature learners, judge important material, and model appropriate behavior. The instructional process is holistic, seeks to develop critical thinkers, and deals with broad concepts rather than specific skills. This is a content-centered approach to education with a heavy emphasis on seeking universal truths and values and with a strong and defined role for the teacher.

Realism holds that reality exists independent of the human mind; matter in the universe is *real* and independent of man's ideas. This philosophy grew out of the Age of Enlightenment and strongly supports the use of the scientific method. Its aims are to understand the world through inquiry, verify ideas in the world of experience, teach things that are essential and practical, and develop the learner's rational powers. The instructional process seeks to teach fundamentals,

encourage specialization, and teach the scientific method. The role of teacher is to present material systematically, encourage the use of objective criteria, and be effective and accountable. **Behaviorism** is congruent with this broader teacher-centered philosophy.

Pragmatism or **Progressivism** is associated strongly with the works of John Dewey. It seeks to inquire and to then do what works best; that is, it seeks to be *pragmatic*. However, everything centers on the human experience. It seeks to promote democracy by developing strong individuals to serve in a good society. It supports diversity because education is the necessity of life. Its aims are to seek understanding, coordinate all environments into a whole, teach a process of inquiry, and promote personal growth and democracy. The instructional process is flexible with a concern for individual differences and for problem solving and discovery. In this learner-centered approach, the role of teacher is to identify the needs of the learner and to serve as a resource person.

Constructionism is sometimes referred to as **Existentialism** or **Humanism** and draws heavily from the ideas of Carl Rogers. This philosophy focuses on the individual and believes that individuals are always in transition. People interpret the world from their own perceptions and *construct* their own realities. Its aims are to promote self-understanding, involvement in life, an awareness of alternatives, and the development of a commitment to choices. Learning is viewed as a process of personal development which seeks to provide learners with options. The role of the instructor in this learner-centered philosophy is to be a facilitator. The cornerstone of this philosophy is trust between the teacher and learner.

Reconstructionism strongly believes that education can be used in *reconstructing* society. In order to achieve social justice and true democracy, change rather than adjustment is needed. This philosophy is futuristic and takes a holistic view of problems. Its aims are to encourage social activism and the development of change agents. It seeks to empower people to think critically about their world, develop decision-making abilities, get involved in social issues, and to take action. The role of the teacher in this learner-centered philosophy is to help learners develop problem-posing skills and lifelong-learning skills. This school of thought has been greatly influenced by the work of Paulo Freire and Myles Horton.