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Abstract

This study is an attempt to understand the nature of entrepreneurship development programs (EDP) in the light of the major contributions in the field of education. Results of the study identify eight approaches to teaching entrepreneurship, which find their theoretical explanation in as many educative orientations. These orientations are influenced by the way those mainly responsible for designing, implementing and evaluating programs view education, learning, and content. The study ends with an attempt to integrate educational sciences with entrepreneurship theories in order to better grasp the conceptual foundations of the many educative practices employed in the field of entrepreneurship.
Introduction

The training of entrepreneurs is a major concern for school teachers, entrepreneurs trainers, socio economic organizers, public administrators, and international development consultants. All these actors will one day have to face the following questions: Is the teaching institution closed or open to the milieu with regard to the definition, development, and evaluation of program content? What other social partners come within students' orbit? What skills and knowledge are needed to supervise training? What learning goals are being proposed? What place does the student have in the process? Is the goal to sensitize a given population to the phenomenon of entrepreneurship? Are efforts being directed towards the creation of new business enterprises or towards the development of existing businesses? All these questions arise when we are teaching entrepreneurship.

Two expressions are typically used to describe entrepreneurship training programs: "entrepreneurship education" and "small business education." Let’s see how these concepts can help us define our unit of analysis. "Entrepreneurship education," a concept frequently used in American and Canadian entrepreneurship journals, essentially conveys one of two meanings. It refers either to training programs devoted to helping future entrepreneurs start up their business (Vesper, 1982) or to education programs preparing for a career in entrepreneurship (Ronstadt, 1985). In Europe, the expression "small business education" is used to cover four kinds of programs:

- Entrepreneurship education (in the Schumpeterian sense of "carrying up a new combination of elements")
- Education for small business ownership and self employment (reproduction or acquisition of an existing enterprise)
- Continuing small business education (continuing education for owners of small businesses)
- Small business awareness education (education for a career in entrepreneurship)

It is frequent to see that the American and European definitions cut across several possible objectives. If we wish to analyze all the formally structured programs, we will need an expression that casts a wider net. A common definition has been agreed by three international organizations: the International Network of Management Development (INTERMAN), the United Nations Development Program (UNAP), and the International Labour Organization (ILO) in Geneva. The expression recommended for use by these three bodies is "entrepreneurship development program" (EDP), meaning any set of structured courses designed to inform, train, and educate those interested in participating in socio economic development through projects aimed at business awareness and creation or at the teacher training. It is this definition of an EDP that we shall use in our discussion.
Major Questions in Entrepreneurship and Education

An attentive review of the literature in the field of entrepreneurship and education suggests four angles of analysis: teaching content, teaching method, school and community networks, and, finally, educative values.

We can now identify the various kinds of information (know what) needed to start up and manage a small business. But little is known about the intuition (know when); social skills (know whom); technical skills (know how); or attitudes, values, and motives (know why) which determine success. Our research suggests that course content is built more on the trainer's expertise than on the needs of learners, market opportunities, and the business project's stages of development.

We observe that the teaching methods now used favor more observation and theoretical thinking instead of problem solving and the implementation of corrective measures. Though we know the main clienteles attending EDPs, little work has been done on the learning process of these different learners/entrepreneurs.

As far as networks are concerned, we are witnessing a phenomenal growth in administrative infrastructures at both the school and community level (chairs, research centers, journals, foundations, international organizations, support groups, etc.). But there is no specialized pedagogical infrastructure for teaching entrepreneurship, especially at the elementary, secondary, and community levels.

Though some researchers favor "schools" as places to promote entrepreneurial behaviour, others point out that the educational system is limited in its ability to foster the autonomy and creativity needed for entrepreneurship. In the view of the latter, entrepreneurship must be taught outside the structures of the school, college, or university.

An overview of the literature in entrepreneurship and education sheds light on the quantity and diversity of programs devoted to the awareness, creation, and development of businesses, whether in the United States (Vesper, 1985, 1993; NCRVE, 1984), Canada (Robinson, Christensen, 1992); Europe (Dana, 1992); Australia (Gillin, 1991) or developing countries (Buzzard, 1984; Harper, 1984; Loucks, 1988; Wyckham, Wedley, 1989; Interman, 1992).

Despite their quantity and diversity, the quality and effectiveness of these programs remain to be seen (Robinson, Haynes 1991; Plaschka, Welsch, 1990). Evaluative research remains on a case to case basis and indicators focus essentially on participants' satisfaction; on the training's effect on the project, and, finally, on the quality of the management program (Garnier, Gasse, Raynal, 1991; Singh, Singh, 1993; Allen, 1992; Kirby, Mullen, 1990; Price, Monroe, 1993; Patel, 1992).

In order to solve this problem, it would be useful to ask questions about the theoretical foundations of entrepreneurship development programs. It is reasonable to think that understanding the theoretical foundations of each program, leads to choose a methodology suited to their respective evaluation. A body of knowledge has been, for the past 50 years, concerned with the way theory and practice work together in a training context. We are, of course, thinking...
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of the educational sciences and we would now like to show how we have used these contributions in an exploratory study of EDPs.

An Exploratory Study

These are the two questions we propose to answer in this section. What is the testing ground of the present research and what methodology will be used? But first, it would seem important to sketch a brief outline of the important contributions in the field of education. This will allow us to construct a theoretical framework.

Introduction to Education

The Latin etymology of the word "education" refers us to two meanings: "educare" means to nourish and "educere" means to lead forth, to rear. Today, this semantic duality has branched off in four directions. Education is constantly spoken of in terms of the school system, its pedagogical processes, its programs, and its products the educated. To clarify the multidimensional nature of the realities it covers, the concept of "education" thus requires the contributions of several sciences, each with its specific object and method.

According to Mialaret (1991), education includes all the disciplines that study the conditions in which educational situations and facts exist, operate, and evolve. The following disciplines treat the general and local conditions of education: history of education, sociology of education, ethnology of education, school demographics, economy of education, school administration, comparative education, and geography of education. Disciplines analyzing the situations and facts of education are: physiology of education, psychology of education, psychosociology of small groups, communications, didactics and curriculum theories, and methods and techniques of evaluation. Finally, the philosophy of education and educational planning contribute to reflection and exploration in the field of education.

This initial classification leads to observe the wide range of contributions, the differences in their theoretical or practical outlook, and their unanimous choice of a common finality: better education. However, all the knowledge accumulated around the concept "education" is not of the same value. Morin and Brunet (1992) suggest the need to analyze the foundations of the educational sciences. Starting from an epistemological reflection on science, these authors define four levels of knowledge: practical knowledge useful in the development of skills; experimental knowledge useful in the inductive construction of theories; universal knowledge aiding in the deduction of general principles; and wisdom needed for the construction of systems of philosophical thought. For Morin and Brunet (1992), the educational sciences are defined mainly through the prism of practical knowledge of didactics; the experimental knowledge of psychology, biology, sociology, and history; and the metaknowledge of philosophy. These six approaches of knowledge give a very good picture of what education is all about (Table 1).
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Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundations of Educational Sciences</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Morin, Brunet, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meta Knowledge</strong></td>
<td><strong>Philosophy of education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Knowledge</td>
<td>Biology of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Knowledge</td>
<td>Psychology of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Knowledge</td>
<td>Didactics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Didactics, the teaching and learning practices used to attain educative intentions, have evolved greatly over the centuries (De Corte, 1990). Early methods were purely imitative. Then, as schools became institutions, there was the development of a pedagogy for the child which finally led to an andragogy for adults. The progress in educational technologies has also been spectacular, allowing interesting experiments with audio visual and computer equipment. Finally, a lot of research has been devoted to the evaluation of learning, both formative and summative.

The psychology of education has produced a number of instructive studies on learning. From 1880 to 1980, we have seen a good number of studies on conditionning, gestalt, cognitive processes, personality development, and on the cognitive processing of information (Dubé, 1990).

For its part, the sociology of education informs us of the mechanisms by which schools reproduce, adapt, and transform society's values. We now have a better understanding of the four functions of the educational system: (1) socialization; (2) training and selection; (3) change and innovation; and (4) personal and social development (Cloutier, Moisset, Ouellet, 1983).

Studies on the biology of education help us to understand the physiological conditions of any educative act. Studies on the brain and language learning are also very instructive. Parallel to psychology, the biology of education raises questions about the role of the other in the child's development and leads to see man, not as an animal machine or a programmed animal, but as a self-organizing animal (Trocmé Fabre, 1987).

The history of education shows how each civilization and epoch has formally or informally defined the facts, situations, and conditions governing the education of people. Research in this field reminds how much evolution there has been in learning content (hunting, military manoeuvres, arts, sacred scripture, sciences); place of learning (family, community, army, monastery, school, factory); teaching agents (parents, masters, monks, professors, military leaders); and clienteles targeted (children, women, elites, ordinary people, adults) (Gal, 1991).

Finally, the philosophy of education invites to respect the natural mode of learning. The guiding principle is to go from the known to the unknown, from sense knowledge to universal
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knowledge with the help of a master who leads by the hand (Ozmon, Craver, 1986; Elias, Merriam, 1980).

These six fields of knowledge allow to go one step further and develop a theoretical framework capable of decoding the reality of entrepreneurship development programs.

The Theoretical Framework

There are fundamentally three major debates in education; they concern the conception of education, of learning, and of content.

The questions revolving around the first debate are the following: What are the goals of education? What is the role of the school? What is the role of the community? From the second debate on the conception of learning, five questions emerge: What is the role of the teacher? What is the role of the student? What are the teaching/learning strategies to be used? What type of evaluation should be used? What material and pedagogical resources are available? The third debate on the conception of content focuses on finding answers to the four following questions: What are the objectives? What are the elements of content? what are the outcomes? What are the criteria of evaluation?

These three debates have long crystallized the attention of practitioners and theoreticians. Putting it very schematically, we are faced with a conception of education which fluctuates between being school centered and community centered; with a conception of learning which, on the one hand, leaves everything in the teacher's hands and, on the other hand, pays more attention to learners; and, finally, with a conception of content which sometimes focuses on knowledge and skills with no concern for the meaning students may give them and sometimes on integrating knowledge and skills into the student's project.

In constructing a theoretical framework we can imagine entrepreneurship development programs evolving in a conceptual space defined in three dimensions: 1) a conception of education moving from a tightly controlled training context (organizational dynamic) to educative decisions shared by all community partners (psycho social dynamic); 2) a conception of learning where teaching strategies are collective (pedagogical approach) or learning strategies are controlled by learners and adapted to different parts of the program (andragogical approach); 3) a conception of content ruled by content and behavioural objectives (declarative and procedural knowledge) and by situational objectives (conditional knowledge). We would now apply this reflexion to EDP practices.

Testing Ground

Under an agreement between the Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec (MEQ) and HEC's Maclean Hunter Chair of Entrepreneurship, we undertook, in the 1992 93 academic year, an in depth analysis of the implementation process of the MEQ's program entitled "Launching a Business." The hypothesis underlying the project was that this Quebec wide program will adapt to the educative orientation of the trainers from the sixteen regions in which the program is to be offered.
The program lasts 330 hours, 220 of which are devoted to acquiring the skills directly related to mastering the tasks of an entrepreneur and 110 to acquiring broader management skills.

1. Entrepreneurship and training  
   30 hours
2. Definition of a business project  
   30 hours
3. Development of a business plan  
   120 hours
4. Applications of management notions  
   75 hours
5. Applications of sales techniques  
   30 hours
6. Negotiation of financing  
   45 hours

During the pre test, we noted that this program was interesting from more than one point of view. First of all, the content was just as much concerned with awareness of the entrepreneurship phenomenon as with the creation of a new business and the development of an existing business. We then noticed the diversity of the trainers who came from both the academic and business milieu. Finally, the sixteen regions chosen by the MEQ were all at different stages of their local and regional development. This led us to consider that such diversity of content, teachers, and milieus would be a good testing ground for the theoretical framework.

**Research Methodology**

We interviewed twice the sixteen trainer coordinators in their respective school boards throughout Quebec. The first time was during November 1992 and the second in April 1993. Based on interviews, analysis of documents, and questionnaires we were able to characterize the educative practices of the sixteen regions with regard to the teaching of entrepreneurship. These practices reflect the conceptions of education, learning, and content to which groups of teachers give preference in their milieu.

To measure the conception of education, and index called SIM (socio organizational interactions measurement) was developed. This measurement is obtained by identifying, on the one hand, the steps involved in the implementation process common to all the school boards (10 steps) and the different groups of schools and communities involved (13 categories) and, on the other hand, by checking their level of involvement at each step of the process (3 levels of involvement). For each of the ten steps of the process, we add up the contacts that the school board made with its milieu (frequency) and we weight this number by the intensity (1,2,3) attributed to each step. The sum of the ten weighted scores gives us the SIM score. For example, a weak SIM indicates that the school is closed in on itself and makes little use of its community networks to establish the program in its region. By contrast, a high SIM indicates a well developed partnership between the school and its milieu in all the program's decisions.

The conception of learning is measured by the PIM index (pedagogical interactions measurement). We identified four teaching models (lecture model, large interactive group model, interactive subgroup model, and individual supervision model) which vary depending on the level of control the student can exert on the content and the learning process (1,2,3, or 4). We next measure the frequency (in %) with which these teaching/learning strategies are used for each of the program's 6 modules. Then we multiply these frequencies by the level of intensity of the pedagogical model used. Once recoded, the PIM index can be classified as weak, average, or high. For example, a weak PIM indicates that the teacher controls the content and learning process, whereas a high PIM denotes that students strongly influence what and how they learn.
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Finally, the conception of content is measured by the IKM (integration of knowledge measurement). Here it is a matter of identifying the number of hours devoted to the teaching and supervision of student projects. The more hours devoted to teaching, the more declarative and procedural knowledge the trainer transmits to the detriment of hours of supervision devoted to conditional knowledge. By dividing the number of hours of supervision by the number of hours of teaching, we obtain an index which, once recoded, can be classified as weak, average, or high as determined by the choices made by the trainers in each region. A weak IKM indicates that the program is focused on declarative and procedural knowledge with no regard for the transfer of knowledge in the project the student has chosen. On the other hand, a high IKM indicates the predominance of conditional knowledge, meaning that more hours are spent supervising the student's project than teaching content and skills.

Results and their Interpretation

Using a hierarchical ascendent classification, we identified eight broad regional adaptations of the Quebec wide "Launching a Business" program. On the conceptual level, we consider them distinctive educative orientations linked to the main theoretical foundations of education. An educative orientation is a particular vision shared by participants in a program regarding their common conception of education, learning, and content (Miller 1983). Below, we pass in review these various orientations: conformist; internal and external adaptive; self training; self learning; transformative; convivial and, finally, communal. Table 2 presents a synthesis of our results.

Conformist Orientation

Only one school board (ALPHA) falls under this branch of theory. Weak interactions with the milieu show that this organization remains relatively closed and assumes almost exclusive responsibility for training. It does not have a great variety of contacts with local organizations. In class, dialogue is accepted, but the lecture model takes precedence. Knowledge is mainly declarative and procedural. Transfer of knowledge within the business project become less important than the assimilation and application of knowledge.
# Table 2

**Eight Educative Orientations of EDPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conformist Orientation</th>
<th>Internal-adaptive Orientation</th>
<th>Self-learning Orientation</th>
<th>Transformative Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALPH A</td>
<td>BETA GAMMA</td>
<td>IOTA KAPPA</td>
<td>LAMBDA MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Weak socio-organizational interactions</td>
<td>● Average socio-organizational interactions</td>
<td>● Weak to average socio-organizational interactions</td>
<td>● Weak socio-organizational interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Average pedagogical interactions</td>
<td>● Weak to average pedagogical interactions</td>
<td>● High pedagogical interactions</td>
<td>● High pedagogical interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Weak integration of knowledge</td>
<td>● Average integration of knowledge</td>
<td>● Average integration of knowledge</td>
<td>● High integration of knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External-adaptive Orientation</th>
<th>Self-training Orientation</th>
<th>Convivial Orientation</th>
<th>Communal Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DELTA ZETA EPSILON</td>
<td>ETA THETA</td>
<td>XI NU</td>
<td>RHO PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● High socio-organizational interactions</td>
<td>● High socio-organizational interactions</td>
<td>● Average socio-organizational interactions</td>
<td>● Average to high socio-organizational interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Average pedagogical interactions</td>
<td>● Weak pedagogical interactions</td>
<td>● Average pedagogical interactions</td>
<td>● High pedagogical interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Weak to average integration of knowledge</td>
<td>● High integration of knowledge</td>
<td>● High integration of knowledge</td>
<td>● High integration of knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Theoretically interpreted as a conception of education, this orientation strives to transmit values favouring success in the dominant culture, turning the school into an agent of society designed to inculcate the norms of cultural socialization. In this orientation, learning is experienced as a process of accumulating knowledge with no concern for the meaning students might confer on it. The teacher favours collective teaching and controls the external conditions of learning. The student absorbs the subject matter contained in the program and reproduces socially expected behaviours in summative evaluations. Finally, the conformist orientation views content as information useful to live successfully in society. The expected results are defined by the teacher in the content objectives. Evaluation criteria are standardized. This mechanistic type model appears most strikingly in the research undertaken early in the century by behaviourists and later by neo behaviourists. The common thread running through their work is the study of different external and internal stimuli capable of triggering a precise response, an expected behaviour.

**Internal adaptive Orientation**

This orientation is practised by two school boards (BETA and GAMMA). Socioorganizational interactions are average and pedagogical interactions go from weak to average. There is only average integration of knowledge. The goal is the development of the student's global potential in the democratic context of a class. The orientation takes an ecological approach which seeks to establish a certain equilibrium in the internal environment of the class. Learning is a process of construction of knowledge through problem solving. The individual teaching method is favoured, where different answers to the same question are sought. The student's learning pace is respected and the steps of the process receive as much attention as the course content. Both quantitative and qualitative evaluations are used. This educative orientation draws its meaning from studies on cognitive psychology which have shown the importance of the learning process.

**External adaptive Orientation**

Three school boards fall into this category (DELTA, ZETA, and EPSILON). Theoretically, the conceptions of content and learning are the same as those in the internaladaptive orientation presented above. But in this universe, interactions with the milieu are fundamental. While suitable attention is given to class experience and the integration of learning, the goal here is balanced exchange with local agents. The latter are invited to collaborate in students' academic and para academic life. Recent contributions in the cognitive sciences have shed light on the concepts of the cognitive map and the socio cognitive conflict underlying any construction of interactions with the environment.

**Self training Orientation**

Two school boards lean favor a self training orientation (ETA and THETA). We find high socio organizational interactions, weak pedagogical interactions, and a high level of integration of knowledge. As a conception of education, this orientation shares and facilitates access of and sharing the partners resources; as a conception of learning, it downplays class interactions. Everything is centered on the student's project which interfaces with all the other
partners from the milieu. In class, basic information is transmitted, but the student is left to integrate this knowledge without the help of supervision. The self training orientation is rooted in anarchism and the class conflict. Contributions carrying this banner are those concerned with institutional analysis.

**Self learning Orientation**

Two school boards take an approach typical of this orientation (IOTA and KAPPA). It is characterized by weak to average interactions with the milieu, an average level of integration of knowledge, but by a high level of pedagogical interactions.

In this vision of education, teachers assemble school resources around the learner and encourage partners to share responsibilities in defining content, formulating goals, selecting resources, and establishing learning pace. The self-learners are, in fact, responsible for managing their own learning situation. But, unlike the self training orientation, knowledge is less strongly integrated into the unifying context of a project. Many things are learned for the simple pleasure of learning and self development. Theoretical foundations are found in several scientific disciplines such as biology, physics, and philosophy which advocate radical change both in the individual and society. This has led to a renewal of educative practices for both young and adult learners.

**Transformative Orientation**

Here, we find two school boards (LAMBDA and MU). They are characterized by rather weak socio organizational interactions. However, they are high on both pedagogical interactions and integration of knowledge. Education is viewed as seeking to develop a positive self image and personal skills. The school and the milieu provide students with a wealth of resources to encourage them to develop their own perceptions of and solutions to life's problems. Learning is a personalized process of appropriating knowledge where the teacher serves as a guide. Students develop their interests, give and receive criticism, and are supposed to be self motivating. Training is seen as a never ending process in which self evaluation is a fundamental element. Finally, content is essentially defined in terms of conditional knowledge. To characterize this orientation, we turn to humanist and gestaltist psychology which favours the development of the whole person.

**Convivial Orientation**

Two school boards can be grouped under this orientation (XI and NU). These boards are average in their interactions with their milieu and students. But they provide a high degree of integration of knowledge as linked to each student's business project. In this vision of education, the program is a combination of knowledge, know how, and social skills democratically negotiated by a group sharing the same passion. Though all share the same program of studies, each participant expects to achieve different results according to his own pace, capacities, and level of motivation. This orientation implies that learning is a process of appropriating knowledge through the articulation of experiences occurring in a group which shares common interests. A leader assists in the interactions to facilitate the exchange of information and
personal views. The learners listen to each other, generously share their experiences, and constantly evaluate what helps them make progress. Education is here conceived as a means of promoting groups through valorizing networks organized around centers of interest. All the organizations of the milieu offer their support and expertise to develop the technical and social skills of the learning group. Here, we make reference to the important work done on change in small groups and the philosophical reflection underlying contemporary adult education.

Communal Orientation

Two school boards (RHO and PI), with their average to high socio organizational interactions, high pedagogical interactions, and high integration of knowledge, follow this orientation.

Here participants promote regional development by solving problems rooted in day to day reality. All educative resources are made available to ensure the socio political and economic development of the region. Learning is conceived as a process through which one becomes aware of problems; looks for short and long term solutions; and learns to manage the development of a territory. A social organizer involved in local issues encourages people to attend meetings, to become involved in decision making, and to help bring about change. Content is conceived of as a combination of knowledge, know how, social skills, and perceptiveness generated by the people of the region to solve their development problems. Content is original and well adapted to local realities. This educative orientation is supported by the great strides made in creating more open schools and in literacy programs for adults.

In sum, the presentation and interpretation of our results suggest eight ways of teaching the program under study. These eight approaches have found echoes in as many different theoretical orientations. Let's go one step further and construct a synthesis allowing us to understand all the EDPs.

Synthesis of the Theoretical Foundations of EDPs

How can we regroup these eight regional adaptations of the Quebec entrepreneurship development program? The notions of type and paradigm will help us along here, both in the area of education and of entrepreneurship theories.

Types of Entrepreneurship Development Programs

Pairing up the educational orientations reviewed, we can identify four broad types of adaptation of the national program under study: institutional, reticular, didactic, and, finally, regionalist.

The institutional type cuts across the conformist and internal adaptive orientations. On the whole, it has an average level of socio organizational interactions, average pedagogical interactions, and average integration of knowledge.
As compared to the institutional type, the reticular type shows a 54.7% increase in socioorganizational interactions, an 11.7% drop in pedagogical interactions, and a 21.8% increase in the integration of knowledge. The reticular type is thus characterized by a high SIM, a weak PIM, and an average IKM. Its theoretical foundations are to be found in externaladaptive and self training orientations.

As compared to the institutional type, the didactic type posts a 19.8% drop in socioorganizational interactions, but one notes a 37.8% increase in pedagogical interactions, and a significant 42% jump in the integration of knowledge. The didactic type is thus characterized by a weak SIM, a high PIM, and an average IKM. Four school boards are associated with the didactic type whose theoretical foundations are linked to self learning and transformative orientations.

Still using the institutional type as a point of comparison, the regionalist type shows a 31.1% increase in socioorganizational interactions, a 16.5% gain in pedagogical interactions, and a phenomenal 79% surge in the integration of knowledge. The regionalist type is characterized by an average SIM, a high PIM and a high IKM. This type is also linked to two different theoretical orientations: convivial and communal.

These four broad types of regional adaptations of the "Launching a Business" program find a favourable echo in curriculum theories. Hameyer (1991) identifies four kinds of curriculum theories: curriculum legitimization, curriculum implementation, structural curriculum, and process curriculum.

Curriculum legitimization theories focus on the study of the arguments justifying some particular subject matter. Integrating new knowledge into the school system requires the construction of a rationale, which may emanate from moral principles, negotiations, or the advice of experts. Analyzing the need for justification highlights the permanent growth in knowledge and the dissatisfaction with existing programs. We think that the institutional type described above corresponds to these theoretical concerns.

Curriculum implementation theories examine the conditions prevalent during curriculum change. The two basic questions asked are: Who will work with this new curriculum? How will this network of people test teaching and learning methods? The reticular type shares these kinds of interrogations.

Structural theories are concerned with two basic questions: (1) How should educational content be selected and justified? (2) How should knowledge be organized in a curriculum? These concerns perfectly match our didactic type.

Process theories view curriculum as a process of interaction and development whose adaptations include all dimensions of change, whether individual, institutional, or social. The goal is to promote both the assimilation and adaptation of knowledge at all levels. These theories coincide with what we have called the regionalist type.

The foregoing represents the first level of synthesis of the eight orientations of the EDPs. We shall now pursue our theoretical reflection and ask what links there are between the broad paradigms in the fields of education and entrepreneurship.
Paradigms of Entrepreneurship Development Programs

In the field of education, we can easily identify two conflicting paradigms: that of the industrial society and that of the educative society. The theories and practices constituting the field of entrepreneurship can also be linked to two broad paradigms: that of the economy of entrepreneurs and that of the society of entrepreneurs. Remember that Kuhn (1983) defines a paradigm as a set of beliefs or of generalizations and values. A paradigm includes a conception of knowledge; a conception of relations between persons, society, and nature; a set of values and interests; a way of doing things; and a general sense of meaning. These parameters define a given social groups potential for action and orient its social and practical practices, thereby ensuring its coherence and relative unanimity.

Industrial Society and Education

Born in the XVIIIth century industrial revolution, this society would gradually help to shape a dominant vision in education that Bertrand and Valois (1992) call the industrial paradigm. This paradigm stresses material progress and economic and technological development. From this angle, knowledge is understood under a rational mode, with an accent on the scientific method, objectivity, and quantitative measurement. Skills crystallize around mechanisms of accumulation (market strategy), of industrialization (system of production), of utilitarianism, and of technological and scientific imperatives. The vision of man is often reductionist, subordinated to an external model and to society as a whole. Economic interests dominate psycho social perceptions and, with the help of the meritocracy, shape the values of an industrial society bent on maintaining the established order.

This view of men and society leads us to think that education must be mainly provided by institutions named "schools", "colleges," and "universities". The paradigm of the industrial society favours collective, individualized, or personalized teaching. No matter what training objective is pursued, this paradigm leads teachers to stress information. The pedagogical relationship is asymmetrical and students must meet institutional standards of evaluation. Furthermore, organizational concerns about controlling resources and adapting the educational system to society's needs play a major role.

Educative Society and Education

Faure (1972), in his famous UNESCO report "Learning To Be," introduces the concept of the educative society: drawn from Plato's Republic, it means that any economic, political, social, cultural, and religious entity will, in addition to its own role, assume educative functions that collaborate with, complement, or replace the school. Man is perceived as a being who learns throughout his life and the basic objective is that all social agents should actualize the potential of each man. The kind of education whose objective it is to form a man capable of confronting a more and more demanding universe must be global and continuing. It is not a matter of occasionally mastering some pieces of definitive information, but of preparing to spend a lifetime in pursuit of constantly evolving knowledge and of learning to be.

It is essential to stress that the educative society paradigm no longer considers the school as the main site for personal training. The educative process is characterized by a dynamic
relation with society as a whole. It is decompartmentalized, liberated; it explodes in time (basic, recurrent, and ongoing training) and in space (inside and outside the school in all learning situations). This vision both continues and makes a clean break with the industrial society paradigm. Basically, it breaks with that vision in its resolutely "deschooled" stance where what is sought is rather the total blossoming of the person in a perspective of global development.

If, in education, the industrial society and the educative society are the two poles around which the major debates crystallize, what is the case in the field of entrepreneurship?

**Economy of Entrepreneurs and Entrepreneurship**

Following Drucker (1985), we say that the dominant paradigm in the field of entrepreneurship is that of the economy of entrepreneurs. This paradigm considers the phenomenon of entrepreneurship strictly from the economic viewpoint and more particularly from that of the creation of businesses. We can say that the paradigm of the economy of entrepreneurs rides on three sets of forces: 1) economic forces regulating trade; (2) psychocultural forces determining the entrepreneurs psychological and cultural traits; and (3) organizational forces which are shaped by market opportunities.

**Society of Entrepreneurs and Entrepreneurship**

Similarly, the paradigm of the society of entrepreneurs is also defined by three sets of forces: (1) economic forces of innovation characterized by discontinuity; (2) psychocultural forces permitting innovative behaviour and social change; and (3) organizational forces forged through networks. This vision of entrepreneurship is much broader than that proposed by the paradigm of the economy of entrepreneurs. Yet, it is the latter which clearly predominates in the literature.

Now, keeping an eye on table 3, we would like to bring together the various threads of our reflection. We can safely say that the paradigm of the economy of entrepreneurs displays affinities with the paradigm of the industrial society and that these two paradigms constitute the large family of entrepreneurship development programs of the institutional and reticular types. The paradigm of the society of entrepreneurs coincides with the paradigm of the educative society and, together, they set the limits of didactic and regionalist EDPs. In our opinion, this model sheds new light on the multitude of educative practices in entrepreneurship development.
TABLE 3
Theoretical Foundations of EDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>EDP of Institutional type</th>
<th>EDP of didactic type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Economic forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psycho-cultural forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organizational forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Paradigm of the economy of entrepreneurs
- Paradigm of the industrial society
- Paradigm of the educative society
- Education
  - Conception of education
  - Conception of learning
  - Conception of content

Paradigm of the society of entrepreneurs
Conclusion

While aware that an exploratory study based on a small sample is inherently limited in its validity and possibility of reproduction, we can suggest three avenues for future research. Based on our results regarding the four types of EDPs and their definitions, we can construct a matrix for use in classifying EDPs. As abscissa, we find the four types of programs (institutional, reticular, didactic, and regionalist) and, as ordinates, we identify the four program objectives (sensitization, creation, development of a business, and basic career training including that of a teacher). This framework can be tested on a larger sample which would be representative of the diversity of EDPs worldwide. This long term effort could run parallel to another basic task, that of evaluating the programs. We still know little on this subject: Are programs of good quality and are they effective? It may be hypothesized that the evaluation of a EDP will depend on its place in the classification suggested. Should all EDPs be evaluated in the same way?

As to the impact of EDPs, this research suggests that trainers and their educative orientation are key elements in an entrepreneurship development program. We are of the opinion that it is imperative to develop research action on the training of these teachers, using, among other things, the concepts of this study. We are thus left with three openings to explore over the coming years in the fields of entrepreneurship and education. Here too, the sciences of education will be useful in generating meaningful reflection.
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