Australian Journal of Teacher Education

Volume 33 | Issue 2 Article 6

2008

# Enterprise in the New Zealand Curriculum and its Challenge to Ethical Teacher Professionality.

Leon Benade
*Mockingbird Education Management Consultants, Auckland*

# Enterprise in the New Zealand Curriculum and its Challenge to Ethical Teacher Professionality[1]

Leon Benade[2]
Mockingbird Education Management Consultants
Auckland, New Zealand

Abstract: The release in 2006 by the New Zealand Ministry of Education of a Draft national Curriculum set for release in November 2007 challenges schools and teachers to evolve their role to align with the priority to 'embed' enterprise values and methodologies. These values and methodologies will be expressed in curricula that school communities will develop locally in line with the new national Curriculum. This paper contextualises the place of 'enterprise' in the Draft New Zealand Curriculum of 2006 and considers some modifications in the final version released in November 2007. The possible impact of an emphasis on enterprise for teacher education is considered before evaluating 'enterprise' in reference to the occupational role of teachers, expressed here as their 'teacher professionality', following the work of Hoyle & John (1995). This paper extends the concept of 'professionality' to what is termed 'ethical teacher professionality'. It concludes by giving thought to how an enterprise focus in the New Zealand Curriculum challenges teacher education and the concept of ethical teacher professionality.

## Introduction

The release in 2006 by the New Zealand Ministry of Education of a Draft national Curriculum set for release in November 2007 challenges schools and teachers to evolve their role to align with the priority to 'embed' enterprise values and methodologies. These values and methodologies will be expressed in curricula that school communities will develop locally in line with the new national Curriculum. This paper contextualises the place of 'enterprise' in the Draft New Zealand Curriculum of 2006 and considers some modifications in the final version released in November 2007. The possible impact of an emphasis on enterprise for teacher education is considered before evaluating

[1] An earlier version of this paper was read at the 2007 Conference of the Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia held in Wellington, NZ.
[2] Author can be contacted at: info@mockingbird.co.nz

'enterprise' in reference to the occupational role, expressed here as their 'teacher professionality', following the work of Hoyle & John (1995).

This paper will however extend this notion to one of 'ethical teacher professionality', and attempt to suggest a conception of teachers' work that requires teachers to operate altruistically for that work to be deemed ethically professional. On this conception, teachers' work is required to be other-centred, informed by an understanding of duty and be inspired by service. It will be suggested here that teachers can be faithful to other-centredness and enterprise, but that teachers philosophically opposed to the concept of enterprise will be unable to fulfil the responsibility requirements of duty, even though they will feel obliged to deliver on the Curriculum promise to teach students to be enterprising. Similarly, one of the implied objectives of enterprise studies, namely to motivate students to become materially independent, seems out of place with the non-material service aspect of altruism.

This paper concludes by giving thought to how an enterprise focus in the New Zealand Curriculum challenges teacher education and the concept of ethical teacher professionality.

## Enterprise in the Draft New Zealand Curriculum

'Enterprise' is now commonly used to categorise a set of dispositions that has as much to do with creativity, being willing to think and act laterally, and taking initiative, as it does to refer to economic ideas such as entrepreneurial risk-taking and exploiting business opportunities.

In the Ministry of Education's Draft for Consultation 2006, enterprise is embedded in the 'Key Competency' of 'Managing Self': "Students who can manage themselves are enterprising, resourceful, reliable, and resilient… They have strategies for meeting challenges and know when and how to follow someone's lead or to make their own, well-informed choices." (Ministry of Education, 2006, p. 11). This suggests that the disposition of 'enterprise' can be attained by inculcating habits, behaviours or ways of thinking through learning experiences that will treat students as independent learners who have pre-acquired knowledge and are taught to be resilient and self-reflective.

These considerations are the stock-in-trade of modern conventional school-education wisdom, articulated in the form of inquiry learning, co-contructivist models of teaching and learning and metacognition. When considering school curriculum design, the Draft Curriculum (2006, p. 26) guides teachers to 'significant themes' that could be used to integrate the 'Key Competencies' and the 'Learning Areas" (curriculum content). One of these suggested themes is 'enterprise':

> students explore what it is to be innovative and entrepreneurial. Through their learning experiences, they develop the understandings, skills, competencies, and attributes that equip them to be innovative. They can identify, create, initiate, and successfully manage personal, community, business, and work opportunities, including working for themselves. (2006, p. 26)

Although this extract does not indicate what it may be to be 'innovative', it will be assumed here that this characteristic suggests that an innovative student is creative, resourceful and able to sense an opportunity where perhaps others may not. Furthermore, such a student is able to be novel or unique or to develop a novel or unique concept that could become a tangible asset or that may have a tangible effect in policy or action.

The ability to be 'entrepreneurial' is not dissimilar, that is to say, a successful entrepreneur ought to be innovative. In addition, it may be suggested that an entrepreneur is a resilient risk-taker willing to venture capital to grow and develop an opportunity for personal gain and hopefully, for the benefit of others, possibly by providing employment.

Many teachers engage in classroom practice that encourages independent learning, creativity and actively encourage habits of self-discipline in their students and thus would support the references to learning experiences that encourage 'managing self' and those to the qualities of 'innovation'. However, many may stop short at the qualities of the 'entrepreneur' just outlined. These are the teachers who will feel intellectually and morally compromised by having to provide learning experiences that could nurture entrepreneurialism. Aside from whether it is appropriate to teach such qualities because of their strong links to individualistic economic norms, many will hold the view that entrepreneurialism is 'caught, not taught', or that most children do not have the innate qualities that such a disposition demands.

The question must also be raised of what effects an entrepreneurial focus in the daily curriculum lives of schools will have on pre-service preparation and indeed, in-service support, of teachers. If teachers are required to inculcate habits of mind and to develop in their student's skills required for those students to become enterprising and/or entrepreneurial, then they too must form, develop and demonstrate these same habits and skills. It was suggested above that 'innovation' is linked to the idea of creativity, and thus a brief reflection on 'creativity' is apposite here.

What may be likely to occur is that in response to the imperative to produce teacher graduates who have to be 'creative' so that they can teach their students to be enterprising and innovative, faculties and colleges of education preparing teachers for service in schools will see the solution in establishing atomistic courses in 'creativity', 'innovation' or 'enterprise', leading to a bifurcation of 'education' and 'creativity'. Faculties and colleges of education reacting this way would be responding in a peculiarly instrumentalist manner that runs counter to creativity as an expression of the human ability to bring together imagination, ideas, possibilities and materials and to see in their nexus fulfilment of self-potential. An 'education' programme that fails to treat 'creativity' as an integrated feature of what should be a holistic and intrinsically valuable experience for individual students may suggest that such a programme is only about ticking the correct boxes so that students can 'get a qualification' that allows them to 'get a job'.

Instead, teacher education programmes should be holistic and well-integrated around a concept or theory of 'problem-posing education' that realises the vocation of people who are authenticated "…only when engaged in inquiry and creative transformation" (Freire, 1970, p. 65). In

such programmes, there could be no place for atomistic courses in 'creativity' for reasons already outlined. Education programmes that are 'problem-posing' challenge students' settled beliefs and existing prejudices and attempt to open up their thinking to new possibilities for what can take place in the classroom and school. Only transformed students can hope to become transformative teachers; otherwise they are mere service functionaries in schools that 'are set up as delivery systems to market official ideas and [that do] not develop critical thinking' (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 8).

## Contextualising the Curriculum

The New Zealand education community and the wider community were given the opportunity to comment on a Draft Curriculum in 2006, which was introduced in final form in November 2007. This policy document has been several years in the making, and now supersedes the earlier Curriculum Statements by Learning Area that progressively made their appearance since Mathematics in 1992 and English in 1994. The Draft Curriculum combines all existing Learning Areas into one document and adds an eighth, Languages. The Ministry of Education website, Te Kete Ipurangi (www.tki.org.nz) carries a significant body of information, research and case studies pertaining to the New Zealand Curriculum. This includes a detailed section of so called 'long submissions' on the Draft made by individuals, schools and other institutions. In addition, the results of contracted research and analysis of these submissions is also available (Ministry of Education, 2007a). The evidence of 'long' submissions may be a sign of frustration felt by some, given the extent to which consent was manufactured in the consultation process, especially through the feedback questionnaire. The questions posed assumed the Draft to be acceptable at a philosophical level and dealt instead with technicalities such as whether the document was flexible enough or easy enough to understand, and the responses were tick box, and limited comment to a few lines.

According to TKI, over 9000 feedback questionnaires were received, almost 800 'short' submissions (less than 3 pages in length) and almost 170 'long' submissions (more than 3 pages) were received (2007a). Contractors included Colmar Brunton, a major Australian market research company; the Australian Council for Education Research (ACER); Le Métais Consulting, a UK-based consultancy; and Lift Education, a New Zealand consultancy. Independent academic critiques were also invited. The TKI site therefore now presents a considerable body of collected data and analyses, both qualitative and quantitative.

What is striking is the lack of importance that the concepts 'enterprise' and 'entrepreneurialism' appear to have in these various submissions. In their paper however, the Lift researchers, whose task it was to provide qualitative and quantitative analysis of the 'long' submissions do note that one of the 'common themes' is an 'economic focus' (Watson, Bowen, Tao, & Earle, 2006, p. 20). Nevertheless, of 133 submissions that commented on these common themes (and some commented on more than one theme), only 19 (or 14%) actually referred to the 'economic focus' of

the Curriculum (2006, p. 20). Unsurprisingly, the positive views of the philosophical dimension of this focus (ie as an item of value) are expressed by stakeholders such as Business New Zealand, Enterprise New Zealand Trust and the Employers and Manufacturers Association (EMA), whist reservations are expressed by schools and academic institutions (Watson, Bowen, Tao, & Earle, 2006, pp. 27-28), where individual or group respondents may be expected to hold views more critical of government economic policy intruding into schooling. Further concerns expressed relate to the low profile given to the curricular aspects of Accounting, Economics and financial literacy, and these are expressed by teachers of those subjects and the business bodies referred to above.

It should be a matter of some concern that so few respondents commented critically on the 'economic focus' because this focus reveals the real intent of the Curriculum, namely that it will be a vital tool in the creation of a workforce that will enable New Zealand to remain competitive in global markets. Any discussions, therefore, around the aims of education in New Zealand would have to take cognisance of this point. Given that the 'economic focus' is ***the focus*** of the Curriculum as will be explained shortly, far wider and more substantial response might have been expected. This dearth of response suggests either acquiescence with this strategic alignment of the Curriculum, or that the economic focus was sufficiently well disguised to have escaped the notice of most respondents.

The Curriculum regards schooling as preparation of the young to be 'lifelong learners' who have to be able to 'achieve success in a constantly changing world' (Ministry of Education, 2006 Foreword) whilst contributing to New Zealand's economy and transforming New Zealand into a 'knowledge-based society' (2006, p. 8). It articulates a vision that has been progressively spelt out in New Zealand since the early 1990s which is informed by Human Capital Theory. Essentially, this line of thinking sees education as a lynchpin in securing economic success for individual and society both at home and on the global stage. There is however a dubious linearity between school success and economic success for the individual. This is in part due to crude thinking that views individual choice to be always aligned to economic motives and a concomitant failure to recognise the role of culture and politics as contributors to individual decision-making.

Human Capital Theory has led to a heightened sense that the role of the individual has supplanted the role of the community. The purposes of schooling have shifted from a greater concern with the creation of a democratic community of citizens to a concern with the creation of citizens adjusted to living in a globally competitive democratic community. This shift illustrates the shift from social consensus politics to neoliberal, 'new Right' politics in the late 1980s and into the 1990s.

The electoral success of the Labour Party in 1999 and the introduction to New Zealand politics of Labour-led governments in the previous 8 years has not seen a return to the politics of old, but rather to the politics of the 'Third Way' that has given neoliberalism a kinder face (O'Neill, 2005). Following the lead set by the Blair Labour government in the United Kingdom, New Zealand Labour cemented its position in the polls by

occupying and domesticating some of the ideological ground commonly associated with neoliberalism and conservative capitalist politics, but tempered this position with a range of 'family friendly' legislation, thus maintaining some commitment to community and welfare. Labour has secured this position by compromising with parties both to its left and right. Therefore, it is making an increasing commitment to environmental politics at the same time as it has made overtures to the business world. These (contradictory) strains are evident in the Draft Curriculum that refers to its vision of young people making a contribution to the growth of New Zealand's economy *and* its valuing of community and participation and care for the environment (2006, pp 8 & 10), thus displaying a 'pragmatic commitment to a technoprofessional education of the working class' (Freire, 1996, p. 114).

The Curriculum that presupposes a vision of 'Left modernising' government over the cruder new Right formulations of the 1980s and early 1990s (Brown & Lauder, 1996) now requires schools to provide personalised learning to individual students who will become flexible workers and entrepreneurs whilst also being lifelong learners. It is a document that is very thin on detail and it has already been noted in this paper that its feedback questionnaire manufactures consent by failing to probe the philosophical basis of the Curriculum.

Careful analysis of the 'Reports, Critiques and Analyses' section of the TKI site (2007a) reveals that in fact not only was the nature of the questionnaire designed to manufacture consent by an emphasis on technical issues, but that the contracted reports were strictly limited by the contract mandate from the Ministry of Education, meaning that none of the contributions were able to or even attempted to tackle the Curriculum critically (certainly not even the 'critiques', which are in praise of the Curriculum). These various reports merely reflect the work of others in analysing the submitted questionnaires and 'long submissions'. In his analysis, Flockton (2007) seems to imply that there could be some concerns, but suggests that many "… of the issues… are entwined in political/social/cultural issues, many represent advocacy for submitter mission… [and]… a number take viewpoints that may not be shared by wider constituencies of educational interest…." (2007, p. 2). It may therefore be assumed that this paper represents 'advocacy for submitter mission'!

Enterprise concepts mirror a greater commercial focus in education which in turn has led to an increasingly vocational curriculum. Not only are commercial firms invited to participate in schools through sponsorship (Gordon & Whitty, 1997) and by providing naming rights (eg the Bairds Mainfreight School in Otara, south Auckland) but they are increasingly involved in education through vocational programmes such as 'Gateway'. This initiative was piloted in 2001 by Skill New Zealand (now the Tertiary Education Commission) and places students into the workplace environment where they get work experience and are assessed in the workplace (Vaughan & Kenneally, 2003). Teachers are now increasingly likely to have at least some teaching responsibility in an area that is vocational, rather than academic. Schools offer subjects such as Tourism and Travel and Employment Skills. Whereas previously these subjects

may have formed part of a 'Transition to Work' programme for just some students, now they are offered as stand alone subjects in competition with regular academic subjects. Unwittingly, teachers in New Zealand now find themselves in the role of 'occupational trainers' on an ever-increasing scale, contributing to a curriculum that can be narrowly tailored, potentially restricting future life choices dramatically.

This narrowness is nowhere more evident than in the barren epistemology of achievement outcomes that pervades the content of what is taught in schools. Herein lies the steady erosion of the work of teachers to a core of technical skills secured through steady adherence to 'quality teaching' indicators such as those presented in the tradition of teacher effectiveness researchers including Alton-Lee (2003). This Ministry of Education research has such a tight knit with the articulation of 'Effective Pedagogy' in the draft Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2006, p 24) as to create a seamless garment. The focus on outcomes erodes not only the broader opportunities for creative teacher work, but also the opportunities for broader, holistic learning by students, especially in the secondary environment.

The thinking that underpins the new Curriculum also forms a seamless garment with government thinking as seen in other contexts. A recent commissioning of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) by the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology (MoRST) and the Ministry of Economic Development led to the *OECD Review of Innovation Policy: New Zealand* (2007). This report notes that "[h]ighly skilled and educated people are indispensable for an innovative, knowledge-based economy" (2007, p 81). In its press release, the Ministry of Economic Development quoted government minister, Trevor Mallard, as saying that "[b]usinesses succeed through a culture of innovation, adaptability and risk taking. We need great inventors with great ideas, and ways of transforming those ideas into products and processes that will make a difference to our economic development" (Ministry of Economic Development, 2007). This commitment to such clearly defined outcomes for education will have a bearing on teachers' work, and it is to the likely disjuncture between one conception of that work and the call to enterprise that this paper now turns. Before doing that, however, a short comment by way of update is necessary.

Since this paper was first written, the final version of the New Zealand Curriculum has been published, in November 2007 (Ministry of Education, 2007b). The concept of 'enterprise' remains embedded as a central element of the 'Managing Self' key competency. Whereas the Draft suggested integrating teaching and learning in the school curriculum through 'significant themes' such as enterprise, the final Curriculum document now refers to 'Future Focus' as an integrating principle, which continues to have 'enterprise' as one of its elements. In respect of these particular aspects, there has been little change to the substance of the Draft, although as an articulated statement of policy, the New Zealand Curriculum is clearer and more purposeful than the Draft.

It is possible now to consider some reflections on the bifurcation that may exist between ethical teacher professionality and the obligation

schools now have to pursue 'enterprise' as a defining principle of their curricula.

## Ethical teacher professionality

Hoyle and John (1995) use the term 'professionality' "…to refer to that set of knowledge, skills, values and behaviours which is exercised on behalf of clients" (p. 16). Notwithstanding the discordant use of the term 'clients' which may have a home in the notion of 'enterprise' being challenged by this paper, the term 'professionality' has been adapted here in preference to 'teaching as a profession' partly for stylistic reasons but mainly to note that the implication of the clumsy 'teaching as a profession' suggests that whatever meaning may be ascribed to 'profession' is ascribed *to* its members by implication. 'Professionality' as used here is both an identifier and a descriptor that suggests a sense of *being* reflecting an active commitment to what the concept entails, rather than a passive acceptance of being-ascribed-by. Professionality suggests that identity as a teaching professional is therefore actively forged and developed by practice as a teacher. So-called 'classical' definitions of professions suggest that they are occupations based on knowledge, autonomy and a sense of public service. It is this third element that is of some interest in this paper, as it is a key source of the 'ethical' component of teacher professionality.

*Knowledge* is a readily acceptable criterion of teacher professionality – teachers require a body of knowledge and a range of competencies and skills unique to teaching to do their work. This knowledge will be regarded by teachers as esoteric, and although the general public may think it 'knows' what teachers do (after all, everyone has been a student or is a parent of school-goers), teachers will realise that they have more intimate knowledge of forms of assessment, what the assessment means and how it can be interpreted, of methods for dealing with challenging classroom behaviours or perhaps of policies and their impacts on schemes of work, to suggest a few examples.

The criterion of *autonomy* is contested as teachers are not autonomous in the sense of dictating income, hours of work and who they teach. Teachers are however autonomous to some extent in that they may make decisions about aspects of a course to emphasise, the order of topics to be covered and the time to be spent covering those. This autonomy is however moderated when the teacher has to work in the confines of a subject department or syndicate that may be setting this agenda, although in this sense, the teachers of that department or syndicate exercise a corporate autonomy, making these decisions collectively. At another level higher, that departmental autonomy will be curbed by decisions made by Senior Management that could require, for example, that all departments or syndicates in the school adhere to specific guidelines for assessment.

The *public service* criterion is also contested. To explain this criterion, it will be illuminating to remain with Hoyle & John (1995), who refer to *responsibility,* distinguished by the authors from accountability, the former as a 'divergent principle' and the latter as a 'convergent principle',

it being 'responsibility' by which teachers ensure that the interests of their students are met (p. 128). This notion of 'responsibility' will be extended in this paper through the suggestion that an account of teacher professionality must have a bias for *altruism.* A case will therefore be made that 'ethical teacher professionality' be based on altruism, without which ethical teacher professionality is not possible, and equally, that teaching cannot be considered a profession if not ethical.

Teaching is assumed in this paper to be an *ethical* activity because it is value-laden and normative, for the reason that it is concerned with the hopes, dreams and aspirations of students and because it is a political activity. It is a political activity because teaching is situated in a context that is directly influenced by policy and in response teaching could conscientise students to be critical thinkers in one context whilst it could serve the interests of a dominant socio-political class in another. There is no neutral pedagogy (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 13).

Altruism is underpinned by a sense of 'the other', duty and service. Having a sense of 'the other' means that one acts out of concern for other people rather than out of concern for one's own interests or, for example, those of the Ministry of Education. Teachers are in a position to make a positive impact on the lives of their students. Faced with a curriculum that calls on teachers to ensure that their students are 'enterprising, resourceful, reliable and resilient', how does the altruistic teacher, with a view to 'the other' respond? It is not an entirely convincing argument to dismiss this curriculum statement as 'apple pie and motherhood'. It is a common idea that a teacher is a positive role model – it is awkward to suggest that teachers in general would not like to exhibit the qualities of enterprise, resourcefulness, reliability and resilience. The ethical teacher struggling with the economic implications of enterprise may feel a contradiction here.

Duty can be conceptualised as *accountability* or as *responsibility*. When regarded as *accountability,* duty is a concept that is extrinsic in origin (such as being in class when required to by the timetable, because that is what one is paid to do) whereas when seen as *responsibility,* duty is intrinsic in origin (such as recognising the needs of a student who wants extra help to get better results and therefore making time available after school to help that student). This distinction is helpful in considering when duty is to be regarded as primarily an *ethical* concept and when it is to be regarded as primarily a legalistic one. That which is freely taken on by an agent is considered *intrinsic.* When however one feels *obliged* to turn up to work on time, prepare lessons or mark essays, then one can be said to be motivated to duty by *extrinsic* factors which may be understood at a rational level, but carry a degree of obligation in return for an extrinsic salary reward.

To the extent that the enterprise focus could be regarded as an imposition by some, its application in the classroom has the potential to trend toward extrinsic obligation, rather than as an intrinsic responsibility towards students. Therefore, in respect to duty, the prospects for altruistic teacher professionality in relation to the implementation of enterprise are dim.

A personal sense of responsibility to their students by many teachers will, however, outweigh the distaste of extrinsic obligation, so given a situation where they may be required to implement enterprise programmes, they will. It remains an interesting question whether a teacher is, under such circumstances of obligation, behaving as an ethical professional. This begs a more fundamental question: are teachers not behaving as ethical professionals when performing the legalistic obligations of their roles? As noted before, these obligations are extrinsic to the teacher, and not freely taken up by the teacher, but rather imposed upon them. This reduction in autonomous behaviour, it would seem, reduces the degree of professionality that may be claimed. However, as also noted previously, the idea of *public service* must have a sense not only of what a profession gives or offers, but also of what the public it serves may expect when taking up what the profession offers. Teachers find themselves in a particular bind that is peculiar to teaching: their public is largely unwilling and is itself under duress from the law to take up what teaching tries to offer. This seems to be very shaky ground for any consideration of altruism or of an ethical professionality. Some of what teachers are 'doing' for their students, seen in altruistic terms, is rather paternalistic, that is, driven by a sense that whilst students may not realise it now, what their teachers are trying to do will be of benefit in later life. This is indeed a central premise of all schooling.

Where does this leave us? The assumption has to be made that what schools offer is in the best interests of the students who have to be there. A utilitarian may suggest that this is in keeping with ensuring that the greatest good is derived by the greatest number. Teachers are required then to deliver on the promises made by the schooling system to the public it serves. To fail to do so would be unethical. The problem faced by individual teachers is that they do not always get to decide what the content of those promises will be. When the Curriculum calls on schools to have their "...students explore what it is to be innovative and entrepreneurial"(Ministry of Education, 2006, p. 26), some teachers may find this unpalatable. It is at this intersection that for some teachers, they are not behaving ethically, but merely legalistically, by exercising what it is their *duty* to exercise.

'Service' suggests one is working for others and in their interests, placing these above or beyond one's own, and that this work is carried out for reasons other than extrinsic, material ones (Wise, 2005). This idea of 'service' is sometimes conceptualised as 'social responsibility' (Brien, 1998). There is thus a sense here of 'mission'. It is a necessary component of the altruism that characterises ethical professionality that a teacher is motivated by a belief in the good of people and the ability to enhance that goodness, to 'make a difference'. These characteristics are not, however, *necessary* to teaching. It is quite conceivable that there are people in teaching who have a low opinion of their students and of the world in general and who do not believe that their effort will make one iota of difference to the lives of anyone. Such people however, could not on the account given here, be considered as 'ethical' professionals. Nevertheless, there are countless teachers for whom it is a common-sense mantra to say "I didn't come into this for the money", or "I'm here for the kids".

The issue of financial rewards is controversial because some professions see themselves as such precisely for the reason that their practitioners are able to set fees and charge these to clients according to an established 'going rate'. For teacher practitioners (and indeed other state service professionals) this is simply not relevant. Is the appeal to a service commitment that is somehow nobler than concerns about income merely a screen that shields teachers from the reality of low pay? Given that teachers are not free to dictate their rate of pay or other terms of work, it is questionable how they will successfully teach their students to "...identify, create, initiate, and successfully manage personal, community, business, and work opportunities, including working for themselves" (2006, p. 26). The stated commitment in the Curriculum to enterprise provides an uneasy fit with the commitment of many teachers to conceptions of service and vocation, as the intended outcome of enterprise studies is that students will be ready and able to enter business for themselves, essentially a selfish motive. Again the prospects for teachers to develop their own sense of ethical professionality in respect to the important place of enterprise in the Curriculum are dim.

## Conclusion

Unless teachers encourage students to use their skills of enterprise for some greater social good, their own ethical professionality would be thwarted. It therefore remains a question for subsequent research and analysis to assess ways of locating spaces that teachers can penetrate to accommodate the Curriculum intention of teaching enterprise in such a way that this requirement will enjoy better philosophical fit with the demands of intrinsic duty and service and thus allow teachers to claim an ethical professionality.

This is a task that will fall to pre-service teacher education faculties that will soon find themselves under pressure to respond to the new demands to be made of teachers who graduate from their courses to be able to 'teach enterprise'. The danger is that conceptualised and articulated in this way reduces enterprise to a technical skill that soon will come with its own unique achievement outcomes. This narrow reductionism will rob the notion of 'enterprise' of any sense of 'creativity' thus opening the door for tertiary teacher education providers to simply insert courses or papers on 'enterprise', and perpetuate a 'banking education that inhibits creativity and domesticates consciousness' (Freire, 1970 p. 64). It will be appropriate for course planners and curriculum designers working in these tertiary institutions to act early to ensure that enterprise is liberated from a technicised conception to one that could make a meaningful contribution to the creative education of teacher undergraduates and thus, ultimately, to schools themselves.

**References**


Alton-Lee, A. (2003). Quality Teaching for Diverse Students in Schooling: Best Evidence Synthesis from www.minedu.govt.nz

Brien, A. (1998). Professional ethics and the culture of trust. *Journal of Business Ethics, 17*(4), 391-410.

Brown, P., & Lauder, H. (1996). Education, globalisation and economic development. *Journal of Education Policy, 11*(1), 1 - 25.

Flockton, L. (2007). *Consideration of submission and questionnaire responses on the Draft New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1996). *Letters to Cristina* (D. Macedo, Trans.). New York: Routledge.

Gordon, L., & Whitty, G. (1997). Giving the 'hidden hand' a helping hand? The rhetoric and reality of neoliberal education reform in England and New Zealand. *Comparative Education, 33*(3), pp. 453-468.

Hoyle, E., & John, P. (1995). *Professional knowledge and professional practice*. London: Cassell.

Ministry of Economic Development. (2007). OECD Report Highlights Innovation Policy - Minister of Research, Science and Technology Media Statement. Retrieved 15 Oct 2007, from http://www.med.govt.nz/templates/MultipageDocumentTOC____29683.aspx

Ministry of Education. (2006). *The New Zealand Curriculum: draft for consultation 2006*. Retrieved 18 August 2008. from http://www.tki.org.nz/r/nzcurriculum/index_e.php.

Ministry of Education. (2007a). Retrieved 18 August 2007, from http://www.tki.org.nz/r/nzcurriculum/consultation_feedback_e.php

Ministry of Education. (2007b). *The New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media Ltd.

O'Neill, A. (2005). Individualism, enterprise culture and curriculum policy In J. Codd & K. Sullivan (Eds.), *Education policy directions in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 71-86). Southbank: Thomson Dunmore Press.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2007). *OECD Review of Innovation Policy: New Zealand report to the New Zealand Ministry of Science, Research and Technology (MoRST) and the Ministry of Economic Development*. Paris: OECD.

Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). *A pedagoggy for liberation*. London: Bergin & Harvey.

Vaughan, K., & Kenneally, N. (2003). *A constellation of prospects: a review of STAR (the Secondary-Tertiary Aligned Resource): New Zealand Council for Educational Research report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Watson, S., Bowen, E., Tao, L., & Earle, K. (2006). *The New Zealand Curriculum Draft for Consultation 2006: Analysis of long submissions - Report*. Wellington: Lift Education.

Wise, A. (2005). Establishing teaching as a profession. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(4), 318 - 331.