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THESIS ABSTRACT

My research was initiated by an increasing awareness of divisions between practice and theory in entrepreneurship teaching, the literature noting the subject being defined by action but having an inconsistent tradition of studying action. My thesis explores the issues that relate to this, for instance, the neoliberal restructuring of higher education, the nature of entrepreneurship research and who it is for, the relationship between professional and cognitive knowledge, the status of practice and commerciality within entrepreneurship teaching, and how these issues (and others) relate to the beliefs and understandings of participants and are enacted in teaching. I approach the research using a constructivist perspective as, given its concern with the links between experience and knowledge, it seems a relevant conceptual framework to explore entrepreneurship teaching that aims to develop the “knowing how” skills. This focus does not seek to diminish the role of cognitive knowledge, which the literature observes as systematically undervalued, rather, my research seeks to clarify the role of traditional and experiential forms of knowledge in relation to the purposes of entrepreneurship teaching.

My research was carried out in three Russell Group universities, one post-1992 university, and one Plate Glass university, with eight participants who were identified and recruited via a purposive sampling method, with the help of two respected senior entrepreneurship researchers. Two of the participants then recommended their own contacts. The group was a mix of mostly mid-career entrepreneurship researchers and teachers, and contained some who had significant commercial experience, with most of the participants having less extensive or no commercial experience. Because the participants were experts in their field, they had the experience to contribute valuably to my research, which was carried out via observations and semi-structured interviews to allow them the space to discuss what they considered of value. The findings were subsequently analysed through a thematic approach, given that participants’ commentary was often at a thematic level. My thesis makes five theoretical claims: first, rather than viewing the divisions between theory and practice in entrepreneurship teaching as a given, my thesis explores how this arises out of a background of policy, organisational, disciplinary and ideological pressures.
that shape what teachers think and believe and explores how their teaching reflects the nature of their intersection with these pressures. Second, my thesis observes that entrepreneurship research is “about” the phenomenon of entrepreneurship and is not intended to inform action, and that academic incentives reward entrepreneurship teachers for research in their disciplinary area. Consequently, these continually reinforce the estrangement of practice from the main body of theory-led teaching, because of practice’s basis in strategy rather than entrepreneurship theory.

Third, my research finds that there are considerable additional blocks to the teaching of practice – organisational, disciplinary and ideological, that perpetuate the prevalent engagement with theoretical knowledge. Fourth, I explore how the nature of entrepreneurship teaching is personal, observing that this is rooted in participants’ routes to their current role, and how the concerns of the research they are undertaking orient them either towards or away from commerciality, demonstrating that teaching “for” or “about” is not merely an operational choice, but reaches down to deep layers of meaning, and in doing so, asserts allegiance to one set of values or another. Finally, observing how the terminology of theory and practice has become overlapped, I explore the vernacular of entrepreneurship through understandings of knowledge drawn from educational theory, to clarify the nature and effect of practice-based teaching instruments.
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CHAPTER 1:
ORIGINS OF THE RESEARCH AND OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

1.1: THE ORIGINS OF MY RESEARCH

My interest in this research arose from the contrasts that I observed between my experience of entrepreneurship practice and how it is taught: within practice, much depended on “reading” (Eraut, 2005) and evaluating constantly changing commercial contexts to make decisions, and after starting to teach in the business school of my university, I was struck by the different approaches taken to teaching entrepreneurship, covering the spectrum from highly “academic” teaching about the phenomenon, to the fewer modules that were oriented towards start-up. I noticed different approaches that were used in this teaching, particularly in relation to how practice and theory seemed to operate somewhat separately. Although at the time I was relatively uninformed about theory surrounding the differences between experiential and cognitive learning, I observed their functionalities, both in my commercial life and in my teaching, and it was their role in the teaching I observed which made me curious to know more about the nature, rationale and context of how entrepreneurship is taught.

While scholars have observed the functionalities of the separation between theory and practice in entrepreneurship teaching, for instance, Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton (2016) observe that there needs to be emotionally engaged, interpretive teaching based in practice, Greenwood and Levin (2001, p. 438) call for entrepreneurship teachers to educate in both professional and theoretical knowledge and Fayolle (2018) notes that entrepreneurship research has moved away from practice – there seems to be a gap in the literature in terms of seeking to explain the estrangement of theory and practice cognitively, organisationally and ideologically, and how these shape entrepreneurship teachers’ beliefs and teaching. My research seeks to address this, using an interpretive case study format in order to be able to access the qualitative character of this interrelationship, to provide insight into how entrepreneurship teachers conceptualise the nature and purpose of entrepreneurship and its teaching, and the relationship
between these, their teaching and the disciplinary, organisational and ideological pressures that form their teaching environment.

Using Fayolle and Gailly’s (2008, p. 571) observation that teaching models link the conceptions that scholars and educators have about teaching, and their actual teaching behaviour, my research seeks to gain insight by using Fayolle’s (2018), framework, which asks the following questions: What is entrepreneurship education for? What is the content and knowledge being taught? What objectives and goals does the teaching have? What methods and pedagogies are being used? How are these assessed and for what results? I hope to answer Fayolle’s questions through my research questions (detailed in Section 1.3) that are structured around understanding what my research participants believe about entrepreneurship and its teaching. I shall then use the insight gained from these discussions to interpret their teaching and assessment. However, entrepreneurship literature contains recurrent observations of lack of definitional clarity (Matlay, 2002) and absence of agreed frameworks for teaching (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008, p. 570), so in order to try to illuminate the relationship between participants’ beliefs and understandings and their teaching, my research reaches beyond the vernacular of entrepreneurship and introduces understandings of knowledge from the discipline of education.

My thesis explores issues that may shape the relationship between entrepreneurship teachers’ beliefs and teaching, investigating, for instance, the role of academic institutional structures, the nature of entrepreneurship research and who it is for, the relationship between professional and cognitive knowledge and the status of practice. These issues are examined within the context of academic capitalism (Slaughter, Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004) and neoliberalism (Brown, 2015) and its restructuring of higher education (Morley, 2003). My research seems relevant, given the confluence of traditional academic values (Little and Brennan, 1996, p. 33) and the operations of neoliberal academic capitalism (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004), which position research as the means for individual and institutional competitive success (Morley, 2003). Consequently, it seems that cognitive knowledge is becoming increasingly entrenched, with little sign that this will change, and it seems that as long as this pertains, the role of practice is likely to
be estranged from the main body of theory-based teaching. Seeking to provide illumination into
the circumstances that contribute to the divisions between the teaching of theory and practice
seems timely in view of the lack of countervailing pressures observed in my research.

One of the themes that emerges from my research that seems determinative of
positionality in relation to theory or practice is a quest by entrepreneurship teachers for academic
legitimacy, which seems to relate to a context of competing characterisations of
entrepreneurship. These correspond to the disciplinary heterodoxy within the subject, given that
strategy theory informs teaching for start-up (Brush, Greene and Hart, 2001, p. 7), while
entrepreneurship theory informs teaching about the subject, evidenced by the research of Meyer
et al. (2014). It also seems to relate to a view of entrepreneurship by participants as unpredictable
and transgressive. However, a different perspective is reflected in policy, where it is seen as a
remedy to significant economic problems, such as stagnating growth and unemployment (Farny
et al., 2016, p. 3), recognised as one of eight key competences needed for personal fulfilment and
development, active citizenship, social inclusion and employment (EU, 2006). Another perspective
is represented by anti-neoliberal characterisations, which view entrepreneurial principles as
central to the neoliberal agenda, integral to the restructuring of higher education (Brown, 2015)
with its imposition of a competitive framework that applies pressure to research and to teach
instrumentally, compromising the producers, consumers and product of higher education (Morley,
2003). From this perspective, entrepreneurship teaching is stripped of social context (Reay, David
and Ball, 2005, p. 9), operates through the enforcement of normative values (Farny et al., 2016, p.
5) and is exclusionary on gender and socio-economic bases (Ahl and Marlow, 2012), the nature of
which stands in opposition to liberal higher education values (Little and Brennan, 1996, p. 33).
Given the breadth of variation in the ways these perspectives value entrepreneurship, it seems
likely that the beliefs and teaching of my research participants will be shaped by these, and the
disparate nature of these views of entrepreneurship and its teaching seems to support my research
in seeking to clarify these relationships.
A participant in my research observes that entrepreneurship teaching has an "orphan child" quality, which seems to arise from the issues discussed above, and correspondingly there is a theme of separation from the academic mainstream that recurs through my research. Another pattern that emerges is the correlation between the pathway to participants' current role and their engagement with commerciality, that mirrors Neck, Greene and Brush's (2014) observation of correlation between entrepreneurship teachers’ paths to current role and position on the theory/practice spectrum. In relation to this, my research explores the position of practical skills within university education, the nature and purpose of entrepreneurship research, including its application to practice, and the correlation of all these with the nature of teaching "for" or "about" entrepreneurship and frames these issues within the ideological oppositions between the liberal and applied education models. My research seeks value from being transdisciplinary in nature, gaining insight from the interpenetration of the disciplinary epistemologies (Gibbons et al., 1994, p. 10) of entrepreneurship and education, and theorises from a perspective that encompasses the academy and the market (Hark, 2007, p. 16).

1.2: THE CONTEXT FOR MY RESEARCH

The market for UK higher education is global, with approaching half a million non-home or EU students in UK higher education out of a total number of approximately 3.4 million in 2018 (Bolton, 2019), who make a significant economic contribution to UK universities' teaching and research funding (ibid.). The marketisation of higher education (Morley, 2003) and resulting significant increase in student numbers puts pressure on the ability to carry out academic research (Deem, 2006), which has created an uneasy relationship between the forces for marketisation and those that support traditional academic values (discussed in detail in the Neoliberalism Section 2.2 of the literature review), particularly given that it is often the same members of faculty having to mediate these opposing pressures (Ek et al., 2013). One of the results of a commercialisation ethos for universities is the large number of business schools that have been established within UK universities: these numbered 147 in 2019, up from 102 in 2009) (Moules, 2018) and are recognised as a "cash cow" (Debrecht and Levas, 2014, p. 65) for universities because of the demand from
students for the teaching of these institutions (ibid.). The status of business schools within the
culture of universities seems controversial, in the sense that the reason for existence for business
schools is to promote a commercial agenda, and in so doing, contributing significant financing to
the overall activities of the university, while at the same time representing the managerialism that
has contributed to the decline of the liberal education ideal of learning for learning’s sake (Morley,
2001; Raunig and Negri, 2013). Raunig and Negri (2013, p. 350) propose that the university should
not operate as a “factory of knowledge”, but as “as a place of creative disobedience” against this
marketisation agenda. While their views seem expressed in an intentionally provocative way, what
they say nevertheless illustrates the intensity of the clash of cultures that seems to exist within
universities, and particularly between business schools and other university faculties (Parker,
2018). This conflict between knowledge for knowledge’s sake, and knowledge which is useful for
commercial purposes, seems sharply played out at the level of entrepreneurship teaching, given its
simultaneous assimilation into traditional, academic scholarship, while being based in action
(Corbett and Katz, 2012, p. 4), and my research explores the issues that are thrown up by this.

Addressing the issues raised by the above discussion, my research takes the form of
interpretive case studies of eight teachers of entrepreneurship within five higher education
institutions and aims to provide a “snapshot” of how they conceptualise the nature and purpose of
entrepreneurship and its teaching. As suggested above, these understandings are potentially
shaped by a range of competing, contradictory and complementary ideas, arising from social,
policy, business and research contexts which have diverging objectives for entrepreneurship and
its teaching (Nightingale and Coad, 2013). These seem to play out in relation to the legislative push
for universities to follow an entrepreneurship agenda, particularly in terms of becoming economic
actors (Morley, 2003), evidenced, for example, in the enshrinement of entrepreneurial
development as one of four strategic goals for British universities (Universities UK, 2000). Because
the quest of this research is to understand the nature of the conceptualisations that teachers have,
and how these are expressed through classroom practice, the form of an in-depth interpretive case
study has been chosen, and the triangulated form of my research approach is structured to draw out issues that are less articulated as well as those that are more explicit.

The interpretive nature of this research has made my position as an insider researcher an important issue, particularly as it explores my own area of teaching practice (which has been wide and varied, encompassing undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, including collaboration within other colleagues’ teaching) that followed my significant commercial experience. Although this teaching experience was positive in terms of understanding the terrain, it was potentially a constraint on a more open way of observing participant teaching, the avoidance of which depended on being constantly alert to bringing my own “meaning perspective” (Erickson, 1985) into the design, operation and analysis of the research, continually steering my approach away from being evaluative, and towards being inquisitive. My supervisors were central to my understanding of this reflexivity, providing me with feedback in relation to work I submitted to them, offering me academic insight into my positionality within the research, which as a result developed over time.

The potential contribution of my research is captured by Neck and Corbett (2018, p. 6) who observe that while the field of entrepreneurship research and teaching has expanded so rapidly that it has outpaced our understanding of what should be taught, research from the educator perspective has been relatively silent: a contribution of this research will be to try to address this omission.

1.3: RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1.3.1: Research question

- In relation to eight higher education teachers of entrepreneurship in the UK, what are their knowledge and beliefs relating to the subject and to the teaching, and how are these enacted in their teaching?

1.3.2: Supplementary questions

- What are the case study teachers’ beliefs about entrepreneurship?
• What are the case study teachers’ beliefs about the nature and purpose of entrepreneurship teaching and learning?

• What forms of knowledge do the case study entrepreneurship teachers draw on in their classroom practices?

• How do the studied teachers teach entrepreneurship?

1.4: OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

The separation between theory and practice in entrepreneurship teaching seems to be most significant in undergraduate teaching, as these students are likely to see their degree as preparing them for the world of work (Brown, 2015, p. 25), and for this reason my research focuses on teachers of undergraduate students. In order to understand what entrepreneurship teachers believe and think about their subject, as discussed in Section 1.2, I try to identify the pressures that may shape this, encompassing the neoliberal restructuring of higher education (Morley, 2003), policy developments and academic incentives and sanctions. I also consider each participant’s route to their current role in terms of their potential to shape their beliefs and understandings in terms of engagement with commerciality. As discussed in Section 1.1, to interpret the teaching and understand what types of cognition are being developed, I employ understandings of knowledge and their relationship to subjectivist and objectivist teaching philosophies. My research also investigates the blocks to practice within entrepreneurship teaching, to assess the degree to which they may affect what is taught.

In addition to the discussion of the origins of the research, theoretical framework and context, my thesis comprises eight chapters.

In Chapter 2 I focus on the policy, ideological and disciplinary context for teaching entrepreneurship, looking in particular at the neoliberal restructuring of higher education (Brown, 2015) and the operations of academic capitalism (Slaughter, Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004). I trace the contribution of other disciplines to entrepreneurship to understand how these have formed its
character and explore the types of knowledge that relate to entrepreneurship teaching and use this to understand the nature of entrepreneurship research.

Chapter 3 explores constructivism as a conceptual framework for my research, framing this against the philosophies of objectivism and subjectivism, and relates these to the divisions between practice and theory in entrepreneurship teaching.

In Chapter 4 I relate the constructivist, interpretivist methodology that this research uses to the “multiple meaning perspectives” that teachers have, and in relation to interpreting their teaching practice. I explain how I structured the data collection in order to answer the research questions, and the methods used in relation to these and to analysis of the data.

Chapter 5, as well as introducing the participants, seeks to provide an individual view of the way they intersect with the issues explored in the research, on the grounds that it only seems possible to understand how and why this happens if this process is framed through individual perspectives. For instance, each participant’s route to their current role, how they see themselves in relation to the academic hierarchy, what they think about neoliberal issues and their teaching. This chapter also explores the more qualitative and behavioural aspects of teaching (Schwitzgebel and Kolb, 1974) that are likely to be lost at a thematic level of analysis, but which provide contextual meaning for it.

Chapter 6 explores the nature of entrepreneurship research, in order to identify the difference in the types of knowledge that arise from it and to identify the role of this in the division between theory and practice in teaching. My thesis frames entrepreneurship research against a context of organisational and ideological pressures to try to illustrate their influence on its nature, and to assess the significance of these. It uses understandings of cognition to differentiate between research “about” and “for” entrepreneurship and triangulates theory with the commentary and teaching of my research participants.
In Chapter 7, based on scholarship that establishes that assessments are a reliable indicator of the nature of teaching, I observe the relationship between these, teaching, and participant commentary, to access the nature of the cognition that is being taught.

Chapter 8 focuses on how participants use exposure to entrepreneurial context, and what role this has in both practice and theory-based teaching. It tries to unpick the relationship between the role of practice in teaching and the cognition that is developed by different approaches teaching “for” entrepreneurship, by exploring participants’ use of and views about different types of entrepreneurial context within their teaching and comparing it with their classroom practice.

Chapter 9 summarises my intellectual contribution to thinking about entrepreneurship education and suggests briefly how practice might be repositioned pedagogically.
CHAPTER 2:
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1: IDEOLOGIES THAT INFORM THE CONTEXT FOR THIS RESEARCH

2.1.1: Introduction

This section explores the influence of ideologies that inform the context for this research, policy evolution in relation to entrepreneurship education and contributions of other disciplines to entrepreneurship. These provide a context to the heterodoxy of entrepreneurship, the relative positions of “how to” and cognitive knowledge in higher education, and the policy promotion of entrepreneurship and its teaching within the wider pattern of academic capitalism (Slaughter, Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004).

2.2: NEOLIBERALISM IN HIGHER EDUCATION

2.2.1: The context for entrepreneurship teaching neoliberalism and liberalism

The concept of entrepreneurship, premised on individualism and autonomy within a context of economic liberalism and free markets, arose from the Enlightenment’s recognition of the primacy of the rule of law and property rights, and its assumption that “objective and competent” reason (Hicks, 2004, p. 9) enacted “the dominance of...ideas...and (their)...translation into practice” (ibid.). In contrast, postmodernism is seen by Hicks (ibid., p. 3) as a philosophical approach without a corresponding operationalisation into practice, which therefore intersects critically with entrepreneurship, because of the latter’s expression through activity (Corbett and Katz, 2012, p. 4). The oppositions between these philosophies are reflected strongly within the teaching of entrepreneurship, in the sense that students can be taught to “do” entrepreneurship, or “about” it, and given entrepreneurship teaching’s role in potentially representing opposing philosophies, it may be helpful to set out the differences between liberalism and neoliberalism in order to identify the former’s location and to examine how neoliberalism grew from a liberal philosophy.
A significant element in the relationship between liberalism and neoliberalism seems to be the disengagement of the former from the concept of common good, which seems to have played a significant role in its subsequent identification with neoliberalism, and postmodernism’s consequent opposition to it. Marginson (2011, p. 430) observes that:

All forms of liberalism struggle to understand the common and collective aspects of the public good except as the sum of realised individual benefits, or as a spill-over from individualised transactions. Nodding towards methodological individualism in which the individual is prior to the social, liberalism fails to value the collective imagination as an end in itself.

Notwithstanding liberalism’s estrangement from the concept of public good, it engaged with protecting the weak from the powerful through its legal framework for the operations of the market (Gerber, 1994), which informed the moderate position of the Freiburg school of the 1930s, where the term “neoliberal” arose (ibid.). In order to fight the high levels of inflation in the USA, UK and Chile, that had emerged as a result of a Keynesian demand stimulus following the end of World War II in 1945 (Marcuzzo, 2010), Hayek (1948) and Friedman (1994) spread the principles of monetarism, and at the time, there was minimal association of their work with negative implications of neoliberalism (Boas and Gans-Morse, 2009, p. 147). While a key focus of Keynesianism had been job creation (Marcuzzo, 2010), widespread unemployment arose from a monetarist approach (Boas and Gans-Morse, 2009), and it seems that once the term “neoliberalism” was used to describe economic reforms under the Pinochet dictatorship in Chile, and the cost of the social damage arising from monetarist measures became understood, pejorative connotations became associated with the term, and it correspondingly ceased to be used by market proponents (ibid., p. 139). However, Olssen and Peters (2005, p. 324) observe that neoliberalism has close links with the original principles of liberalism, particularly in relation to economic issues: the self-interested individual, free market economics, and a commitment to free trade and laissez-faire, most of which are foundational to entrepreneurship.
However, they observe (ibid., p. 319) that the neoliberal promotion of a “productive” role for the state that is both policeman and participant cuts across “the traditional guarantees of classic liberalism regarding the spaces it sought to protect...personal freedom, the rights of privacy involving freedom from scrutiny and surveillance, and professional autonomy” (ibid.). It can be seen from this discussion that a primary assumption in liberal thinking is a role for the state in limiting the mechanisms of the market, whereas in neoliberalism the market is seen as a mechanism at the disposal of the state, with its concomitant limitation of individual freedom. From this, it can be seen that, notwithstanding entrepreneurship’s co-option into the neoliberal agenda, it seems to have its theoretical foundations in liberalism, and to enshrine some of its core values, in the sense that it is an individually focused activity, policy regards it as an economic stimulus, and its feasibility is predicated on efficient markets. However, as a result of its identification with the issues discussed above, entrepreneurship teaching seems to be a focus for the contentions between the philosophies discussed, particularly in relation to the relative positions of the individual, the common good and the state.

2.2.2: Neoliberalism in higher education

Brown (2015) seems to present a convincing case for the advance of neoliberal activity at every level of political, social and economic life, including the creeping substitution of economic for political criteria and the continuing withdrawal of government funding from higher education, noting its corresponding progress towards an economised model, with a market rationale (Slaughter, Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004). Brown (2015, p. 44) identifies neoliberalism, not as a set of policies, but as a:

- normative order of reason that submits every sphere to economisation, a
- political rationality that departs production, exchange and circulation to produce new kinds of subjects and subjectivities in non-monetised domains.

She sees it as “ubiquitous...in statecraft and the workplace, in jurisprudence, education, culture...converting the distinctly political character, meaning and operation of democracy’s
constituent elements into economic ones” (ibid., p. 17). She (ibid., p. 65) observes “competition as the market’s fundamental value” and an “emphasis on entrepreneurship and productivity”. Peters (2001) reflects that neoliberal thinking has generated the idea that humans should invest in themselves as entrepreneurial actors in order to contribute to economic growth and gross domestic product (GDP) enhancement, and Ball (2012, p. 24) correspondingly reflects that the “discipline of profit” is being used to neoliberalise the public sector, in which the economisation of higher education has reshaped its structure and purpose towards investment and return (Brown, 2015), generating a form of academic capitalism that uses market ideology to make profits from previously state-owned assets (Slaughter and Leslie, 2001).

They (ibid.) observe that this has profoundly reshaped the structure and purpose of higher education, embedding the idea into discourse and policy that it is merely a market commodity (Lynch, 2006, p. 1). Higher education is positioned as a competitive market arbitrated by consumer choice (Browne, 2010, p. 1), filling the space left from a partial withdrawal by the state from financial responsibility that is substituted by revenue from students in an “expansion of numbers on the cheap” (Collini, 2010, p. 4). This repurposes the university as an economic actor, with economic interests and a focus on creating financial surplus, supported by an emphasis on entrepreneurial activity at institutional and personal levels (Peters, 2001, pp. 61–62). Slaughter, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004, p. 29) observe academic capitalism intermediating between the public and private sectors, linking “institutions as well as faculty, administrators, academic professions” to the new economy that views academics as “state subsidised entrepreneurs” (ibid., p. 1), measured by the competing metrics of research and teaching success (Morley, 2003).

The struggle to survive, therefore, depends on universities competing in terms of both research and recruiting students (ibid.), with successful schools obliged to become “cash cows” (Debrecht and Levas, 2014, p. 65) generating maximum income for the university, and subsidising less financially successful departments (Zawadzki et al., 2020, p. 267). The associated drive for efficiency links with significant restructuring: “the reduction or closure, or expansion or creation of departments, changes in resource allocations, (and)...division of academic labour in relation to
research or teaching” towards a more flexible model of the labour force (Slaughter, Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004, p. 33), featuring extended use of part-time or contingent faculty, described by Morley (2018, p. 18) as “uberised”. She (2003) observes that the focus on cost and efficiency has resulted in an audit culture involving increased governance and expectations of accountability, in which academic faculty suffer reduced autonomy and increased measurement and control, viewed as a “hegemonic grip” on the rationale of universities (Morley, 2018, p. 24). A competitive structure has highlighted the differential between higher education institutions in terms of being able to deliver the commercial agenda assigned to them, Naidoo and Williams (2015) noting that high status universities with more established reputations and elite brands have access to resources to resist these market pressures. Correspondingly, Collini (2010, p. 3) reflects that the disarticulation of the historical differentiation between vocationally and traditionally oriented universities (new and old universities) forces the former to “ape” better resourced traditional universities, and against this background, Morley (2003) observes that there has been a sector-wide deployment of competition and quality metrics to act as marketing measures. However, Slaughter and Rhoades (2000, p. 1) cast doubt on universities’ commercial capability, observing that they lack “clear accounting rules, clear expectations as to profits, or clear (or any) measures of customer satisfaction”, showing a certain naivety in that “virtually any market activities are considered ‘good’ in and of themselves” (ibid.), the significance of which is that universities appear to be compromised in terms of operating effectively within a competitive environment.

2.2.3: Neoliberalism and academic identity

The issues discussed above in relation to academic capitalism, the reorientation of higher education from a public to a private good and the imposition on universities of an economically productive role and competitive structure (Naidoo and Williams, 2015, p. 209), have resulted in a fragmentation of academic roles and diminution of professional authority (Olssen and Peters, 2005, p. 325), overturning traditional conceptions of professionalism which ascribe rights and powers over work:
No professional...has traditionally wanted to have the terms of their practice
and conduct dictated by anyone else but their peers...or determined by
structural levers that are outside their control (Simkins, 2000, p. 326).

The neoliberal agenda positions academic faculty as driven by self-interest and therefore
requiring regulation, however, notwithstanding this restrictive environment, they are also
expected to be entrepreneurs, maximising the commercial returns from their research and other
activity in the face of a university system that, as observed, is not structured for
commercialisation.

Morley (2018, p. 23) observes the impossibility of resistance through the accumulation of
permanent reputational capital, owing to its repeated recalibration by sequential performance
reviews, reflecting “if individuals are unable to contribute to their institution’s high scores, they are
seen as having no right to employment security” (ibid., p. 22), with a consequent fragmentation of
the academic role (ibid., p. 21). She (ibid.) observes a corresponding culture of
“overregulation...mindless surveillance and bureaucracy”, with staff “held to account via reductive
and infantilising performance indicators” reinforced by a “powerful moral reasoning” (Morley,
2003, p. 53) “governed by central administrators and non-faculty managerial professionals”
(Slaughter, Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004, p. 23). The increasingly economic rationale for higher
education has correspondingly applied pressure for universities to move away from “useless”
research which accumulates academic and scientific capital, from which academic staff have
historically derived their status and identity, and moved them towards developing commercially
valuable knowledge (Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd, 2012, p. 1) that academic workers are
increasingly under pressure to contribute to, but which undermines their traditional purpose
(Slaughter and Leslie, 2001, p. 1). The detailed nature of the writing above is intended to make
clear the divisive nature of neoliberalism, and its powerful potential for polarisation, that forms the
context for the academic lives of my participants, and which are likely as a result to trigger
resistance, and to be an element in participants’ aspiration to academic legitimacy (Neck, Greene
2.2.4: The political and intellectual position of the business school

The following discussion interrogates these issues through an examination of the position of the business school within the university, focusing on its role in propagating market operations and management techniques, and on the issues that arise from its lack of social dimension and its narrow focus on profit, which forms the context against which the business school seems to be alienated from anti-neoliberal discourse on campus. The values of the market that have entered the academy and changed its mission are described by Morley (2018, p. 16) as “philistinism”, which seems to capture the view of the business school by the rest of the university, on the basis that the business school represents the controversial aspects of neoliberalism discussed above: its rationale is economic, its departments promote efficiency and effectiveness through strategic and financial structuring, and it attracts large numbers of students and generates considerable funding. Business schools’ generation of evaluative management techniques has contributed to the reorientation of university culture and operations, and as discussed in Section 2.2.3, has contributed to the technocratic supplanting of philosophy and politics (Davies and Dunne, 2016, p. 165). They (ibid.) observe that because of work with governments and transnational organisations, gurus like Michael Porter facilitate this shift towards economisation and managerialism, which results in the fact that considerations of what would be “good” or “just” become a technocratic matter of “GDP enhancement, competitiveness facilitation, or efficiency maximisation”. Fotaki and Prasad (2015, p. 559) observe paradoxically that while business schools enact a dominant ideology of neoliberalism, they are a “value-free proposition”. In fact, there is no paradox present: a belief in the free market is not understood as an ideology within business schools, rather as an inevitable fact of life (Miller, 2018, no pagination) and its explicit rationale is viewed as a form of managerial “common sense” (Parker, 2018). This apparent ideological agnosticism may arise from the fact that an academic faculty that develops and promotes the managerial approaches co-opted to a neoliberal agenda comprises business academics and economists rather than political or social scientists who, as a result, do not accommodate socially oriented issues into their rationale (ibid.).
Nevertheless, this represents a significant strand in commentary, that the business school promotes a narrow, profit-focused view that is stripped of social or environmental considerations. Pors and Pullen (2020, p. 2) observe that business schools promote the managerial techniques instrumental to neoliberalism of:

- strategic management, divestment of non-core activities, re-engineering...delaying and decoupling, total quality management, use of information technology and management information systems, improved accountability systems...and the principle of competition,

However, omitting social and environmental costs from their rationale. Brown (2015, p. 71) additionally cites finance (a central discipline within business schools) in the outsourcing and financialisation of the state itself. Fotaki and Prasad (2015, p. 558) observe that “the implicit and explicit focus of core management subjects taught in business schools is on harnessing market competition as a means of generating growth and prosperity”, however, omitting “critiques of...capitalism and its corresponding effects of structural economic inequality from their teaching”. They point out (ibid., p. 565) that business schools have promoted “reductive, impoverished, and simplistically ‘pure’ economic concepts...(leading to) values of individualism, profit maximisation, and self-interest which are, all too often, treated as inexorable traits of human nature”. Corroborating this, Khurana (2010) reflects that while business schools’ previous ethos incorporated a larger public purpose, their current rationale is that the management function is primarily to promote shareholder profits: in other words, that the costs to society and the environment are not being accounted into business activity. This omission may arise both from an operational difficulty in translating these costs into measurable economic figures, but also from a deeper philosophical turning away from the wider implications of business activity, evidenced, for instance, by the failure of business schools’ critical management studies departments to alter business schools’ focus towards a wider political and social canvas (Fotaki and Prasad, 2015, p. 565). Miller (2018, no pagination), however, argues that business schools are “concerned with improving our society. They do this primarily by helping organisations function more efficiently”.
However, the issue that strategic and financial decisions have social and economic effects, and that these may or may not be synonymous with business success, is excluded from his discussion, consistent with the narrative above.

This exclusion of social purpose from the business school ethos seems to arise in part from the impermeability between academic disciplines (Hark, 2007), and also because the business school focuses on clear prescriptions for action, whose efficacy is based on the exclusion of considerations of relativism. The issues above result in a disciplinary estrangement, characterised as “culture wars” by Olssen and Peters (2005, p. 340) between business schools and the anti-neoliberal discourse on campus, exemplified by Parker’s (2018, no pagination) threat to destroy them. This places the business school at the figurehead of neoliberalism’s advance, therefore compelling entrepreneurship teachers to mediate these forces. Fotaki and Prasad (2015), observe the business school’s approach as unreflective and anti-intellectual, however, their repudiation of the business school’s intellectual integrity creates the environment that business school academics have to work in, and informs entrepreneurship teachers’ choices about what they research and teach. The apparently a-philosophical position of the business school places its faculty in an ambivalent position as academic researchers: if they maintain the business school’s “value free” position they research with one eye closed, and if they do not, they stray outside the neoliberal orthodoxy that sustains the business school: this is an example of the way that the neoliberal agenda intrudes into and shapes their way of work. However, because of the “value free” rationale of the business school observed by Fotaki and Prasad (ibid.), its academics may not necessarily be explicitly aware of the existence or implications of neoliberalism, and therefore may not recognise its implications in relation to themselves, either as academics or as part of the university. Nevertheless, its functionalities seem to shape their working lives, whether they understand it or not.

Why use this framework of neoliberalism to examine the values and beliefs of participants? As observed above, it has emerged as a dominant political economy which structures
priorities and resources, and to varying degrees, desires, aspirations and rewards (Morley, 2003), therefore the pressures that arise from this shape how my research participants view their position within the university and the business school, and the extent to which they accept or reject them. This defines how participants view entrepreneurship: what its purpose is and how they should teach it. As observed above, the Business School is seen to represent the managerial technology that neoliberalism works through (Parker, 2008) and entrepreneurship teachers are therefore located at the spearhead of neoliberal rationale within the university, whether or not they are sympathetic to, or even aware of, a neoliberal rationale. However, in order to be critically coherent, it seems necessary to locate the argument of this thesis within the discussions above, and to define its assumptions, and I examine below some of the issues relating to neoliberalism as a contested area. However, analysis of this faces an obstacle, given that neoliberalism emerges as action rather than argument, evidenced through the work of Springer, Birch and MacLeavy (2016, p. 2), and an unwillingness to explicitly identify as neoliberal, given Morley’s (2018, p. 19) view of it as a term of “abuse”. Springer, Birch and MacLeavy (ibid.) note that there is a significant amount of anti-neoliberal commentary from the arts, humanities and social science faculties of the university (termed “liberal arts“ in this discussion) (Bhardwa, 2020), giving anti-neoliberalism an intellectual voice, articulated rationale and vocabulary. In contrast, as discussed earlier in this section, the business school does not perceive its belief in the free market as an ideology.

A problem seems to arise here: as observed, business academics and economists do not systematically accommodate issues of social cost into their calculations and this is communicative of a position where discussion about neoliberalism does not have the expressive instruments to provide countervailing commentary to anti-neoliberal assertions (Howell and Annansingh, 2013, p. 33), given that economics and “liberal arts“ each see their own perspective on the issue, and that therefore discussion on the subject is significantly defined by positionality in relation to it. For instance, Weller and O’Neill (2014, p. 105) challenge the characterisation of neoliberalism as a pervasive ideology, arguing that it is in fact the discourse in opposition to neoliberalism that is
hegemonic, to the extent that “it is difficult to recognise counter tendencies” (ibid., p. 106), additionally observing that because there has not been a clear definition of what neoliberalism is not, there is therefore no limit on the practices that could be accommodated by it (ibid., p. 110). Their commentary, drawn from observation of Australian government policy, an action-based approach, illustrates the point made.

Given the contentious nature that this ideologically derived positionality gives to discussion of neoliberalism, particularly in relation to its assertion of moral deficit, and the resulting difficulty in a critically detached position, it seems that a useful way of accessing its relevance in relation to entrepreneurship teaching is to look at the latter’s reported nature, which tends to contradict the view of the business school expressed above. Given Welter’s (2011, p. 173) observation of the “recursive links” between society and entrepreneurship, it may be useful first to understand the social and policy contexts for entrepreneurship research and teaching in the USA and Europe. These contrast particularly sharply in their understandings of social entrepreneurship, operationalised within entrepreneurship teaching (Kerlin, 2006). She observes that while US research on social entrepreneurship focuses on the “practical knowledge needed by business and non-profit managers” to develop revenue generating activities (ibid, p. 256), she (ibid., p. 255) reflects that this contrasts with European research and teaching that engages with the social and policy context of “cooperatives, mutual help societies, and associations operating in the social economy” (ibid., p. 258). She (ibid.) observes that while “in the U.S. most…support for strategic development of social enterprise comes from private foundations as opposed to government”, there is a contrasting prevalence of legal and policy frameworks for social enterprise in Western European countries (including the UK), resulting in teaching focused on the social as opposed to commercial economy.

Supplementing the positioning of entrepreneurship teaching described in the previous paragraph, Omorede, Thorgen and Wincent (2015, p. 744) observe “a massive proliferation of research examining the entrepreneurial process, through the psychology lens”, citing, for instance,
its relationship with decision-making, judgement and evaluation, recognising and exploiting opportunities, intentions and decisions to start a venture and decisions to close an existing or failing venture. There has been a considerable strand of scholarship focusing on entrepreneurship’s relationship to emotion (Baron, 2008; Foo, Uy and Baron, 2009), and its links with recognising and exploiting opportunity (Baron and Tang, 2011; Welpe et al., 2012).

Reinforcing this teaching perspective oriented towards the nature of entrepreneurship, rather than its commercial functionality, Thompson, Verduijn and Gartner (2020, p. 247) observe that practice-based entrepreneurship is not amenable to traditional academic models of developing explanatory theories of causation, therefore practice research sits “uneasily alongside academic publishing custom in which articles are valued for their ‘theoretical contributions’” (ibid.), observing that as a result, the influence of the practice tradition “remains peripheral” (ibid., p. 248).

The implication of these observations is that in the UK, there is a stronger academic orientation towards researching and teaching about social than commercial enterprises, which militates against the allegations above of a neoliberal character for entrepreneurship teaching. The approach of my thesis will, for the reasons expressed above, to be to accept Brown’s case for the advance of academic capitalism, if not for neoliberalism as an explicit political ideology, given that the moral calibration enmeshed within the latter is invoked by the positionality of the commentator. For this reason, it does not seem possible to discuss neoliberalism in a critically detached way. However, the force of anti-neoliberal commentary nevertheless shapes the understandings of research participants, and its functionalities, in the shape of academic capitalism (Slaughter, Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004), defines their environment: therefore, where the phrase “neoliberal” or “neoliberalism” is used in my thesis, it is intended to represent the understandings above.

2.2.5: The business school as Trojan horse?

The type of knowledge that is produced within business schools seems to pose a challenge to the traditional university structure, in the sense that the links between the applied, transdisciplinary knowledge of entrepreneurship research and teaching and the neoliberal agenda
may contribute to the academic insecurity about the legitimacy of entrepreneurship as a field of study, observed by Neck, Greene and Brush (2014, p. 7). Gibbons et al. (1994, p. 27) identified that the type of transdisciplinary knowledge promoted by business school research and teaching promises mobility and flexibility of knowledge in crossing boundaries between disciplines, scientific and lay knowledge, and between the academy and the market (Hark, 2007, p. 16), functionalities privileged by the neoliberal, economised model of higher education. It therefore challenges the traditional academic rationale of the university, “historically more concerned with theory than practice” (Lenoir, 1997, p. 3), structured into “exclusive political institutions that demarcate areas of academic territory” and allocating “privileges and responsibilities of expertise” (ibid.). The nature of entrepreneurship research therefore seems to challenge the nature of university knowledge production, in that the latter is critical, reflexive and predicated on the assumption of independence and autonomy (Lynch, 2006, p. 7), notwithstanding the ongoing significant commercial restructuring of higher education (Collini, 2010; Ball, 2012). The threat from transdisciplinary knowledge is that it withdraws from viewing knowledge as intrinsically valuable, framing it instead in terms of its utilitarian value (Peters, 2001, pp. 61–62), and in this respect it seems to present a threat to “useless” research which historically has led to genuine social advance (Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd, 2012). Hark (2007, p. 12) observes that if the university engaged fully with transdisciplinary knowledge, it “would imply...a redefinition of values governing its own existence”. However, Bresnen and Burrell (2013, p. 31) challenge the threat from transdisciplinarity, noting that academic advancement is determined by publication in single-discipline journals, whose publishing criteria exclude commercial application (Béchard and Grégoire, 2005). Another obstacle to producing scholarship in collaboration with practitioners is that the methods and processes of research are structured by academic frameworks, therefore limiting potential practitioner contribution (Bresnen and Burrell, 2013, p. 31).

It can be seen from the above argument that strong institutional structural and cultural obstacles to interdisciplinary programmes remain formidable, and that there are strong vested interests in maintaining the status quo (Hark, 2007, p. 14). Additionally, both the salience and
terminology of inter- and transdisciplinarity are contested on an intellectual level: Weingart (1997, pp. 521–529) argues that they are among “the most seriously under thought critical, pedagogical and institutional concepts in the academy”, observing a confusion in their usage that Hark (2007, p. 14) reflects “are as much about academic politics...of knowledge production as they are about the actual production and organisation of knowledge”. She observes that because of the slipperiness of their usage and therefore meaning, they are deployed as a “magic sign” (ibid., p. 13) that can convey both the “neoliberal...reforms of higher education” but also relate to postmodern agendas. Notwithstanding the challenges posed to the threat from transdisciplinarity, it is easy to see why this type of knowledge threatens the status quo: it aims to develop new intellectual frameworks that are created across academic boundaries, and in some instances, outside the academic enclosure.

Linked with this discussion, the threat from the type of knowledge generated by entrepreneurship is expressed in a slightly difference iteration: the supposed division between Mode 1 and Mode 2 knowledge. Mode 1 knowledge traditionally produced in the academy, separate from its use, and Mode 2 knowledge produced through use “linked directly to the functional imperatives of the world of work”, therefore not requiring the privileged enclosure of academia for its development (Little and Brennan 1996, p. 33). However, Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd (2012, p. 5) argue that the divisions between Modes 1 and 2 knowledge are overly simplistic, a view evidenced, for instance, by the work of Eraut (2000) and Derry (2008) who demonstrate the embeddedness of theoretical cognitive understanding within applied knowledge, therefore retaining a place for theoretical knowledge production, and reducing the perceived threat from Mode 2 knowledge. The following discussion relates to these issues in relation to knowledge production within the business school, particularly its orientation towards context and problem-oriented research for use by commercial and research organisations (Starkey and Madan, 2001, p. 6). Apart from its transdisciplinary nature, entrepreneurship knowledge production seems to pose a threat to the traditional university structure, in the sense that studying it necessarily takes the form of an action and context based Mode 2 knowledge approach (Gibbons et al., 1994; Neck and
Corbett, 2018, p. 10): it applies itself to doing entrepreneurship, and is from the disciplinary area of strategy (Brush, Greene and Hart, 2001, p. 7). Bresnen and Burrell (2013, p. 27), observe that business school research is therefore vulnerable to substitution by other institutions (like management consultancies) who are closer to the commercial context that is the raw material for applied, problem-based research (Starkey and Madan, 2001, p. 6). The business school therefore seems to be an embodiment of the threat that Mode 2 knowledge poses to academic enclosure, in part because transdisciplinary, context-based-knowledge production is central to the study of doing entrepreneurship (Greenwood and Levin, 2001, p. 435). However, as a result of the institutional and cultural obstacles to transdisciplinary programmes discussed above, while it is a present rhetoric, it has not led to an institutionalisation of interdisciplinary research and teaching structures, or transdisciplinary research methodologies (Weingart, 1997, pp. 521–529).

Neoliberalism positions the business school controversially in another important respect. It attracts unprecedented numbers of students, particularly overseas, to the university, and in my university, the business school has been the fastest growing faculty for the last seven years, and has the largest proportion of overseas students of any school in the university. This results in an ambivalent relationship between the business school with the rest of the university, who recognise that the organisation’s survival depends on increasing revenue and funding, primarily by attracting more students: this is evidenced by Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data for the 2018–2019 academic year, showing teaching revenue at more than three times research revenue for the higher education sector (HESA, 2019). Mistrust seems to be generated by the business school’s position as the spearhead of neoliberal rationality within the university system, operating as “soldiers of organisational performance” in contrast to the university’s “priests of research purity” (Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd, 2012, p. 1). This combination of dependence on and resentment of the business school by the rest of the university seems a potent mix, particularly as it is set within a context of opposing ideologies, expressed by articles like “Why we should bulldoze the business school” and “If only business schools wouldn’t teach business” (Parker, 2018).
2.2.6: Students as consumers

The neoliberal marketisation of higher education has changed the nature of the relationship between students and teachers, affecting the nature of the knowledge that is taught, and the way of teaching, discussed in Section 2.2.7. The emergence of the student as consumer has occurred as a result of successive governments’ attempts to shift the funding of higher education away from the state and towards students (Brown 2015), and the marketisation of higher education has generated a borderless global market for students (Morley, 2003, p. 3) in which competitive pressure is exerted on universities to produce income by increasing the number of students recruited. This has been driven by policy: the Dearing (1997) and Browne (2010) Reports frame students as consumers, able to “compare the market and shop around to ensure they receive the best value-for-money” (Williams, 2012, p. 34). As a result of their position as consumers, students’ relationship with universities seems more transactional, particularly in terms of work-related degrees: universities teach what students demand (Collini, 2010, p. 3) which is “bang for their buck” (Brown, 2015, p. 25) in terms of improving their earnings post-graduation. The necessity for students to take on debt to pay for tuition means that they are compelled to take a more instrumental approach to their education in order to justify the economic value of their studies, and universities have correspondingly adopted the discourse of education as a private investment (Naidoo and Williams, 2015, p. 209). Students look to quantifiable measurements to mandate and quality assure their choices: the incorporation of quality measurement for courses, student satisfaction surveys, students’ charters and the institutionalisation of complaints mechanisms establishes a contractual relationship between student and university (Aldridge and Rowley, 1998, p. 35), which formalises students’ expectations as to the level of service they will receive. However, the equivalence enacted by the contractual relationship between education consumer and provider diminishes the university’s position as the academic and pedagogic superior, the senior partner in the relationship. Collini (2010, p. 4) critiques a fundamental assumption in this model, observing that school age students are not rational consumers, reflecting that they may know what they want, but they do not know what they need, either in
terms of fashioning them into well-educated citizens, or in terms of maximising their earning potential post-graduation. This in turn suggests that the profound changes to university structures, curricula and academic staff imposed by student choice will incur significant costs by universities, without necessarily a reciprocal benefit to students. Notwithstanding the costs to higher education of "student as consumer", Collini (2010, pp. 1–2) reflects that these developments have achieved a "great democratic good", with significant educational enfranchisement of sections of the population that had previously been excluded from the benefits of post-school education. The enshrinement of students as consumers, and their demand for the type of knowledge that will increase their post-graduation earnings seems to intensify the opposition between utilitarian and academic teaching that contributes to the environment in which my research participants make their choices about their research and teaching.

2.2.7: Neoliberalism’s effect on teaching

The issues of the salience of research as a contributory element to university rankings, and the emergence of students as consumers, have recalibrated the importance and nature of teaching. The culture of rewarding research disproportionately (Collini, 2010, p. 1) is observed as a significant problem for higher education teaching, with staff seeing “research publications as their route to promotion and esteem” (ibid.), with the result that teaching is systematically marginalised (Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd, 2012). Morley (2003, p. 52) argues that the influx of large student numbers has altered the idea of what constitutes quality education, observed by Collini (2010, p. 4) as dramatically diluting:

the level of attention to individual students that most universities can provide:

nearly all parents with children at university hear disturbing reports of overcrowded seminars and minimal contact hours or attention to written work,

therefore, diminishing the relationship between teacher and student. This seems to have had a profound effect on the nature of teaching, in relation to the issue of quality, and in particular,
in relation to the substitution of student satisfaction for more profound and lasting measures of education, observed by Naidoo and Williams (2015, p. 218). Slaughter and Leslie (2001) observe that submission to student choice deprives departments of the discretion to design curricula for purely academic purposes: instead, investment in education is positioned as supplying the needs of business, industry and future economic growth. Another element affecting teaching is that students cast as consumers are likely to internalise the passive quality of the role, not accepting primary responsibility for their own learning (Shumar, 1997). Correspondingly, this seems to have a negative effect on the way they learn, in particular, on their willingness to engage fully in “owning” the learning process, taking risks, trying and potentially failing, in order to achieve real learning (Naidoo and Williams, 2015, p. 217). This mandated avoidance of risk in learning seems to arise from the reciprocity of the contractual relationship: the student’s contract is laid out in terms of his or her attendance and timely submissions, and the teacher’s contract is to deliver knowledge. What seems omitted is that valuable teaching is likely also to be demanding and difficult, requiring the student to try and potentially to fail (Seltzer and Bentley, 1999). Student charters, another quality instrument, are based on the troubling premise that academic faculty and students have opposing interests in teaching, therefore requiring external regulation, which disables “individual academics from negotiating relationships in context with their students” (Naidoo and Williams, 2015, p. 217). The teacher is therefore faced with trying to engage the student in challenging learning within a situation where the relationship of trust is explicitly questioned. As a result, the student cannot automatically assume that the work is difficult in order to stretch and develop, because the contractual stripping of intellectual authority from the teacher creates a liability to suspicion of being misguided or negligent in setting the work to that standard. Evidencing the impact of this, Seltzer and Bentley (1999) observe that trust is critical in situations where students are facing challenging learning: the result of the contractual nature of the relationship between teacher and student is that it incorporates risk to the teacher in providing challenging learning, therefore imposing a perverse incentive for the teacher not to stretch the
student, even though numerous studies have shown that this is necessary to stimulate learning (Scager et al., 2017, p. 319).

2.2.8: Entrepreneurship teaching ethics and functionality

The neoliberal agenda holds that entrepreneurship skills and attitudes such as creativity and a spirit of initiative are valuable to every person in their daily lives, necessary for personal fulfilment and development, as well as social inclusion and employment (EU, 2006). Viewed in this context, entrepreneurship education:

- not only supports the macro level push for economic growth and transformation, but at the micro level, it also supports individual self-fulfilment and the possibility of breaking down barriers of class, race and gender (Farny et al., 2016, p. 16),

offering a vision of empowerment and emancipation, leading to a way of life where one controls one’s own destiny (ibid., p. 17). However, ethical considerations emerge from its simultaneous promise of self-reliance but also the reality of social and gendered exclusivity, evidenced, for instance, by its masculinised and individualised persona (Ahl and Marlow, 2012) and an entrepreneurial self, stripped of social context by “institutional underpinnings which constrain the possibilities of who can be recognised as an entrepreneurial actor, and just what constitutes entrepreneurial behaviour” (ibid., p. 12). This “disarticulation of structural inequalities” (Morley, 2018, p. 17) is enabled by the implicit nature of neoliberalism’s rationale: an example is the idea of “responsibilising” oneself (Peters, 2001, p. 62), expressed in entrepreneurship teaching through the promotion of normative values through a “cult like system of belief” (Farny et al., 2016, p. 5), that because it is hidden it is therefore unchallengeable. Peters (2001, p. 62) notes an insidious framing of a moral imperative to invest in the self through enterprise and entrepreneurship. The above discussion illuminates how entrepreneurship teaching is a location of contention for opposing interests, enacting on the one hand the policy view that it is beneficial in terms of economic activity, and on the other, mobilising ethical critiques.
2.2.9: Development of policy in relation to neoliberalism in higher education

The following discussion traces the development of government policy underpinning the neoliberal activity explored above, in promoting entrepreneurship for students and an entrepreneurial role for universities. Higher education has been a major element in the political rethinking of the economy (Olssen and Peters, 2005), moving towards free market economics, free trade, fiscal austerity, reduced government planning and spending and an orientation towards a reduced role for the state (ibid.). Entrepreneurship education is promoted to stimulate economic growth, employment and wealth creation through innovation, initiative, creativity and a tolerance of risk and uncertainty (OECD, 2009; Singer, Amoros and Arreola, 2015), such that entrepreneurs are characterised as “folk heroes” (Nightingale and Coad, 2013, p. 117). However, these developments should be framed against Nightingale and Coad’s (ibid., p. 135) reflection that “current academic thinking is increasingly at odds with the predominant perspective of entrepreneurship in public policy, which almost exclusively assumes it is a positive thing”. This is captured in the opposed views presented in, first, a 2018 Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) paper (QAA, p. 3) stating that entrepreneurship education “significantly increases start up rates”, which is contradicted in Storey and Greene (2010), who assert that entrepreneurship education offers no advantage to the success of new businesses, observing a death rate for these of over 50% in their first 3 years, therefore undermining the relevance of start-up rates as a worthwhile measure of economic value (ibid.). Policy developments should also be framed against the perception among academic observers that the increasing enterprise agenda in higher education damages liberal education (Morley, 2003), as discussed earlier in this chapter.

The assimilation of entrepreneurship teaching into higher education seems to enact a range of political, ideological, institutional and educational interests aspiring to embed the principles of enterprise and entrepreneurship (Hannon, 2006, p. 297), in response to an increasingly competitive global economy that requires agile and entrepreneurial thinkers and organisations as a source of comparative advantage (ibid.). However, as discussed, neoliberal ideology has been associated with the process of supporting entrepreneurship education as part of
the marketisation of higher education and resulting explosion in student numbers, particularly into business schools (ibid.), positioning policy and anti-neoliberal perspectives in opposition to each other.

2.2.10: Chronology of policy development in the UK

The following chronology details the evolution of policy to apply a commercial agenda onto students and the higher education sector, that reorients further education towards an instrumental ethos and away from traditional liberal education values. "Higher Education: meeting the challenge" (Department of Education and Science, 1987) proposed a significant promotion of the links between universities and business in encouraging applied research (discussed above) and supporting syllabus developments orientated towards employability. Ten years subsequently, the Dearing Report (1997) made specific recommendations that graduates should leave with the set of key skills of communication, numeracy, information technology, and an understanding of learning skills (ibid., section 9.17), promoted within the report not only as fundamental to employability, but as central to creating a learning society based on "respect for knowledge and the search for truth" (ibid., Summary Report, section 8). Kirby (2004, p. 510) notes increasing policy specificity in relation to aspects of programme design, observing that "by 2000 business and entrepreneurial development had been listed as one of four strategic goals for British universities". It can therefore be seen that by 2000, policy was becoming increasingly prescriptive of both the objectives and means of implementing entrepreneurship into higher education.

The Browne (2010) Report recommended a significant de facto cut in the funding of higher education by the state, to be subsidised by revenue from students, and in so doing, officially positioning higher education as a marketplace arbitrated by consumer choice (discussed in detail in the Fees and University rankings section, Section 2.2.11). Legislative promotion of enterprise within higher education was continued in the 2011 White Paper for Higher Education, and of students as consumers in "Students at the Heart of the System", and in the same year the Higher Education Funding council for England set out a manifesto for commercial collaboration between higher education institutions and organisations, stating as a priority universities' role in
creating economic and social impact (Department for Business Innovation and Skills, 2011, p. 6). The 2012 Wilson Review of Business-University Collaboration (Wilson, 2012) stated the requirement for enterprise education and entrepreneurship opportunities for students in higher education. By this time, policy had specified entrepreneurial roles at both institutional and teaching level, the specificity of which is evidenced by a UK Higher Education QAA report (QAA, 2012, p. 2) laying out the differences between entrepreneurship and enterprise education. The Witty Report (2013), commissioned by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, set out a vision of universities operating as commercial entities, linking with local small to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and identifying where these organisations might have the capability to commercialise university research, therefore explicitly enshrining universities’ mission to facilitate economic growth. The report (ibid., p. 6) recommends that “incentives should be strengthened to encourage maximum engagement in an enhanced Third Mission alongside Research and Education...facilitating economic growth as a core strategic goal”, specifying that universities should take the role of business specialists. From this, it can be understood how the business school might be seen as the instrument of government policy, discussed in Section 2.2.5, notwithstanding the observation by Slaughter and Rhoades (2000, p. 1) of higher education’s systemic commercial handicap. Additionally, the Witty Report recommended embedding “commercial and organisational relevance” into future research assessment frameworks in order to implement this envisaged commercial role for university research, the implications of which are discussed above. The movement towards commercialisation continued through Lord Young’s 2014 report “Enterprise for All: the relevance of enterprise in education”, and a call in 2016 from the Council for Science and Technology for entrepreneurship training (Duval-Couetil, Shartrand and Reed, 2016) for science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) students. In 2016, the role of chief entrepreneurship adviser to the government was created, along with the establishment of the Scottish Enterprise and Skills strategic board in 2017, and significantly, an incorporation into the teaching excellence reporting framework of some aspects of entrepreneurship education. By 2017 the destination for leavers from higher education (HESA,
2018–2019) incorporated graduates who were employed in entrepreneurship, and from the autumn of 2019, enterprise and entrepreneurship was recognised as a subject discipline within the higher education classification of subjects.

2.2.11: Fees and university rankings

When the Dearing Report (1997) recommended a move towards students paying for higher education (this was to be means tested, set at a maximum of £1,000 per year) this was the first significant move towards the marketisation of higher education as described, and previously discussed in detail in Section 2.2. Subsequently, the Higher Education Act (2004) raised fees to a maximum of £3,000, and in 2010 the Browne Report recommended raising fees to £9,000 per year, representing a “huge, almost unimaginable, de facto cut in investment in higher education” (Collini, 2010, p. 3). He reflects on the social step change that this represents: “the only social value the report seems able to think of is economic: these subjects contribute directly to the economy…and so we must have them (ibid., p. 5). The 2004 Higher Education Act removed the need for higher education institutions to hold research degree awarding powers before applying for the conferral of university status (Deem, 2006), precipitating division within the university sector, and creating elite status for the universities who differentiate through their focus on research. Notwithstanding this resourcing asymmetry, Marginson (2011, p. 22) observes that “global rankings have caught all universities, all over the world, in the same (competitive) status-incentive trap”.

2.2.12: Summary discussion

What can be seen from the policy developments described above is an increasingly directive incursion of policy into the role of universities in the UK, Europe and globally, and into UK entrepreneurship teaching in particular, reflecting government’s view of the higher education sector as an enactor of state economic policy, moving it away from being an independent provider of a public good while reducing state support, in a move to a neoliberal rationale. This has caused a dislocation of purpose and nature in the higher education sector (Morley, 2018, p. 21), threatening
its ethos and mission, and restructuring its research, teaching and programme design. These changes in the structure and priorities of the higher education sector have affected knowledge production, teaching, educators and students, with the result that neoliberalism has become a divisive issue and a marker for ideological contention that forces educators to locate themselves in relation to it. The imbrication of business schools in the neoliberal move of universities to being economic actors, and faculty having an entrepreneurial role, is made more controversial because of the fact that faculty continue to be incentivised by academic rather than commercial objectives, being expected to build their and their universities’ academic reputation by publishing research, but also being expected to deliver high standards in teaching (Morley, 2003), in the face of the reality that class sizes increase as universities expand intake and drive down costs in pursuit of global competitiveness (Collini, 2010). Given this background, the neoliberal pressures on academic faculty seem considerable, and likely to result in resistance in the form of assertion of academic autonomy and repudiation of neoliberal values, which seems particularly relevant to entrepreneurship teachers, given that they are located at the spearhead of neoliberal rationality within the university, irrespective of their position in relation to it.

2.3: CONTRIBUTION OF OTHER DISCIPLINES TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP

2.3.1: Discussion

To track the evolution of each of the disciplines discussed in this section is well beyond the scope of this thesis: as a result, the following writing is not intended to be a detailed examination of the evolution of each discipline, rather to focus on the elements of these disciplinary areas that particularly influence understandings of entrepreneurship. These have been shaped by economics, management, behavioural and social science and psychology, and the following bullet-pointed issues (Seikkula-Leino et al., 2010) illustrate the links between other disciplines to concerns within entrepreneurship.
• Undertaking uncertainty in order to profit from the differences between supply and demand is informed by the work of Drucker (1985), an organisational behavioural scientist.

• Devising novel combinations within products, processes, methods and organisational forms is informed by, for instance, Schumpeter (2010), an economist.

• Exploring opportunities is also informed by economics, Kirzner (1979) in particular.

• The creation of new ventures informed by many entrepreneurship researchers, for instance, Gartner (1988).

2.3.2: Economic theory’s contribution to entrepreneurship

Cowen (2003, p. 1) observes that classical and neoclassical economics are based on the movements of markets rather than individuals, however, they are predicated on an assumption of equilibrium, without enquiring how these tendencies towards equilibrium are set into motion. He observes two schools of thinking within economics in relation to entrepreneurs, the first “that entrepreneurship is a useful historical category but is analytically nothing special” (ibid.): observing that this is the view of most classical economists. The second (the Austrian school) “posits entrepreneurship as a general feature of human action, and distinct in principle from (profit) maximising behaviour” (ibid.). The key insight of the Austrian school, and particularly Schumpeter’s work within this school, related to the issue of individual agency: particularly its recognition of the contribution that innovative entrepreneurship has made in driving change within business, industry and the economy. Kirzner’s “Competition and Entrepreneurship” (1973, p. 60) focused on the role of the individual agent as distinct from the system, commenting specifically on the omission of this within classical economics, and calling for recognition of individual agents as precipitators of equilibrating movements within markets:

it is a methodologically legitimate demand to be made of a theory of the market, that it not merely begins with the instrumentalist assumption of already-attained equilibrium, but also realistically offer a plausible explanation
of how, from any given initial set of non-equilibrium conditions, equilibrating tendencies might be expected to be set into motion in the first place (ibid.).

Kirzner additionally commented that "imagination and boldness must inevitably play central roles" in this process. The relevance of Kirzner’s recognition of the agency of the individual is an accommodation of the role of the entrepreneur within more recent economic theory.

However, this accommodation is subject to the following interpretation: Cowen (2003, p. 6) comments that even the Austrian school “have tried to conceive of the entrepreneur” as “an element that lends vitality to economic systems, and yet somehow stands beyond traditional models of efficiently used information”. Venkataraman and Sarasvathy’s (2001, p. 12) comments support this limitation, in observing that:

- economics imposes utility maximisation as the sole purpose...of the individual;
- profit maximisation of the firm; and welfare maximisation of the economy.
- But others, such as psychologists and historians have argued that individuals and firms...may have a variety of purposes that are not given a priori and that are born, change and die over time.

Henrekson and Stenkula (2010, p. 51) also report a wider view of entrepreneurship, observing that individuals do not behave like calculating robots that choose one strategy among known alternatives whose outcomes are known (probabilistically). These observations communicate the constraints of economics in shaping entrepreneurship, given that innovativeness, boldness and creativity are not accommodated within traditional microeconomic decision theory. These reflections lead to a conclusion that the field of economics has not assimilated or theorised fully the influence of entrepreneurship, even though it has recognised the role it plays in shaping economic outcomes.

2.3.3: Management approaches to entrepreneurship

The following discussion relates to the areas of management theory that inform the understanding of entrepreneurship. Management theory has developed from a mechanistic
framing of business processes towards recognising the complexity of the role of human capital within this process, which has in turn developed a focus onto the “softer”, more attitudinal and behavioural characteristics of entrepreneurs, moving away from a restriction to the more mechanistic characterisation based on classical economics and theories of efficiency discussed above. A major management focus is the interrogation of the interplay between systems and the characteristics of the “agents” within those systems, linking Taylor (1914) in the early 20th century to more recent writers such as Mintzberg (1975) and Handy (1994). While Taylor viewed human “agents” within the production system as broadly comparable to machine parts, Mintzberg (1975) and Handy (1994) focus on the nature of the workers within company structures, in particular their needs for self-realisation, work satisfaction and sociability. Handy’s (1994) book “The Empty Raincoat”, investigates the central role of needs, motivations and personality within the business structure, and discusses how many businesspeople succeed because of their attitudes and passion for the social and societal meaning of their venture, rather than being motivated purely by profit. The widening of the frames of reference discussed for business thinking has in turn legitimised an extension of the debate about the nature of entrepreneurship to encompass a focus on the attitudes and motivations of entrepreneurs (described as entrepreneurial intent by Kuratko, 2005).

While current management preoccupations relate to globalisation, innovation, corporate social responsibility and governance, as well as the consistent theme of competitive advantage (Grant, 2013), the issues of innovation, entrepreneurial finance and competitive advantage in particular have contributed to current academic understanding of entrepreneurship. Nightingale and Coad (2013, p. 127) observe the difference between new ventures that are genuinely innovative and therefore have competitive advantage, and those that are a repetition of previous business types, and which therefore lack competitive advantage, which they term “gazelles” and “muppets” (ibid.). They observe that innovativeness in new ventures determines access to capital, and the presence of a growing venture capital market focusing on companies who are innovative. However, they (ibid.) observe that “most small new firms... cannot capture the benefits of high variance, highly skewed returns from investing in innovation”, and therefore are unlikely to attract
venture capital funding. This unequal access to finance deepens the division between new ventures that are innovative and have competitive advantage and those that are not: this will increasingly focus attention onto innovation as a core element for funding and will, as a result, change the character of the new venture sector, bringing into sharper focus the link between innovation, competitive advantage and funding.

The interplay between the individual and his or her environment threads the above narrative together: this is critical to entrepreneurship in the sense that this determines the competitive advantage (Porter, 2008) of a new venture. As discussed elsewhere in this thesis, entrepreneurship research “about” is not concerned with this issue, however, to research that is intended to inform start-up, this insight seems fundamental.

2.3.4: Behavioural understandings of entrepreneurship arising from psychology and sociology

Carlsson et al. (2013, p. 921) observe that “most early scholarly work on entrepreneurship focused on the personal characteristics (“traits”)...primarily as a consequence of the research being based in psychology and sociology”, and the following discussion relates to research into these characteristics. Lessem (1986) argues against this type of psychological and behavioural “pigeonholing”, and the following writing explores the heterogeneity in understandings of risk and self-efficacy in particular. Lessem (ibid.) observes that while classical economics presents entrepreneurs as risk takers, psychologists have established that these risks are only part of an entrepreneurial set of characteristics, and moreover that they tend to be carefully calculated (Caird, 1991; Cromie and O’Donoghue, 1992). However, Busenitz (1999), Koh (1996) and Ho and Koh (1992) observe a prevalence of confidence and self-confidence in entrepreneurs and reflect that both are likely to result in a different perception of risk compared to the general population, backed up by Koh’s (1996), insight that entrepreneurs tolerate higher levels of ambiguity than the general population, somewhat undermining Lessem’s (1986) attribution of careful risk calculation within the entrepreneurial population.
With regard to issues of self-efficacy and associated characteristics, McClelland (1961) theorised that because of entrepreneurs’ strong need for achievement, they will intentionally orientate themselves towards situations of individual responsibility (and moderate risk), and that orientation towards achievement tends to be a stronger motivation than financial reward in these entrepreneurs, tending to believe that the achievement of a goal depends on their own self-efficacy (ibid.). However, other research finds this characteristic within high achievers in general (Cromie, 1987), and therefore is not exclusively an entrepreneurial characteristic. Caird (1991) and Cromie and O’Donoghue (1992) found that entrepreneurs display a need for autonomy and a linked fear of being controlled, valuing individualism and freedom and disliking rules, procedures and externally imposed norms of attitude or behaviour, leading to difficulty in operating within constraining environments. The above insights provide evidence for a lack of fit between the entrepreneur and the corporate context and suggest a source of the cultural and structural problems associated with established organisations trying to be either innovative or entrepreneurial (Sharma, 1999).

The following discussion examines contributions to how entrepreneurial innovative thinking is understood. Kirton (1976) observes it as a predisposition to challenge existing assumptions and as being creative in problem-solving: thinking in new ways, rather than thinking in new areas. Carland (1982) positions intuition as the innovative opposite of analytical, structured and systematic thinking, and various writers (for instance, Olsen and Johannessen, 1994) observe that this type of synthesis-based lateral thinking is most instrumental in the invention phase of new ventures. However, Allinson, Armstrong and Hayes’ (2001, p. 41) research contradicts the idea that entrepreneurs have a different cognitive profile from senior managers, findings that arise from their survey of Scottish firms.

2.3.5: Summary discussion

The discussion above indicates that literature from psychology and social science have defined numbers of individual characteristics or attitudes of the entrepreneur which seem to occur not so much as individual, dominant characteristics but, as Lessem (1986) suggests, in differing
combinations over the population of entrepreneurs. This focus on the psychology of entrepreneurs reflects a theme in the development of academic thinking about business, evolved from a focus on systems of production to acknowledging the central role of the motivations and expectations of the humans within corporate systems. This recognition of the centrality of the interface between system and worker echoes the preoccupation with entrepreneurial context that is such a fundamental element of entrepreneurship teaching, discussed in Section 2.4.

2.4: ENTREPRENEURIAL COGNITION AND ITS TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

2.4.1: Introduction

This section discusses entrepreneurial cognition, defined by Mitchell et al. (2002, p. 97) as "knowledge structures that people use to make assessments, judgements or decisions involving opportunity evaluation, venture creation and growth". It explores the nature of this, its difference from cognitive knowledge, and the implications this has for entrepreneurship teaching, through framing it against objectivism and subjectivism, and the differences between traditional (objectivist) and progressive (subjectivist) education. The objectivist approach views that reality exists independently from those who observe, while subjectivism conceptualises reality as constructed by individuals, and that as result, all knowledge is subjective. These relate to entrepreneurship teaching, in that this seems to employ both traditional educational approaches, based on teacher-focused approaches and knowledge transmission (and also progressive approaches) based on a subjectivist understanding, with student-centred teaching and activities where students construct their understanding through activities, for instance, learning from practice (Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton, 2016, p. 4). Mintzberg (1975, p. 60) reflects on the limitations of knowledge transmission approaches in informing an activity-based subject such as entrepreneurship, noting that while:

much important cognitive material must be assimilated by the manager to be...cognitive learning no more makes a manager than it does a swimmer. The
latter will drown the first time he jumps into the water if his coach never takes
him out the lecture hall.

Grimley et al. (2011) correspondingly observe that neither attitude nor behavioural
changes are brought about by traditional teaching methods. This concern with action, behaviour
and attitude is relevant to entrepreneurship teaching as a field defined by action (Corbett and
Katz, 2012), and the development of entrepreneurial capability, based critically on an ability to
interpret the commercial environment, paralleling Mintzberg’s (1975) swimmer’s need to
negotiate their aquatic context, and on the same grounds rejecting the sole use of formal cognitive
knowledge in developing this capability. Because of the observed interdependence of context and
entrepreneurial cognition, entrepreneurial context is a recurring theme, defined by Billett (2010, p.
22) as the “enactment of the kinds of activities and interactions that constitute the occupation”.

The approach to developing entrepreneurial understanding is therefore an important issue
within teaching, and the nature of reflection seems fundamental to this. Reflecting the evolution
of understandings of knowledge, understandings of reflection have evolved from Dewey’s (1916)
ideas, to accommodate a more dynamic concept. However, Dewey’s thinking on reflection has
been influential, conceptualised as “outside the action…and for future…rather than current action”
on or for. While recognising this as an important insight, Eraut (1995) observed that the nature of
Schon’s conceptualisation continued to align with Dewey’s (1916) “cool and deliberate” reflection,
rather than the “hot and rapid” calculations that occur within action, therefore maintaining the
importance of the distinction between a “rapid intuitive process” and a “slower more deliberate
process”, observing that a “decision making process” is distinct from pursuit of a “metacognitive
dimension with that process” (ibid.). In thinking that is relevant to entrepreneurial capability, he
reflects (ibid., p. 20) on the role of intuition and analysis within fast decision-making: “most
decisions have to be made either so rapidly that they have to be purely intuitive or under
circumstances which dictate fast deliberation with a limited degree of analysis”. Clegg, Tan and
Saeidi (2002, p. 132) also challenge the prevalence of a “model of reflective practice (that) assumes
that development is largely deliberative and linear...with reflection on action leading to improvement and change” reflecting that these understandings of professional cognition may instead promote an unhelpful dualism between “knowing how” and “knowing that”. They propose that explicit understanding should encompass “deliberative action capacity” and “explicit representational awareness”, and that “intuitive action capacity” and “implicit representational awareness” should be included within the tacit knowledge register (ibid.), blurring the boundaries between knowing “how” and knowing “that”. They (ibid., p. 133) propose including the “thinking on the feet mode...the deliberative mode...but also a slower more ruminative mode”, (ibid., p. 132) observing that in the process of formal reflection, implicit understanding is “forced into consciousness”, while “knowing how” may be entirely tacit (ibid.). The insights from this paragraph relate to an evolution from Dewey’s visualisation of reflectiveness as a process of deliberative retrospection, to a recognition that reflection can occur implicitly as well as explicitly. This and, for instance, the ruminative mode of sense-making that Clegg, Tan and Saeidi (ibid.) propose, demonstrate the breadth of the spectrum of "knowledge" that accommodates what may be termed intuitive understanding at one end, to Clegg, Tan and Saeidi’s deliberative sense-making at the other, and recognises the fact that an act of reflection can combine different elements from across the spectrum. These conceptualisations have implications for the understanding of entrepreneurship decision-making, and correspondingly, entrepreneurship teaching, in that the more static understandings of knowledge seem not to replicate entrepreneurial cognition, but are perpetuated within entrepreneurship modules, particularly in formal reflective writing, discussed in Section 2.4.8.

How this type of understanding is developed seems an important issue within entrepreneurship teaching, and the nature of reflection is fundamental to this, discussed below through the perspectives of reflection in and for. While the latter takes place away from the action, informing future activity, in refers to “hot and rapid” (Eraut, 1995, p. 9), intuitive, problem-solving reflection that happens within real-life work situations, building implicit understanding that informs instant, current activity, for instance, immediate analysis of a balance sheet (Schon, 1987,
Eraut (2005, p. 20) observes that “most (professional) decisions have to be made either so rapidly that they have to be purely intuitive or under circumstances which dictate fast deliberation with a limited degree of analysis” where “the knowing is in the action” (Schon, 1987, p. 25) of which he observes that “we are characteristically unable to make it verbally explicit…our descriptions are always attempts to put into explicit, symbolic form…intelligence (that is)...tacit and spontaneous”. In this way, Schon “signposts” that implicit understanding and cognitive knowledge are exclusive categories, one articulable, the other not. This type of intuitive action capacity seems to characterise the objective of most experiential teaching that has the development of entrepreneurial capability as its objective, however, is not relevant to experiential teaching instruments that are primarily intended to develop cognitive knowledge, which were observed widely in the participant group.

2.4.2: Theory and practice in entrepreneurship teaching

The divisions represented in Figure 1 relate to a significant concern of my research, which is understanding what types of cognition are developed by teaching “about” and “for” entrepreneurship, and subsidiary to this focus, what means of teaching are used to achieve this, to include the use of instruments based on entrepreneurial context, represented in Figure 1 as “in” entrepreneurship.

![Figure 1: Teaching “for”, “in” and “about” entrepreneurship.](image)

Based on Jamieson (1984).

My analysis uses the framework of “about” and “for” to analyse research participants’ teaching: the former is informed by entrepreneurship research, which, as observed by Meyer et al. (2014), is about the characteristics of entrepreneurship, and therefore has the objective of developing cognitive knowledge about the subject, contrasting with teaching “for”
entrepreneurship that is informed by strategy theory (Brush, Greene and Hart, 2001, p. 7), is based on practice, and is directed towards developing entrepreneurial capability. Jamieson (1984) observes that teaching “about” entrepreneurship is theoretical and academic, however, “for” is a practice-based approach, characterised by Fayolle and Klandt (2006) as developing usable skills. These oppositions arise from contrasting conceptualisations of knowledge: teaching “about” aligns with an objectivist perspective that assumes that reality is a given and that “truth” can be independent from the individual perspective (Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton, 2016).

2.4.3: Neoliberal context to teaching “for” and “about” entrepreneurship

There seems to be a neoliberally influenced context to choices made about teaching “for” or “about” entrepreneurship, linked to the distinction between vocationally based further education and university-based higher education that was brought into focus in the early 1990s when polytechnics were given university status (Delanty, 2003, p. 78). This compelled traditional universities to mediate between a need to differentiate through focusing on traditional cognitive knowledge, and a competing requirement to increase turnover through, for example, investment in business schools (Hannon, 2006), whose focus, however, tends towards the applied knowledge model of vocational education (Shreeve, 2019). The resulting tension between neoliberal, instrumental, vocational teaching and traditional theoretical education seems sharply played out in entrepreneurship education in the sense that teaching “how to do” entrepreneurship is an instrumental process preparing students to set up businesses, measured in terms of profit or social value (Bloland, 2005), socialising students to competitiveness, with educators expected to help students to achieve this (Zawadzki et al., 2020, p. 268). Contrastingly, the accumulation of theory surrounding entrepreneurship corresponding with teaching “about” is consistent with the postmodernist concern for maintaining education for its intrinsic value (Peters, 2001). These different approaches to entrepreneurship teaching therefore align with either a neoliberal agenda, or with preserving the traditional values of higher education, and for this reason teaching to “do” entrepreneurship seems to sit uneasily within the university curriculum and many research participants’ aptitudes and enthusiasms. As a result, the significance of choices made to teach
“for” or “about” is that they express ideological orientations, beliefs and values of participants which inform what an “acceptable” form of entrepreneurship looks like. Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd (2012, p. 4) capture the abstraction of theory from practice as an “ivory tower” of scholars who are not supposed to be relevant or “useful”, correspondingly locating teaching “for” entrepreneurship outside the academic pale. This is not to say, as my research demonstrates, that teaching and researching entrepreneurship is not engaged with practice, but that there are significant structural impediments in its way. The relationship between philosophical orientation and teaching is something that I hope to illuminate through my research.

2.4.4: Theory and skills and teachers’ position

The issue of what teachers view as valuable knowledge is an element in the division between teaching “for” and “about” entrepreneurship: Fayolle, Verzat and Wapshott (2016, p. 10) observe that entrepreneurship research “has undergone a phase of academic institutionalisation, which has progressively shifted it away from the practical perspective it had initially”, and Neck, Greene and Brush (2014) observe a correlation between each teacher’s path to their current role and where they are located on the theory/practice spectrum: this positionality will correlate with what teachers view as valuable knowledge, their corresponding choices about the balance between theory and skills development, and the teaching methodologies and assessment modes that relate to this (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008). The determinative role of experience noted by Neck, Greene and Brush (2014) is illustrated by Hannon’s (2006, p. 300) observation that:

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 personal philosophy about the fundamental purpose of education, about the purpose of entrepreneurship education in particular, and about our role as an entrepreneurship educator,

which therefore defines the purpose of the curriculum, and the role of the teacher (ibid.) An example of this is the differences between entrepreneurship and enterprise education, the former
arising from a liberal/neoliberally informed focus on the individual, and the latter with the 
objective of developing the life abilities of the individual (Jones and Iredale, 2010, p. 12), reflecting 
a social orientation (Gingell and Winch, 2004). This example illustrates that these are not merely 
functional choices, but express significant differences in beliefs and values, as do choices in 
teaching “about” and “for” entrepreneurship discussed above.

2.4.5: The role of entrepreneurial context in teaching

This is defined by Neck, Greene and Brush’s (2014, p. 15) “hands-on, action-based 
activities that enhance development of entrepreneurial competences and performance”. Context 
is observed by Neck and Corbett (2018, p. 10) as the key differentiator of entrepreneurship 
teaching from other disciplines, in developing critical “operationalisable skills” (Fayolle and Klandt, 
2006), Eraut (2005, p. 3) observes the crucial role of context in potentiating “the processes of recognition, interaction and interpretation of a range of evidence... (including) recognition of frequently encountered patterns of evidence (and) discrimination of differences within those patterns”. The "pattern" recognition that Eraut theorises is mobilised when a student is analysing a case study, or working as a consultant within a company, which they are "reading" (ibid.) in order to develop their ability to recognise competitive advantage within mutating entrepreneurial contexts: it is not possible to “read” competitive patterns in the absence of context.

Recent research highlights context’s important role in explaining entrepreneurial actions and their outcomes (Bjørnskov and Foss, 2013). Illuminating the comment above about context’s connection with competitive advantage, Venkataraman and Sarasvathy (2001, p. 3) reflect on its decisive influence on defining entrepreneurial opportunity, noting that “entrepreneurial opportunities are extremely context specific. What might be an opportunity in the Ukraine may not be an opportunity at all in the United States”. Hjorth, Jones and Gartner (2008) also reflect on the generative power of context in understanding entrepreneurship, observing that contextualisation is the key to opening the “black box” underlying entrepreneurial phenomena. The insight from this section is that in order to develop entrepreneurial cognition, students have to be familiarised with the unpredictable, unstructured and emotional nature of entrepreneurial
reality through being immersed in activities that replicate this, particularly as the patterns within
the context encountered dictate the presence or absence of entrepreneurial opportunity. It
therefore seems important to understand how entrepreneurship teachers view the role of context,
and how they use it in their teaching.

2.4.6: Teaching approaches to develop entrepreneurial cognition

As observed above, in Section 2.4.5, the philosophies of objectivism and subjectivism are
expressed in entrepreneurship teaching approaches, the former enacted in knowledge
transmission teaching, based on receiving, storing and using information (Procter, 2019), and
subjectivism, conceptualising that all knowledge is mediated through the cognitive architecture of
the individual (Cunliffe, 2011), relates to the experiential teaching methods that focus on the
development of skills (Labaree, 2012), so choices to teach “for” or “about” entrepreneurship arise
from differing philosophies. The following discussion explores the teaching approaches that may
build the entrepreneurial cognition discussed in the analysis chapters (Chapters 5–8): Gaglio and
Katz (2001, p. 95) reflect that “understanding the opportunity identification process represents
one of the core intellectual questions for the domain of entrepreneurship”, with DeTienne and
Chandler (2004) observing that the aim of teaching entrepreneurship is identifying opportunities
that deliver competitive advantage, and the ability to distinguish this from a generic opportunity.
To achieve this, they propose that students should “creatively interpret the environment“ (ibid., p.
243), asserting (ibid., p. 242) that this capability “can be developed as other unique competencies,
and that the entrepreneurship classroom is an appropriate venue for developing these skills”,
termed “entrepreneurial cognition” by Neck, Greene and Brush (2014, p. 9). Neck and Greene
(2011, p. 60) observe that this is achieved through immersion in practice, reflecting that “in order
to learn entrepreneurship, one must do entrepreneurship”. To achieve this, they (ibid., p. 63) argue
for increased use of case studies and limited duration business start-ups on the basis that they are
“steeped in entrepreneurial thinking”, therefore allowing students to experience critical junctures
in decision-making faced by entrepreneurs, increasing their ability to identify advantage within
dynamic and unpredictable contexts, therefore reinforcing the effectiveness of their judgement.
They (ibid., p. 62) argue that effective entrepreneurship education avoids both traditional “stand and deliver” methods and also teaching “for” entrepreneurship as a process, a series of steps, instead focusing on the importance of building students’ ability to differentiate good opportunities from poor ones. In relation to developing this type of capability Neck and Greene (ibid.) recognise the salience of a practice background, observing that:

knowledge of teaching and practice take their place...as distinct and complementary elements of professional knowledge...when each of these different types of knowledge are together focused on the world’s complex problems, they have the potential to produce a deeper understanding than any other type of knowledge applied alone.

However, Corbett and Katz (2012, p. 4) observe that it is “supremely ironic (that)...for a field defined by action...entrepreneurship has had such an inconsistent tradition of actually studying action" and Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton (2016) note the challenges of teaching process (“for”) rather than content (“about”), and in bridging the gap between detached study and emotionally engaged learning. They note (ibid., p. 8) the following explanatory issues for this, observing the structural incentives towards teaching entrepreneurship traditionally, for instance, that traditional knowledge transmission methods are more measurable and predictable, and a lack of teaching structures in order to educate progressively. They also observe the difficulties of assessing teamwork, in comparison to the more straightforward nature of traditional, individual assessment (ibid., p. 4), and contrast the manageable and measurable teaching enabled by standardised curricula with the localised and multidisciplinary approach of progressive education (ibid., p. 5). Another explanatory issue may be Whetten and Clark’s (1996, p. 159) observation that academic practitioners feel that modules that develop skills lack academic merit, and they cite attempts to endow them with academic authenticity through immersing students in technically sophisticated research literature.
The above discussion evidences the drivers for Fayolle’s (2018, p. 694) observation that “there is no common framework reflecting the key philosophical and didactical dimensions of entrepreneurship education and teaching”. The insights from this section are that a key objective in teaching “for” entrepreneurship is equipping students with the entrepreneurial cognition that enables them to recognise ideas that have competitive advantage from those that do not, that immersion into practice develops students’ entrepreneurial cognition, and that an experience of entrepreneurship practice contributes to educators’ ability to build this capability. However, they also observe that while skills formed by progressive teaching “for” entrepreneurship are a central part of entrepreneurial capability, structural disincentives to this operate, institutionalised through curriculum design and contributed to by the difficulty of assessment, and the requirement for teachers to move to a teaching role based on emotion, from a background of traditional detached study.

2.4.7: The teacher’s role

Increasing immersion in entrepreneurial context correlates with a role for entrepreneurship educators that evolves towards being a guide and partner (Hartshorn and Hannon, 2005, p. 619) captured in the categories in Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Authority, coach</td>
<td>Interactive lectures, guest speakers, students pitching new ideas with feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>Motivator, guide</td>
<td>Case studies, simulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Feasibility projects, lean start-up, problem-based learning projects, starting a business as a course project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Self-directed</td>
<td>Consultant, delegator</td>
<td>Starting a new venture outside class, students working on challenges facing a new or young venture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Picking up the previous discussion on context, Bovill (2019) observes that co-creative teaching is necessary to help students recognise the patterns in, and understand the implications of, the context in which decisions need to be made, characterising this as learning and teaching done with students rather than to them (Cook-Sather, Bovill and Felten, 2014). This involves “an active role of interaction between teacher and students…participating, interacting, or contributing… to gather information, to problem-solve” as well as in developing the values and attitudes of students (Bovill, 2019, p. 4).

However, Bovill observes that this type of active teamwork between teacher and student is less common than the increasingly queried use of traditional lecturing (cited in Freeman et al., 2014), but nevertheless the quality of emotional support and direction from teachers to students seems central to the types of experiential learning (Pratt, 2002) represented in Figure 2. Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton (2016, p. 8) observe that this type of teaching demands that educators enter into a different type of relationship with students from that of traditional detached study, instead participating in emotionally engaged teamwork with them (ibid.) to interpret the commercial contexts that the students encounter in their learning. To teach new venture development and play their role in building new businesses alongside students, it therefore seems that teachers need the following characteristics: the confidence to engage in co-creation teaching, the experience in order to participate in this type of consultancy work and the ability to lead student teams so that students work and learn as deeply as they can, therefore taking on the role of consulting team leader.

The observations from this section suggest that to perform a consulting role, the teacher must differentiate good ideas from the mediocre (or actively damaging) and guide the student team to being able to recognise opportunities, take risks and make decisions, skills central to entrepreneurial capability (Hartshorn and Hannon, 2005, p. 619). However, each of these is bound tightly to a recognition of the context in which it presents itself, as discussed which are by definition made up of combinations of constantly changing elements, in changing weightings. It is the accurate reading of those changing weightings (Eraut, 2005) that enables the successful ability
to recognise opportunities, take risks and make decisions. If the teacher is supposed to be a consultant (Bovill, 2019), interpreting entrepreneurial context alongside the student (Neck and Corbett, 2018, p. 20), this seems to demand the skill of being able to read commercial context.

2.4.8: Assessments and their relationship with knowledge types

This section relates to forms of assessment that are congruent to these types of knowledge, including the interior-focused retrospective construction of action into cognitive knowledge, theorised by Dewey (1916). Pryor and Crossouard (2008) reflect that assessments are not in any way exterior to the teaching, but that they are formed by decisions about what knowledge is valuable, which relates to my research in the sense that the choices made by entrepreneurship teachers about assessment reflect what discourses have meaning for them (Fayolle, 2000), and therefore signify what they consider to be worthwhile entrepreneurship education. The following discussion will take Gipps' (1994) definitions of assessment: summative assessments which test what learners know, and formative assessments that develop learners’ understanding, expressed by Pryor and Crossouard (2008) as “coming to know in different situations”, the latter particularly relevant in teaching that develops entrepreneurial judgement.

The discussion in the next paragraph will explore the relationship between types of cognition and assessments, using the understandings discussed earlier in this chapter. Pryor and Crossouard (ibid., p. 2) observe that while traditional summative forms of assessment are dominant in higher education, and formative assessment is largely ignored, the former is a poor fit with constructivist teaching approaches, which are seen by Lans and Gulikers (2010, p. 56) as relating to assessments that are “contextualised in professional practice”, focusing “not only on knowledge, but on knowledge, skills and attitude”.

The challenge for an educator lies in distinguishing whether the assessment reflects the nature of the learning, an example of which is the difference between retrospective, deliberative reflection, and the “hot and rapid” reflection (Eraut, 1995, p. 9) where the learning is in the action (Schon, 1987, p. 25). Given the significance of the implications for assessment between these apparently slight differences, it is unsurprising that Fook and Sidhu (2010) observe a continuing
mismatch in higher education between curriculum content and assessment design. Illustrating the complexity of the relationship between knowledge and assessment, Pryor and Crossouard’s (2008) observation above of developing students’ understanding through “coming to know” seems open to being inhabited in different ways: for instance, it could relate to the application of cognitive information to a case study, used as an “object” for applying this knowledge, whereas “reading” (Eraut, 2005) patterns within it seems to represent a “coming to know” that is inextricably bound up with the texture of that particular context, and develops interpretive capabilities. While it is likely to be difficult to know the objective that each participant teacher has for his or her assessment, it should be possible, through examination of module assessment details and observation of teaching, to understand where assessments focus more on cognitive or professional knowledge (ibid.).

My analysis will use Pryor and Crossouard’s (2008, p. 2) framework that views assessments as summative or formative based on their purpose: summative assessments test what students know, while formative assessments develop students’ understanding. Assessments can be categorised according to the following criteria: those that “live” test students’ ability to “read” situations (for instance, recognising commercial patterns within unseen case studies), or assessments that evidence that the “knowing…(that is) in the action” (Schon, 1987, p. 25) has taken place, for instance, via a retrospective project report for a client. It seems that these assessment categories test different types of knowledge: “live” testing seems to test entrepreneurial cognition (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 60) most closely, given its requirement for students to “read” a situation and make decisions, however, while retrospective assessment of “live” action tests the same ability, it frames it through deliberative thought that acts as a post-rationalisation, and therefore it may not be as accurate as “live” testing in evidencing a student’s ability to “read” an entrepreneurial context. The third category of assessment, for instance, an exam or a theoretical essay, tests that learning has happened and seems therefore to be a summative assessment, and the fourth is a formal Deweyan (1916) interior-focused reflection on the process of learning, retrospectively developing cognitive information out of action.
This paragraph compares the first three types of assessment with the fourth, Dewey’s (ibid.) approach. In doing “real time” analysis of a company, a student’s actions are amenable to different types of assessment: this can be, as discussed, via the interpretation of commercial patterns as well as the analytical application of cognitive knowledge, whereas the Deweyan approach traces the development of the student’s awareness of learning. The difficulty seems to lie in the fact that these test separate things that may not coincide: the first category demonstrates the nature and extent of the learning and by definition that it has happened, however, Deweyan assessment is not structured to evidence the nature or degree of entrepreneurial ability developed by the student, but instead his or her interior-focused perceptions of the process of learning. It is therefore possible that the student can, for instance, have contributed little to a client company, but simultaneously been attuned to his or her own learning (in other words, the awareness of learning can be significant but not related to the results achieved), which suggests that these processes do not necessarily have an intrinsic linkage and are therefore not a reliable documentation of activity. An additional difficulty is that learning in action may defy articulability, as previously observed (Schon, 1987). The insight from this section is that assessments can either test that learning has happened, ask students to demonstrate that learning “live”, or evidence students’ awareness of their learning process via an interior-focused, retrospective reflection, and that making the choice will depend on the understanding of the nature of the knowledge that the learning has produced.

2.4.9: Summary discussion

The discussion in the Section 2.4 focuses on the divisions within entrepreneurship teaching arising from the philosophical differences between traditional, cognitively based teaching “about” entrepreneurship and the constructivist understandings that inform teaching “for”. It views the nature of knowledge taught by these as fundamental to the oppositions between them, and traces the evolution of professional knowledge, and its correspondence to a contemporary understanding of reflection as “in the action” (Schon, 1987, p. 25). It compares the objectives of these teaching approaches, noting that teaching “about” relates to the development
of cognitive knowledge about the subject, with the objective of producing future entrepreneurship scholars, and that teaching “for” has the objective of developing entrepreneurial “entrepreneurial cognition” (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 60), a capability that allows interpretation of entrepreneurial context and what Neck and Corbett (2018) consider the crucial capability of identifying competitive advantage.

The discussion in Section 2.4. explores the means of exposing students to entrepreneurial context, and the roles that these oblige teachers to undertake, noting the difficulty of moving to this type of co-creative teaching (Bovill, 2019) from a formal knowledge transmission background (Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton, 2016), particularly given the links between professional knowledge and experience of professional practice (Fayolle, 2018, p. 695). However, it notes that this type of teaching suffers significant structural disincentives, institutionalised through curriculum design and difficulty of assessment, and also from the difficulty for educators of moving from traditional detached study to experiential forms of teaching. An additional disincentive is the influence of entrepreneurship research, which has progressively disengaged from a practice focus (Fayolle, Verzat and Wapshott, 2016, p. 10).

2.5: THE TYPES OF KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPED BY ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH

2.5.1: Most start-up research is from strategy

The division between teaching “for” and “about” is reinforced by the nature of research. Carlsson et al. (2013, p. 194) observe that entrepreneurship study has developed from subfields of several disciplines, primarily economics, strategy, marketing, finance, sociology, psychology, economic and cultural anthropology, business history and geography. However, Brush, Greene and Hart (2001, p. 7) observe that most research about how to start and scale up a company arises from the field of strategy (rather than entrepreneurship). Venkataraman and Sarasvathy (2001, p. 3) observe that research about the phenomenon of entrepreneurship tends to be drawn from economics and relates to its beginnings: how products, firms and markets are created, while research for, drawn from strategy, relates to entrepreneurial ends: understanding the ways that
market share, profit and competitive advantage can be created. It can therefore be seen that entrepreneurs are concerned with profit, market share, etc., rather than its beginnings.

Venkataraman and Sarasvathy (ibid.) note, however, that these research approaches “have developed largely independent of each other”, which seems part of the separation between teaching “about” and “for” entrepreneurship. The implication of these observations is that, for entrepreneurship academics to have a field of research that they own, it is likely to be about entrepreneurship. This necessity to own the research is reinforced by the structure that supports academic enquiry, which takes place within specialist and exclusive areas of university departments, where entrepreneurship and strategy scholars tend to be separate entities (Hannon, 2006), incentivised to publish in order to be promoted (Morley, 2003), and where the journals for strategy research tend to be separate from those for entrepreneurship research, reflecting the disciplinary divisions described.

2.5.2: **Research finds that entrepreneurship research is about, apart from finance**

Entrepreneurship’s research focus “about” is corroborated by Meyer al.’s (2014) analysis, finding that it is primarily “about” the entrepreneur as a phenomenon, or “about” the entrepreneurial process as a phenomenon. Meyer et al. (ibid.) report that there are four main areas for entrepreneurship research: the first relates to the cognitive aspects of entrepreneurship, how entrepreneurs identify market opportunities, the circumstances surrounding opportunity recognition, probing the motivations of entrepreneurial behaviour, and how entrepreneurs make decisions. This canon of research seems to relate to how entrepreneurs behave. The next area of entrepreneurship research relates to demographic and personality determinants of entrepreneurship. This research relates primarily to the human capital, social and personality related themes of entrepreneur, exploring “the role of entrepreneurship in the macro economy, especially from the viewpoint of labour economists” (ibid., p. 478). For example, this group contains subjects like declining self-employment in Japan, and self-employment in older US workers. The next area identified by Meyer et al. (2014) relates to theoretical perspectives on entrepreneurship, containing “primarily conceptual papers that propose different theoretical
lenses to study the origins, process and impacts of entrepreneurship”. This group includes, for instance, “the institutional entrepreneur as modern prince: the strategic face of power in contested fields”, and “reflections on developments in institutional theory: toward a relational approach”. All of the above are about the phenomenon of entrepreneurship. The last main area of entrepreneurship research relates to entrepreneurial and innovation finance, observed by Meyer et al. (ibid.) as the smallest field. This relates to research on venture capital, business angels, exit strategies, financing instruments and governance issues with regard to new ventures and SMEs. Examples of this research are taxation of a venture capitalist with a portfolio of firms, staged financing in venture capital, moral hazard and risks, and staged finance and the role of convertible securities. What emerges from Meyer et al.’s research is that the only field that could potentially inform how an entrepreneur does entrepreneurship is that of entrepreneurial finance. However, this is unlikely on the basis that the research is raised to a level of abstraction where it is unlikely to be sought out or to inform doing entrepreneurship.

2.5.3: Summary discussion

Research that informs entrepreneurship teaching contributes to its divisions between practice and theory, in the sense that scholarship about the phenomenon tends to relate to its beginnings and its nature (Venkataraman and Sarasvathy, 2001, p. 3), however, that which informs practice arises from strategy (Brush, Greene and Hart, 2001, p. 7), a division reinforced by disciplinary separation (Hark, 2007) and the incentive to publish in order to be promoted (Morley, 2003).

2.6: SUMMARY OF INSIGHTS FROM THE LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review frames the divisions within entrepreneurship teaching against a significant neoliberal/anti-neoliberal discourse that surrounds higher education, highlighted by the clash between strong policy support for entrepreneurship teaching and its characterisation as a significant element in the neoliberalisation of higher education (Brown, 2015), with the latter’s associated restructuring of its product, producers and consumers (Morley, 2003). This context
places entrepreneurship teachers at the spearhead of neoliberal rationality within the university, irrespective of their position in relation to it, a position exacerbated by the business school being viewed as the fulcrum of neoliberal ideology (Parker, 2018) while contributing significant funding through its attraction of unprecedented numbers of students. Additionally, the type of scholarship undertaken by the business school creates networks between the public and private sectors (Slaughter, Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004, p. 29) that undermines traditional scholarship in preference for academic capitalism (ibid.).

Economic policy, business and academia each conceptualise the purpose of entrepreneurship education differently, and these different stakeholder conceptualisations lead to different teaching objectives, and therefore different teaching approaches. Correspondingly, entrepreneurship teaching seems to be characterised by overlapping constructs and a lack of definitional clarity (Matlay, 2002), and absence of agreed frameworks for teaching (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008, p. 570). These issues, and the context discussed above, create a concern with academic legitimacy (Neck, Greene and Brush, 2014) in entrepreneurship teachers that will guide the choices that they make between traditional cognitive knowledge (“about”) and teaching that develops entrepreneurial capability (“for”).

As a result, there seems a lack of consensus about what “good” entrepreneurship teaching is, however, the choices that entrepreneurship teachers make regarding teaching “about” and “for” seem to relate to the philosophical differences between traditional, cognitively based teaching “about” entrepreneurship and the constructivist understandings that inform teaching “for”. Depending on the objective for the teaching, this will contain differing amounts of active, student-centred teaching and teacher-centred, knowledge transmission teaching, which are characterised by different types of exposure of students to entrepreneurial context. This background suggests that teaching “about” or “for” are not merely functional choices, but arise from deeply held beliefs (Hannon, 2006, p. 300). The literature review focuses on the differences in knowledge that these approaches use, exploring the status and nature of, respectively, cognitive knowledge and entrepreneurial cognition (Neck and Greene, 2011), that is directed towards
interpreting entrepreneurial contexts for the presence of competitive advantage (Neck and Corbett, 2018). However, the discussion notes that teaching for development of entrepreneurial cognition suffers significant structural disincentives, institutionalised through curriculum design and difficulty of assessment, and the difficulty in educators moving from traditional detached study to experiential forms of teaching. Entrepreneurship research contributes to the divisions between teaching “about” and “for” entrepreneurship, in that research that informs the former arises from scholarship about the phenomenon (Meyer et al., 2014), whereas that which informs teaching “for” arises from strategy theory (Brush, Greene and Hart, 2001, p. 7), reinforced by disciplinary demarcations (Hark, 2007).
CHAPTER 3:
CONSTRUCTIVISM AS A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Note: A detailed discussion of knowledge’s links with teaching and assessment is in the literature review (Chapter 2), therefore the following discussion limits itself to the interface of these with constructivist issues.

3.1: INTRODUCTION

My research sets out to understand the relationship between how teachers think about entrepreneurship and their pedagogical practices, and a key issue seems the divide between experiential, tacit understanding: the ability to “read” commercial situations (Eraut, 2005) in order to develop “knowing how”; and traditional knowledge (“knowing that”). As discussed in the literature review, these align with the distinct educational philosophies of subjectivism and objectivism, and the contrasting teaching methods that correspond to them, discussed in Section 3.2. My analysis is sensitive to “an excess of constructivism” (O’Connor, 2020, p. 4) potentially diminishing the role of cognitive knowledge, however, as my research seeks to understand the relationship between cognitive and experiential forms of knowledge and the purposes that teachers have for their teaching, a constructivist framework seems appropriate.

The precept of constructivism that people actively build their own understanding, knowledge and meaning from their experiences (Dewey, 1916; Piaget, 1972; Vygotsky, 1978) seems to validate its relevance to my research’s observation of the interrelationship between experience and teaching orientation, that mirrors Neck, Greene and Brush’s (2014, p. 5) observation of a correlation between each entrepreneurship teacher’s route to their current role and location on the theory/practice spectrum. This constructivist, experiential approach also seems a valuable framework to understand the nature of experiential teaching approaches used by entrepreneurship educators, illuminating its potential to engage with what DeTienne and Chandler (2004) and Neck and Corbett (2018) consider a core strategic issue in entrepreneurship teaching, the recognition of competitive advantage, and the development of entrepreneurial
cognition (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 60). A constructivist elucidation of teaching “how” within entrepreneurship education seems pertinent, given that its vocational status seems subsidiary to universities’ traditional concern with developing cognitive, theoretical knowledge (Little and Brennan, 1996, p. 33) and that it seems therefore a disrupter within the university context, notwithstanding the incorporation into the academy of disciplines such as engineering, focused on professional practice (Bentley, Gulbrandsen and Kyvik, 2015, p. 693). The following discussion uses a constructivist understanding to explore the relationship between cognitive and experience-based knowledge, discussed in Section 2.4 of the literature review, and other aspects of entrepreneurship teaching.

3.2: OBJECTIVIST AND SUBJECTIVIST APPROACHES TO TEACHING

Objectivist as well as subjectivist approaches are enacted in entrepreneurship teaching, “about” reflecting an objectivist understanding and “for” a subjectivist (Pring, 2010). Objectivism assumes that reality is a given and that “truth” can be independent from the individual perspective (Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton, 2016), and is enacted in knowledge-transmission teaching through its focus on receiving, storing and using information (Procter, 2019). Subjectivism, on the other hand, proposes that reality is constructed by individuals, and that all knowledge is mediated through the cognitive architecture of the individual (Cunliffe, 2011): for this reason, it links with constructivist, experiential teaching methods that focus on the development of skills (Labaree, 2012), likely to be enacted in the classroom through the use of teamwork, application to real-life commercial contexts, case studies and other collaborative work. Because objectivist teaching seems less useful in developing higher-order skills such as reasoning and problem-solving (Peterson and Walberg, 1984), this may shape the degree to which constructivist as well as knowledge-transmission teaching is used, particularly given that higher education needs to produce critical students “who do not just remember and understand established concepts…but can also apply these concepts, analyse and evaluate arguments” (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001, p. 53). However, given the observation in the literature review that entrepreneurship research informs teaching “about”, and strategy theory teaching “for”, use of constructivist teaching
methods (such as case studies) to develop reasoning and problem-solving are likely to have to cross disciplinary boundaries, therefore engaging with a different disciplinary idiom and set of reference points.

3.3: KEY THEORISTS OF CONSTRUCTIVIST EDUCATION

Some of constructivist education's key original theorists include Dewey (1916), Piaget (1972), Vygotsky (1978) and Bruner (1987). More recently, constructivism has been developed in relation to learning in higher education by Hounsell and Hounsell (2007) and Boud (2006) among others, and in professional education by, for example, Eraut (2000) and Schon (1984). While constructivist understandings and teaching predate widespread neoliberal initiatives, they seem nevertheless imbricated in neoliberalism’s focus on applied, professionally oriented teaching (discussed in detail in Section 2.2 of the literature review), producing “graduates who have the ability to do a job…(and be) skilful practitioners” (Greenwood and Levin, 2001, p. 434). The following discussion exemplifies how constructivist thinking has illuminated the way that knowledge is developed, one of the concerns of my research. Vygotsky (1978) conceptualised that reality is not an objective, external phenomenon to be discovered, but is constructed socially into meaning: this is useful in illuminating the difference between teaching “how to do” entrepreneurship and that which focuses on cognitive knowledge transmission. The potency of Eraut’s work draws precisely from these social foundations of constructivist theory: it is the social process of learning through the process of collaboration, by doing, that separates professional from theoretical knowledge in Eraut’s (2000) conceptualisation. Schon (1984) understood that learning “how to do” is based in reflection in action, and Eraut that implicit understanding, developed from experience, rather than cognitive knowledge, is important to making decisions at speed in professional work. These constructivist insights are useful in understanding the character of the difference between teaching “about” and “for” entrepreneurship, providing a framework for understanding the nature and purpose of experiential teaching approaches, particularly in terms of developing cognitive or experiential knowledge, for instance within the use of case studies or
exposure “live” to an organisation, and in linking these to what the teacher wants to achieve through the teaching.

3.4: CHARACTERISTICS OF CONSTRUCTIVIST TEACHING

This section explores how a constructivist approach to teaching relates to entrepreneurship education. Van Bergen and Parsell (2019, p. 47) observe that “interests...emotion, knowledge, motivation and engagement” emerge from constructivist teaching that tends to be collaborative, enquiry based and based on open discussions (ibid., p. 29). Vygotsky (1978) notes the centrality of social interactions to this type of learning, enacted through communications between teacher and student and student with student, and correspondingly, Procter (2019) observes a pivotal role within this type of constructivist teaching for teacher experience in guiding learning. A constructivist approach values the iterative process of trying, learning from mistakes and incorporating new knowledge into future decision-making, mirroring entrepreneurship teaching in terms of the latter’s exposure of students to differing contexts to create “ideas (that are) continually formed and reformed through experience” (Kolb, 1984, p. 27). This process develops students’ ability to navigate context and therefore build the “entrepreneurial cognition” (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 60) that, as observed above, is considered critical to teaching “for” entrepreneurship, as this type of cognition is seen as fundamental to identifying competitive advantage, a crucial requirement for start-ups to survive (ibid.). The constructivist focus on iterative experience is supported by Eraut’s (2005) observation that what seems an “intuitive” ability to recognise situations is in reality a deep tacit understanding that is built up over repeated exposure to different contexts, underlining the benefits of entrepreneurship teaching that replicates this process.

Continuing the focus on iterative learning, and the corresponding analogy between Eraut’s (2005) research into medical practice and the divisions between teaching “about” and “for” entrepreneurship, he observes (ibid., p. 3) that:
Clinical knowledge is based on a complex taxonomy, which relates disease symptoms to underlying pathology. In contrast, the biomedical sciences are based on general principles defining chains of causal mechanisms. Thus, learning to explain how a set of symptoms is consistent with a diagnosis may be very different from learning how to explain what causes a disease.

This analogy illustrates the cognitive separation between teaching “for” and “about” entrepreneurship: the interpretive ability of clinical medicine seems synonymous with the entrepreneurial cognition that student entrepreneurs need in order to weigh up elements within changing entrepreneurial contexts (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 60). In contrast, the process of learning to explain what causes a disease mirrors learning “about” entrepreneurship, for example, perhaps explaining what macroeconomic factors might predispose regions of the UK towards entrepreneurial activity. From this, it is possible to see that these two types of knowledge are different in nature and function, and are for different purposes, and therefore likely to be developed through different types of teaching. An element of constructivist education is the debated issue of student-led learning (Procter, 2019): as suggested above, novice diagnosticians would not know which questions to ask the patient, and in the same way, student entrepreneurs would not know which were the relevant questions to ask about a commercial case, therefore making student-led learning difficult. Additionally, Meyer and Land’s (2005, p. 373) ideas about “threshold concepts” argue against a student-led approach on the basis that concepts, for instance, market and consumer research, competitor analysis techniques and working capital management, need to be understood before they can be applied. The issue of the extent to which teachers perform this sort of interpretive guiding role, and the role of students in this type of learning, is part of the framework against which the teaching will be explored.

Another constructivist element that may play a role within the observed teaching is conversation, humour and storytelling, particularly given Jones’ (2006, p. 237) observation of the necessity for “high levels of energy and excitement” in experiential teaching, Tyng et al.’s (2017, p. 2) observation that engagement of emotion within teaching results in heightened recall and
retention, and their observation that the learning from emotionally experiential teaching survives
with resilience over time. Enacting this understanding, conversation that is engaged and
experiential has “more force to transmit than classical teaching methods” (Jeder, 2015, p. 632)
given that it provides an opportunity for reflection on experience in “real time” (Eraut, 1995, p. 18).
Alternatively, conversation can enact a “banking concept of education” (Baker, Jensen and Kolb,
2005, p. 15), operating as knowledge download. Storytelling is likely to be observed within
teaching, on the basis that “our brains actually respond to what is happening in a story as if it were
a genuine experience” (Landrum, Brakke and McCarthy, 2019, p. 4) therefore creating connections
between teacher and student (ibid., p. 2). My research should clarify the role that conversation,
humour and storytelling perform within teaching, and how they relate to teaching approaches,
explored in Chapter 5.

3.5: CONSTRUCTIVIST ASSESSMENT

As observed in the literature review, Pryor and Crossouard (2008, p. 3) reflect that,
notwithstanding the prevalence of summative forms of assessments, particularly in the older
universities, these are a poor fit with constructivist teaching. They reflect that assessments are not
in any way exterior to the teaching, but that they are formed by decisions about what knowledge
is valuable, the insight from which is that the continuing focus on summative assessment indicates
a prevalent engagement with knowledge transmission and acquisition. They observe formative
assessment’s engagement of students with “new ways of being and acting” (ibid.), and this insight
seems relevant to teaching “for” entrepreneurship, with its emphasis on shaping capability for
action. In relation to this, my research will explore what types of assessment are used to evidence
“hot and rapid” (Eraut, 1995, p. 9) learning that happens during exposure to “real-life”
entrepreneurial contexts, observing in particular any linearity within the relationship between
“knowing that” and “knowing how”. In terms of options for assessment for this sort of experiential
teaching, Ryan and Ryan (2013) observe an increasingly common use of a Deweyan assessment
instrument, translating experiential learning from a non-cognitive state to a cognitive
understanding, however, Eraut (1995, p. 17) reflects that this type of imposed practice can prompt
inauthentic behaviour. This is one example of the way that choices of assessment can offer insight into the thinking and beliefs behind teaching, and for this reason they will be used as a framework for the analysis in Chapter 7.

3.6: SUMMARY DISCUSSION

The insights above into the constructivist relationship between understanding and experience should provide a framework for understanding the connection between teaching approach and knowledge developed by the teaching, but also between teachers’ experience, their beliefs and the knowledge they privilege in the teaching. This perspective underpins the main research question, which asks: “In relation to eight higher education teachers of entrepreneurship in the UK, what are their knowledge and beliefs relating to the subject and to the teaching, and how are these enacted in their teaching?” Because the linkage between experience, understanding and beliefs is likely to shape teachers’ classroom practice, and because the polarisation between theory and practice in entrepreneurship teaching seems to eliminate a “compromise” centre ground state, the positionality of teachers in relation to their experience and beliefs is likely to be discernible, manifested in quite diverse teaching approaches.

Teachers’ understanding and beliefs will be understood through exploring the linkage between their discussion of what their teaching is for, and its design, emerging particularly where these might be dissonant: a potential site for this is the interface between professional learning, as theorised by Eraut (1995, 2000, 2005), and cognitive knowledge, because these yield different understandings of reflection and assessment, which “signpost” teachers’ beliefs about what they are teaching for. This linkage will inevitably be undermined at times by the fact that teachers inherit teaching, but this potential weakness will be accommodated by triangulating this with what teachers say. To summarise, based on the insights into teaching offered by a constructivist approach, discussed above, it seems a helpful framework for understanding what knowledge is taught, how it is taught, the purposes for teaching, how it is assessed and how these link with what teachers believe.
4.1: RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND INTRODUCTION

My main research question is: “In relation to eight higher education teachers of entrepreneurship in England, what are their knowledge and beliefs relating to the subject and to the teaching, and how are these enacted in their teaching?”, and supplementary questions related to this are: “What are the case study teachers’ beliefs about entrepreneurship?”, “What are the case study teachers’ beliefs about the nature and purpose of entrepreneurship teaching and learning?”, “What forms of knowledge do the case study entrepreneurship teachers draw on in their classroom practices?” and “How do the studied teachers teach entrepreneurship?”.  

This chapter explains the methodology and research structure for this exploration of eight entrepreneurship teachers in five universities in England and takes the form of eight contextualised case studies relating to each teacher. The purpose of my research is to explore the concern of the research questions, which is what teachers’ beliefs and understandings are, and how these relate to their practice. My research took the form of semi-structured interviews, which enabled participants to talk about what their experience was and what was valuable to them, within the broad framework of themes that were of interest to the research: it did not seem possible to understand participants’ teaching without understanding their meaning perspective (Erikson, 1993) that shaped it.  

My research sequence is as follows: initial pilot research with one, initial, teacher that helped to develop themes relevant to this research, followed by a process with the other participants of face-to-face discussions, observation of teaching, and second (Skype) discussions. The research takes a qualitative form, using teachers’ discussions and teaching as the unit of analysis. Analytical approaches altered as the data collection process proceeded, as these were informed by insights gained during the research process, not least of which was the iterative process of being reflective about my own position within the research. Research conclusions were
developed from the synthesis of what teachers believed and understood, how these were enacted in their teaching, teachers’ explanations about their teaching and my interpretation of these. The structure of this chapter is as follows: Section 4.2 details the interpretivist approach and the choice of a case study form. Section 4.3 explores issues of reflexivity, and Section 4.4 ethical considerations. Section 4.5 details the data collection process and Section 4.6 the research participants and how the data was analysed.

4.2: INTERPRETIVIST METHODOLOGY

“Reality” can be seen from the perspective of objectivist and subjectivist approaches: objectivism assumes that reality is a given and that “truth” can be independent from the individual perspective (Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton, 2016), while subjectivism, on the other hand, proposes that reality is constructed by individuals, and that all knowledge is mediated through the cognitive architecture of the individual (Cunliffe, 2011). Positivism is associated with objectivist understandings, and interpretivism with subjectivist approaches, and constructivist understandings. The focus of my research on the linkage between the nature of knowledge and its interrelationship with experience and teaching, fits with an interpretivist approach. This understanding is important to my research because it focuses on the way that people construct social reality through social interaction (Tuli, 2010), that each person has a different perception of what reality is and means, and that events need to be interpreted through the framework of each person’s individual understanding of reality: it is this understanding of each individual teacher’s perceptual positionality, and the influence of this on their teaching that underpins the overarching question: what are entrepreneurship teachers’ knowledge and beliefs relating to the subject and to the teaching, and how are these enacted in their teaching?

An interpretive approach allows insight into understanding the different conceptions that teachers have of entrepreneurship teaching, and to explore and elucidate the motives and reasons behind teachers’ practice (Hidalgo, 2014, p. 44), particularly as value judgements and hierarchies of importance are open to being assigned without an explicit and reflective interrogation of their relative values (Erikson, 1993) but, however, are likely to be enacted in participants’ teaching. The
interpretable character of my research should help to elucidate those perspectives that are explicit, and also those that are tacit or hidden.

These “meaning perspectives” (Erikson, 1993) seem central to being able to interpret teaching practice, and to understand why participants make particular choices about how or what they teach. For instance, my research finds that those who undertake socially informed entrepreneurship research are more likely to value “academic” than experientially based teaching approaches, and it seems to me that to gain insight into this, it is necessary to understand their meaning perspective. Illustrating this approach, I asked participants what good entrepreneurship teaching means to them, which gave insight into what they valued. In order to gain insight from these approaches, I chose a case study format, discussed in Section 4.2.1.

4.2.1: Use of a case study as an interpretive approach

The objective of the research questions is to understand the nature of participants’ orientations. The depth and inflected understanding that this requires demands a narrow and deep rather than a shallow and wide approach, the former of which is consistent with the case study method chosen for this research: this seems particularly so because disparate, contended and context-dependent conceptualisations of entrepreneurship exist, which seem to have a deterministic effect on the teaching, and therefore it seems critical to understand the nature of this relationship. The use of case studies by Basturkmen, Loewen and Ellis (2004) to link teacher understandings to teaching suggests that this format can yield rich, context-dependent knowledge, and because it offers the potential for creating a “systematisation of the variation found in the cases” (Flick, 2004, p. 151), it is open to the possibility of “determining what is typical of the object under investigation and thereby ensuring its transferability to other, similar objects” (Hartley, 1994, p. 225). Its flexibility and adaptability seem appropriate to the situated and context-dependent nature of the interrelationship between beliefs and practice that my research
focuses on, and because it is effective in answering questions of how and why (Mason, 2002), the case study form has been chosen for this research.

A sequential mixed-method research approach seems appropriate to structure the complexity of this relationship, triangulating classroom observation with audio recorded interviews before and after observation, to allow a pattern of correspondence to be developed. Yin (1989) observes that this triangulation of data offers deep and informative insights through elucidating the meanings of what was observed from the perspectives of those observed (Patton, 2002). My research is based on inductive reasoning, beginning with initial assumptions arising from my practice background, that acted as a starting point for the subsequent interviews and observations, and the development of patterns and conclusions (Cresswell, 2003.) This reflects a "snapshot" of teaching practice at a particular point in time (Trochim and Donnelly, 2001) that uses individual and cross-case analysis. However, the interview structure was not rigidly applied to each participant, because each was flexible enough to change shape to accommodate what the participant was saying (while still ensuring that core issues were covered).

4.3: REFLEXIVITY

Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 8) observe that “Interpretivists are no more detached from their subject than are their informants” and it may be helpful to make my conceptual position explicit in order to be able to evaluate to what extent my own conceptual framework, built on my teaching and commercial experience, may have shaped this research. My own location is in a business school, seen as “value-free” by Fotaki and Prasad (2015, p. 559), on the grounds that it does not perceive its belief in the free market as an ideology, and correspondingly, this was my starting point, although I accommodated a feminist perspective, so was not apolitical. However, during the time that I engaged with the research on neoliberalism that is quoted in my thesis, I became aware in a more nuanced way that acceptance of market dynamics is part of a world view that relates to the distribution of power (Foucault, 1982), relating to choices about prioritisation within spending, investment and redistribution, that are deeply political in their nature. I was able to see for myself the effects of academic capitalism (Slaughter and Leslie, 2001) on the higher
education sector, and started to understand the granularity of the context for opposition to the idea of neoliberalism. However, my natural orientation is to be critical rather than ideological, and it was correspondingly extremely difficult to develop a critically coherent position in relation to the ideologically derived positionality that seems deterministic within the narrative of neoliberalism – particularly given that an anti-neoliberal commentary seems the predominant lexicon, notwithstanding that its use signifies imputations of moral deficit that deprive the narrator of discretion to be more nuanced in terms of usage. Immersion in these concerns required me to therefore reflect on questions like: Is there a difference between ideology and critical objectivity? How can I coherently triangulate with these ideas, on the basis that they encompass rejection of capitalism and commerciality, when these are fundamental principles in my thinking? These required me to think deeply about issues that underpin my research: for instance, the subjectivity of reality, the role of objectivity and how belief is linked with experience. As suggested above, I am able to observe the cost to traditional, liberal education ideals of the restructuring of the product, producers and consumers of higher education (Morley, 2003) brought about by academic capitalism, and this correspondingly became my empirically derived starting point. Therefore, in using the term “neoliberal” in my thesis, I acknowledge the significant anti-neoliberal weight of commentary, and recognise its functionalities, without necessarily accommodating the full range of its ideological positioning. These issues are instances of how I constantly had to interrogate my positionality in order to try to work out a position that accommodated and respected understandings different from mine, while trying to occupy a critically coherent position.

In terms of education “for” entrepreneurship, reading Marlow’s (2012) work on the implicit representation of the entrepreneur as male, and Nightingale and Coad’s (2013) on “hero” entrepreneurs, and other writing on entrepreneurship’s exclusionary characteristics, I became more aware of the structural inequalities imbricated in its characterisation. Researching the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, and other academic sources, the potential cost of these became clear, in terms of poorer countries taking up entrepreneurship to raise the wealth levels of their populations, notwithstanding unequal genuine access to opportunity. The consciousness derived
from the developmental process described above has made me more sensitive to issues that relate
to who has the power, what the implications of this are and how this is expressed. Another is to
make me sensitive to questions of ideology, and the linked issue of shared and exclusionary
identities.

A reflective orientation has therefore been a significant requirement for my research,
although I realised, particularly as the research process developed, that I tended to orient towards
thinking in an absolutist way, and therefore had to apply a consistent focus on retaining a more
reflective and interpretive approach. Pillow (2003, p. 278) observes that reflexiveness “requires the
researcher to be critically conscious...of how the researcher’s self-location, position and interests
influence all stages of the research process”, for instance, in the design of the collection, analysis
and interpretation of the data. What this has meant for my research, as discussed above, is the
necessity of being aware of my own beliefs and assumptions brought into the research process,
and to try to be constantly aware of their potential to shape the research. A reflexive approach has
also been critical, given that my research participants are part of a wider peer group at other
universities who teach entrepreneurship, which obliged me to reflect on the power dynamics
within the interview process, and try to avoid the trap that the act of reflexivity may simply
operate to mask the power relationship (ibid., p. 186), by approaching the research in a way that
enables participants to “own” the way that the narrative is constructed. Given the peer
relationship with my participant group, I tried to be aware that participants would “present”
different sides of themselves in different settings (Ball, 1990, p. 162). This was enacted by Sara, for
instance, whose persona in class was the “Energiser Bunny” (termed by her students), however, in
a different setting she was open about suffering lapses in confidence. The power relationship with
my participants may have been affected in part by the fact that some of them had been
recommended to me by a senior researcher with whom they had close contact, and therefore may
have felt to some degree obliged to participate. While this is not provable, I felt that I needed to
keep this in mind and make sure that in my interactions with them that I should recognise their
agency through my words and actions, observed by Mason-Bish (2019) as fundamental in elite interviewing, which I found a useful way of thinking about my research participants.

Against this background of needing to mediate power dynamics within the research, the decision to follow a naturalistic interviewing approach was made, on the basis that semi-structured conversations are an appropriate way of exploring a wide set of issues (Merriam, 1998), which gave participants space to talk about what is important to them, and recognised the value of their personal context to these meanings (Hopf, 2004), which would not have been possible within a structured interview. In particular, the repeated conversation sequence, situated before and after the observed teaching, gave different perspectives on how participants' beliefs interacted with their teaching, particularly as some of these were separated by up to a year as a result of my intermission period: however, this had the effect of temporally triangulating the data collected, therefore enabling different frames of reference to be brought to the same material.

The process could be viewed as a tunnel, starting out wide with an exploration of participants' beliefs in the first discussion, and narrowing down to a discussion of the specific links between what teachers believed and thought, and their teaching, in the second, post-teaching discussion. The initial interview was to understand participants' views about the issues operationalised in, and by, the pilot interview, and to understand other issues that participants raised. The observed teaching functioned as a contextually embedded iteration of these, but also enabled understanding "live" the hierarchies of importance participants give to them (Erikson, 1993). Because of the open structure of having a thematic "spine", each participant brought considerable individual context into their story, and for this reason, my research can legitimately be viewed as a series of contextually differentiated cases, as well as a single case that draws together the ways that specific issues play out across the participant group. I have chosen to position my research in terms of the former, because while it seems to me that the value of my research lies in understanding how these issues interact across a range of participant contexts, detailed in Chapter 5, and that this is what gives it the potential for transferability and credibility
(Mason, 2002), each participants' ability to contribute is generated by the way that their contexts have shaped their experience and attitudes.

While it was not chosen primarily for this reason, Mason-Bish (2019, p. 275) notes that “telling their story” gives power to research participants, and in this way the guided conversation format respected their status, and they were open about discussing, sometimes at length, their beliefs and insights, which was extremely valuable for my research. I also encouraged my participants in their role as research collaborators by explaining in advance the nature of my research and the contribution that they would make to it. Participants were also consulted about their feelings about being audio recorded, which most participants were open to. It is not possible to know to what extent the participants felt at a disadvantage from the power relationship enacted through being researched, however, it is likely that my positionality as an insider researcher affected what my research participants were willing to share (ibid., p. 256), and the openness of all the participants and the resulting richness of data suggests an absence of barriers. However, the repeated interview structure prompted two participants to comment that they had reflected on a specific topic of the first interview during the intervening period, which supports Ball’s (1990, p. 159) insight that the researcher can never be just a “fly on the wall”. Being an insider researcher, researching my own area of teaching practice, has been a challenge, on the basis that my experience has been wide and varied, encompassing undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, and also collaboration within other colleagues’ teaching. The fact that this experience has informed my view has been positive, in the sense that I am familiar with the terrain, but also negative, in embedding my own “meaning perspective” (Erickson, 1985), a lens through which the research teaching was perceived. This was a constraint to a more open way of observing participant teaching, and a challenge in altering my approach from evaluative to inquisitive, which I had to constantly struggle with. My supervisors were central to my understanding of reflexivity, providing me with feedback in relation to work I submitted to them, offering me academic insight into my positionality within the research, which as a result developed over time, which seemed to me to be to be an extremely challenging and dynamic process.
4.4: ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical considerations are fundamental to the design of the research, the expression of the observations and the sharing of the findings (Merriam, 1998), and my research reflects the ethical requirements laid down by university’s research ethics framework (University of Sussex, 2014). The issues of anonymity and informed consent were particularly important, which has posed a particular challenge because the entrepreneurship teaching community in the UK is relatively cohesive, so I had to be very careful about, on the one hand, deriving insight from the nature of the context that the information arose out of, and on the other being opaque enough to anonymise the source. The linked issue of confidentiality was also critical, and I ensured that the laptop that I worked on did not leave the house and was protected by a password so that I did not accidentally make participants’ information available. The audio recordings have been destroyed. These ethical safeguards had to be ensured, on the basis that research must aim only to do good (British Educational Research Association, 2011). To ensure anonymity, I altered participants’ names (Cresswell, 2003), and also considered changing their gender, but reflected that this formed part of the context that gave authenticity to their accounts, so ultimately decided against this.

Ethical considerations were mobilised in terms of participant selection. Because some participants were approached on my behalf by academics more senior to them, it was very important to respect their agency in terms of choosing not to participate: as part of this approach, two potential participants chose not to engage with my research. Ethical considerations were also mobilised in terms of participants being fully informed in order to be able to give their consent: prior to the first interview, I spoke with all the participants on the phone, having sent them the participant information sheet, to familiarise them with the nature of the research, and to make sure that the implications of their participation were clear. During this phone call, I was careful to emphasise that potential participants may not feel comfortable with engaging, and that this decision would be understood and respected. During the logistical process of arranging visit dates, I remained alert to any non-obvious signals that participants might not be happy to continue
participating. Consistent with the participant information sheet, I also confirmed with each participant that if they decided to withdraw from the research, up to the point that research data had been gathered, that also would be understood and respected. The interpretive nature of my research means that it was particularly important to send my completed thesis to all participants, which has been done, so that they have the opportunity to validate the interpretative approach of my research: this step gives my research confirmability (Mason, 2002), in the sense that it has been independently verified, insofar as this is possible. With regard to ethical issues in terms of students, at the start of each teaching session, teachers made it clear to students that they were not the subjects of the study, giving them the right to object to the process.

4.4.1: Documentation

The participant information sheet and consent form are supplied in Appendix C.

4.5: DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

This was structured as an initial pilot process of interview and teaching, followed by a cycle of main interview, observation of teaching and Skype follow-up interview at each of the remaining universities.

4.5.1: Data collection and sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection activities</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main discussion with each participant</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of teaching (recorded) for each participant</td>
<td>Twice over a year</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skype interviews with each participant, to cover questions not covered in original interview, to probe issues not clear in original interview, and to gain clarification where necessary</td>
<td>Once, after teaching and main discussion written up (in some cases this was 6 months after original teaching observation)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant check of his/her case study</td>
<td>Once, after the case is written</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two teaching topics were observed at two different universities: while this was a major challenge because of the teachers’ strike and the resulting reshuffling of teaching sessions, a comparative approach enabled a valuable view into the difference within teaching. A comparison between observed topics was an aim of this research, however, it was limited by topic commonality within the participant group (see Table 3). A teachers’ strike was an unanticipated intervention into the research, and in terms of obstacles to my research, was accompanied by another unanticipated intervention of an intermission following a brain injury. In some cases, this delayed the follow-up Skype conversation significantly, with the positive effect of triangulating teachers’ responses over time, adding different time-separated perspectives to the initial commentary. All of the intersections with the participant teachers detailed above were scheduled by them to reconcile with their other commitments as far as possible.

4.5.2: Methods

The case study format was chosen to understand the “meaning perspective” (Erickson, 1985) of the teachers in relation to entrepreneurship, and how this triangulates with their teaching, a complex relationship. For this reason, multiple methods have been used, of recorded guided conversations and recorded teaching observation. Triangulating these approaches was necessary (Yin, 1989) – as was the sequence of starting the conversations with teachers’ wider beliefs and insights, narrowing down to specific linkages between their beliefs and teaching – because initially understanding how teachers viewed the subject and their own relationship with it established a framework for observing the teaching. This was in addition to issues that were explored across the group, that arose from my own practice and the pilot research.

4.5.3: Pilot research

I had no experience in academic research, so it was particularly important to carry out pilot research in order to understand what implications my questions had and how they could be improved, how the mode of interaction with the participant could be improved and what areas of interest emerged that should be incorporated into the main research. This was done with a mid-
career teacher with commercial, teaching and research experience, who therefore represented the breadth of experience types within the participant group. This followed the structure of the main research, of interview and observed teaching, audio recorded. In the first interview, issues and perspectives emerged from the participant that I had not included in the initial topic list. This was particularly useful for me because it demonstrated that having an open interview form that allowed for discursiveness was productive in enabling insight into teachers’ perceptions and thoughts. The observation schedule was developed in the same way: first, from issues that had emerged from my own experience, but significantly added to by the issues that emerged from the pilot participant’s interview. Second, it was an opportunity to test out the recording technology, to make sure that it would perform as expected, both in terms of recording but also in the transcription phase of the first discussion that provided input into the pilot observation phase. Listening to the first interview gave me understanding of the way that I verbally interacted with my participants, particularly in relation to the value of silence in giving them space to shape their narrative. These concerns are encompassed within the issues of positionality, discussed above. Reflecting on the pilot stage, what I learned shaped the research content but also how I went about conducting the interactive element of it. What was helpful was that the pilot participant seemed able to occlude my presence from her teaching which was very helpful in observing authentic teaching.

4.5.4: Observations

Teaching was observed, audio recorded in most cases, and through notes. However, as noted above, the observer’s own meaning perspective (Erickson, 1985) shapes the perception of these, nevertheless the understandings and perceptions of participant teachers forms a strong frame of reference through which to gain insight (Patton, 2002). Observing participants’ teaching allowed me to see how what they thought emerged within it, what they felt strongly about and what less so, and consequently the hierarchies of importance that participants give them. As mentioned above, I observed two topics being taught at two different institutions, which gave a good insight into their nature, the differences between them and how these were likely to have
arisen. The teaching observation was not so much focused on how the teaching was done, but rather on the role of the teacher, what types of knowledge were being taught, and what methods were being used to teach them, focusing on the teacher rather than the detail of how the teacher interacted with the students. Following the protocol suggested by Cresswell (2003) I made some descriptive notes, where I felt the audio capture would not be complete enough, for instance, where the teacher moved among the students. One of the participants did not want to be audio recorded, and in this case, I made extensive descriptive notes. I also made some reflective notes after the teaching sessions. Transcribing the recordings functioned as a reliving of the observed session and prompted an identification of issues that needed clarification within the subsequent discussion session.

As observed in Section 4.3, being a “fly on the wall” is not possible for an observer within a classroom and may impinge on the behaviour of the teacher and students. I tried to minimise my presence by sitting right at the back where most of the students were unable to see me, because I realised that if the students felt inhibited, this would make teachers’ lives difficult and would prevent me from observing a realistic version of their teaching. I also reflected that, for the teacher, it would have been more inhibiting to have seen me making notes at the back of the class than becoming habituated to a discreet recording device (smaller than a mobile phone) on the desk, so I refrained wherever possible from making notes in real time unless I thought there was something that the recorder was likely to miss.

4.5.5: Audio recording

For reasons surrounding inhibition and resulting lack of authenticity, I chose audio rather than video recording, particularly as the issues I was researching did not relate to the granularity of the teaching, rather the approaches to teaching that participants took. Erickson (1985) views audio recording as an opportunity for repeated deliberation, which was valuable in my research, rather than the “primitive analytic typification” (ibid., p. 14) that can arise from note-taking. Because the way of saying something can suggest a different meaning from that conveyed by a written
account, for instance, indicating how a speaker is triangulating emotionally with what is said by, for example, sighing or laughing, audio recording is invaluable in reflecting on what has been said.

Being able to repeatedly listen to recordings, I was able to pick up on issues like use of humour and storytelling, as well as the emotional register used by the teacher and the nature of the relationship between teacher and student, which was valuable in understanding how what participants believed shaped their teaching. Audio recording “happens without prioritising, misses nothing, and has no preconceived questions. The data prompts the enquiry” (Wilkinson and Birmingham, 2003): they are referring to the comparative selectivity involved in note-taking, that is avoided in recording. Because audio recording was an accurate record of the teaching session, it was reliable in establishing topics of interest for the interview subsequent to the teaching session, helping to build the convergence in lines of enquiry called for by Yin (1989).

4.5.6: Interviews

As discussed above (Miles and Huberman, 1994), the interviewer shapes the information that emerges from the interview, as a result of determining the purpose and shape of the questions. However, the researcher needs to think carefully about the nature of the information that is required and to make sure that the questions are structured correspondingly (Merriam, 1998). For this reason, the interview questions needed to be expressed in an open way that left space for the participant to respond. However, in terms of follow-up clarificatory questions this is not so much the case, however it remained important to avoid value judgements in questions, instanced above in Section 4.2. While the second Skype interviews related to clarificatory issues, they also had an explanatory function, for instance, asking teachers for their views on how observed aspects of their teaching linked back to the initial discussion about what they believed, and in some cases asking them for their insight as to how their views had shaped their teaching. These helped to clarify the rationale behind the nature of the teaching.
4.6: PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY

As mentioned above, the entrepreneurship teaching community in the UK is cohesive, and it is therefore necessary to protect the identity of the participants. For this reason, I have chosen to present data relating to participants, universities and modules in a table containing data that is intentionally minimal to protect them from identification (see Table 2). There were six female and two male participants, all of whom teach undergraduate entrepreneurship in English universities: three of these are Russell Group (traditional research-intensive) universities (IDP, 2021, no pagination), one is a Plate Glass university, formed from 1963 to 1992 based on recommendations from the Robbins Report on Higher Education (ibid.) and one is a post-1992 university, arising from educational reforms of the 1980s and 1990, to include former Polytechnics (ibid.).

Table 2: Research participants and universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Commercial experience</th>
<th>Career research academic</th>
<th>Teaching background</th>
<th>University type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katya</td>
<td>10–15 years, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>10–15 years, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>5–10 years, QG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>0–5 years, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>0–5 years, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ita</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Russell Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>post-1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: C signifies commercial experience working inside companies and QG working with companies. Teaching background signifies a teaching route to current role.

4.6.1: Rationale for the choice of university

The method for the choice of the five participating universities was determined by the 2014 Research Excellence Framework rankings for business subjects (hereafter referred to as REF).

The background to this approach is that research suggests that there is a trade-off between a university’s research focus and its teaching (Stromquist, 2007), and Collini (2010) observes that a focus on research pressures teachers to spend less time on teaching, and correspondingly it was hoped that there would be some sort of inverse correlation, as Stromquist and Collini suggest, between a university’s place in the REF rankings and its teaching. The
Entrepreneurship teaching is a subject that is particularly divided between practice and academic approaches (Neck and Greene, 2011), therefore potentially yielding interesting insights by understanding the teaching via these criteria. Correspondingly, it was hoped that engaging with universities at different rankings in the REF would yield differing perspectives on the teaching of entrepreneurship, not just because of generic issues relating to the relationship between research and teaching, but because entrepreneurship exhibits a divide between “academic” and more practice-led approaches (Corbett and Katz, 2012). A post-1992 university was included because it was hoped that this institution might be an example of a more practice-based, applied, teaching approach (Delanty, 2003, p. 78). The pattern of participant universities was developed simultaneously from two angles: the first as described above, but within this pattern, through the network of contacts who helped me to connect with potential participants (see Section 4.6.2). Given that the distribution of participant universities was led in this way by contacts, it is therefore not purposive that these universities turned out to be English, rather than drawn more widely from around the UK.

4.6.2: Rationale for the choice of participants

The participants (shown in Table 3) were eight entrepreneurship teachers within five higher education institutions in England. These participants were identified and recruited via a purposive sampling method (Patton, 2002), with the help of two respected senior entrepreneurship researchers. Two of the participants then recommended their own contacts. The group was a mix of mostly mid-career entrepreneurship researchers and teachers, and contained some who had significant commercial experience, with more of the group having less or none, however, because of their expertise in teaching entrepreneurship, they had the experience to contribute valuably to this research (Merriam, 1998).
4.6.3: Participant teaching

Table 3: Participant teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New venture creation modules</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katya</td>
<td>Russell Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Russell Group 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International entrepreneurship modules</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>Russell Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Plate Glass university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrepreneurship as a phenomenon modules</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>post-1992 university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>Russell Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ita</td>
<td>Plate Glass university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Russell Group 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of pairs of modules, as shown in Table 3, was used as a filtering approach in terms of identifying potential research participants, in order to be able to understand possible different combinations of, and interactions between, practice and theory in teaching these. Outside these, the pattern of teaching was not curated, reflecting instead the pattern of teaching that participants engaged with, that reflects the previously observed orientation towards teaching “about” entrepreneurship.

4.6.4: Thematic analysis

Thematic analysis has been used to analyse the data, for reasons that emerge from the following discussion. Although I took an N Vivo course (a digital method of mapping words), this type of software-based approach encompassing formal coding was avoided, as I felt that this was likely to decontextualise and fragment the material. Johnston (2006, p. 384) observes rigour within the context of software analysis programs as consistency and completeness in coding, whereas rigour in the context of my research derives from a nuanced and contextualised insight into participants’ views, attitudes and beliefs, and how this intellectual context shapes their teaching.
While Nowell et al. (2017, p. 2) observe that “thematic analysis is disadvantaged when compared to other methods, as it does not allow researchers to make claims about language use”, my participants are articulate experts in their field, and in this research, they talk at the level of ideas. The research does not direct me to look for meaning that is expressed through patterns of prosody, but instead to draw insight from the explicit meaning of the words. The quantity of data was significant, and repeated close reading of the transcripts was necessary to become familiar with the complexity of the data. The figure below shows the steps within the analysis process.

4.6.5: Analysis process

Figure 3: Analysis process.

| Interviews were recorded and transcribed. |
| Teachers’ observed classes were audio recorded and sometimes supplemented by descriptive note-taking. Additionally, there were some reflective notes made after sessions. |
| Transcriptions were read intensively and repeatedly. |
| Themes and issues emerged from these, which were related across the group and individually to participants’ teaching. |
| These themes were linked to views and teaching across the participant group. |
| Additionally, each participant’s teaching was linked to the form of knowledge that he or she was using, and links made with what each participant’s perspectives were. |

These steps of reading and emergent themes were cyclical, subject to constant revisitation (Borg, 2003). Participants’ commentary and teaching were the units of analysis used, the commentary viewed as the access to participants’ beliefs and perceptions (Wilkinson and Birmingham, 2003), that were evidenced in their teaching. A system of categories derived from my practice experience, literature review and pilot research was generated, and used as a means of searching for and retrieving data (Ritchie et al., 2013) so that material gathered from interviews could then be related to classroom observation. This research approach was also open to emergent categorisations of relevant issues that became clear during the analysis sequence. Additionally, there was data categorisation that organised data separately to gain a sense of the distinctiveness of particular sections of the material, and to organise the data around themes that
do not appear in all the research (Mason, 2002). Cross-case thematic analysis was also be done to compare and contrast conceptualisations of entrepreneurship, and each’s effect on shaping teaching (Yin, 1989, p. 63). The types of themes that emerged related to the following teaching and knowledge categories are as follows.

**Figure 4:** Themes that emerged from the analysis.

| - Teaching for and about |
| - Cognitive and other knowledge categories enacted in teaching |
| - Role of practice |
| - Role of experience |
| - Relationship of research interests |

**4.6.6: Themes that emerged from the analysis**

The themes from the pilot research then developed some of the topics for discussion within the main body of the research. Once all participants’ initial conversations had been written up and the way that these interrelated with teachers’ individual contexts, for instance, path to current role were clear, these were read and re-read, to understand other, less obvious patterns of correlation. These contextual connections then provided a provisional map with which to understand the backgrounds for teaching approaches undertaken, in so doing elucidating the hierarchies of importance (for instance between theoretical and practice-based knowledge) demonstrated in the teaching. Thematic analysis was mapped in two ways: first, themes that emerged in teachers’ commentaries, for instance, the functionalities of academic capitalism, were discussed with quotes and inputs from across the participant group. However, second, each participant’s contribution was also written up in terms of how these themes were enacted in his or her academic life and teaching. At each point my supervisors read and gave me feedback on this process, which gave me a valuable exterior perspective, prompting me to make changes. I felt that these interrelationships were critical to answering the research questions (Coffey and Gibbs,
2002), given the focus of this research on the nature of teachers’ understandings and how these are enacted in practice.
CHAPTER 5:
PROFILE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

5.1: INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this section is to provide a view into the way that the issues discussed in the following analysis chapters (Chapters 5–8) intersect individually with my research participants. The following chapters tend to discuss at a thematic level, and therefore take the focus off individual participants, however, it only seems possible to understand why and how participants intersect with the issues that the following chapters explore, for instance, neoliberal pressures, understandings of knowledge and ways of teaching, if these are perceived within a context of individual perspectives relating to, for instance, participants' journeys within academia, how they see themselves in relation to the academic hierarchy, what they think about neoliberal issues, and their teaching. For this reason, the discussion below of each participant presages some of the themes in the following analysis chapters: “Who is entrepreneurship research for?”, “Entrepreneurial cognition and its links with teaching and assessment” and “Practice into teaching”. The individual perspective of this chapter also gives expression to the more qualitative and behavioural aspects of teaching, which mediate the content (Schwitzgebel and Kolb, 1974).

As discussed above, the research participants teach at five universities – three Russell Group, one Plate Glass, and one post-1992 university – and have different routes to their current roles: Katya and Rachel have around 10 years commercial experience working in large companies; James, Naomi and Shona have varying degrees and natures of commercial experience; Edward and Sara have a teaching route to their current roles, and Ita is a career-research academic. My research “paired” teaching of similar modules at different universities, exploring the similarities and differences between Katya and Edward’s modules for start-up, and Rachel and Shona’s international entrepreneurship modules.
Table 4: Research participants, universities and route through to current role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Commercial experience</th>
<th>Career research academic</th>
<th>Teaching background</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katya</td>
<td>10–15 years, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>10–15 years, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>5–10 years, QG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>0–5 years, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>0–5 years, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ita</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>post-1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: “C” signifies commercial experience working inside companies and “QG” working with companies. Teaching background signifies a teaching route to current role.

5.2: PARTICIPANT PROFILES

In the following profiles, where modules are categorised as “about” or “for”, these are participants’ own categorisations.

5.2.1: Edward

Edward’s role involves teaching for entrepreneurship at a Russell Group university. He is a member of a minority group, which I will not identify because of the need to maintain anonymity. However, this is represented within his commentary, so it needs to be made explicit. His career in a non-research teaching role has moved between post-1992 and Russell Group universities, and between different arts faculties where he seems to have suffered poor job security, which he describes as “peripatetic...going from discipline to discipline and place to place”, to teaching in a business school. His pattern of employment seems to reflect Morley’s (2018, p. 32) reflection on the precariousness of academic workers, Slaughter, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004, p. 33) linked observations on academic capitalism’s reliance on contingent faculty, and Read and Leathwood’s (2018, p. 334) observation that around half of higher education teaching staff are on insecure contracts, and that minority groups are disproportionately affected, recalling the discussions about the neoliberal pressures on higher education discussed in Chapter 2.

Edward’s experience of precarious employment is evidenced by a statement he made, just as the interview was closing:
the only thing that’s been consistent is that I've been a teaching fellow but never really had any career development in that area, because it was rolling contracts...there was never any point in investing, on my part or on the institution's part, and I think that’s the problem for the quality of teaching in universities. I think it will be even more of a problem now with zero-hour contracts and things like UniTemps...that outsources PhD student teaching and things like that. So, what that means is you’re no longer employed by the university, the university no longer has any legal rule to recognise you in terms of strike, so you can’t strike, you can’t progress. You don’t accrue increments, or holiday pay, or sick pay. And that’s becoming a bigger thing here. PhD and postdoc teaching as well...there wasn’t a lot of interest in kind of teaching development at X University (Russell Group).

From this, it can be seen that academic capitalism has imposed a high personal cost on Edward, and this contingency continues into his present job, where he has neither research nor practice experience of entrepreneurship. Consistent with this background, he communicates a sense of estrangement from the academic mainstream, commenting “I've been burned by the Arts academia, and I haven't got publications, I haven't even got a book contract, there’s no way I’ll even get into the slush pile” (talking about trying to get into a business school).

His career reflects the operations of academic capitalism in other, significant ways. He relates that following his PhD supervisor realising he “wasn’t going to be a quick and easy stellar win, he kind of lost interest because he was a very career minded person“: this supports Collini’s (2010, p. 1) observation that pressure to publish puts pressure on faculty to limit teaching in favour of research. Edward’s journey into entrepreneurship teaching mirrors Sara’s movement between poles of the neoliberal arc: he became disillusioned with the prevailing orthodoxy in arts faculties and moved to teaching entrepreneurship, recounting his previous faculties “arguing about abstract notions by a load of people who think they represent minorities, and they don't, they represent 1%!” and wanting to teach in a business school where he feels he can “actually DO stuff
for minorities, in terms of actual programmes”. His identification of the business school as action rather than ideology oriented is corroborated by Fotaki and Prasad (2015, p. 559), and his expectation of opportunity there reflects the prevailing policy agenda, where entrepreneurship is seen as an important contributor to innovation and economic stimulation (OECD, 2009). However, the opportunity that entrepreneurship presents for minority groups may be constrained by issues such as those reflected in Ahl and Marlow’s (2012) observation of its exclusionary nature, and a withholding of start-up funding from them (Tiku, 2020).

Edward relates other experiences of academic capitalism, discussed in this section. The following quotation from Edward’s experience in a Russell Group university evidences an increase in student numbers that is not matched by a corresponding rise in supply: “alright, it’s the first week of term, this module’s got 200 students, we haven’t got anyone to lead it, and you know, can you do this please?”, exemplifying Collini’s (2010, p. 1) observation of expansion of student numbers “on the cheap” in higher education. Edward also encounters the “student as consumer”, recounting that his course on Critical Analysis was “killed because it wasn’t very popular with students…but when you saw them a year later, they would always say “that was really useful!”. This exemplifies Naidoo and Williams’ (2015, p. 218) observation that positioning the student as consumer results in a substitution of student satisfaction for profound and lasting measures of education quality, which has the resulting effect of draining academic authority from universities (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2000). Edward also relates a functionality of the competitive race for publication, reflecting that, in a previous post, the culture was “very kind of ‘up or out’, basically, so if you’re not publishing in 4-star journals you’re given the boot”, illustrating Morley’s (2003) observation of research funding as a key factor for success in the competitive markets of academic capitalism.

He comments “teaching is where I’ve got my value, my kind of reward, and it’s the meaningful part of my job”. Evidencing this emotional investment in teaching, he makes an effort to protect his students against the insecure employment that he has experienced, by developing their life skills and therefore lifelong opportunities (Jones, 2010, p. 11), reflecting that “it’s
important to...have a kind of ethical and development perspective”. His background in critical thinking plays out in the way he sees his teaching role, “bringing out...the information...and facilitating learning”. This was evident within the simulation venture sessions that I observed, where he took the role of asking students questions about how they had interacted within their groups and with the programme, getting them to reflect on the operational aspects of their learning, and at some points relating students’ actions to economic and management theory. This was a different type of teaching input from the entrepreneurs on the teaching team, who coached students to navigate the entrepreneurship context, and to understand competitive advantage, Edward commenting that the students “seem to get a lot out of it”. This may reflect Hartshorn and Hannon’s (2005, p. 618) discussion of the paradox of teachers having to be guide and partner in the practice-based learning process of how to “do” entrepreneurship, without having the practice experience to do this.

Contrasting with the entrepreneurship theory-based teaching of most of the research participants, Edward’s teaching was based on strategy theory, dealing with issues such as managing teams, marketing and selling, with “professional and practical skills” listed within the learning objectives, with 3 hours of scheduled work on a simulation package. In answer to a question about the exam component in his module’s assessment, he commented: “I don’t like using exams for assessments at all, not appropriate for long, complicated experiential learning”, however, he confirms that he inherited this, based on the rationale that it is “the least work for a marker to do. And it prevents cheating”. He also communicates his negative opinion about the simulation package’s ability to effectively replicate entrepreneurial context, both of which indicating that he has reflected on the experiential aspects of teaching for entrepreneurship. While Clegg, Tan and Saeidi (2002, p. 131) observe that reflexivity is viewed as educational orthodoxy, this seems to arise integrally out of Edward’s interest in critical thinking, and his teaching approach of getting students to reflect on their learning was matched by a formal, reflective writing assessment. However, as discussed in Chapter 7, the 3 hours of mentored sessions when compared with 19 hours of lectures in this module, seem to signal an estrangement of experiential learning
from the main cognitive focus of the teaching. The impression I took away was that, laying aside
the commentary discussed in the Neoliberalism section of the literature review (Section 2.2) that
business schools’ purpose is stripped of social meaning (Khurana, 2010), while Edward’s lack of a
research or practice background caused problems in previous faculties, the business school seems
to value the adaptability of his critical analysis approach to teaching.

5.2.2: Katya

Katya is a research-active academic who teaches entrepreneurship for business start-up,
in a Russell Group university, following considerable business experience heading a unit in her
international family firm. Her commentary evidences conflict between her commercial and
academic self-perceptions: for instance, she states that she is not interested in entrepreneurship
education per se “because I am a scholar that does gender and family firms”, however, she also
observes that “I am more of a practitioner...they’re (her colleagues) more the academic side”.

However, her academic identification is at odds with the commitment she shows to
delivering an extensive programme of experiential teaching to her students that gives them
considerable exposure to entrepreneurial thinking and decision-making. Her academic and
commercial selves seem to function without compromising the other: in her rationale, they appear
not to be mutually exclusive, at odds with the rejection of commerciality that correlates with
“academic” teaching and socially oriented research among the group. Katya’s research is also
socially applied, positioning her outside the characterisation of the business school as unreflective
and unintellectual (Fotaki and Prasad, 2015, pp. 557–558). She questions the status quo position of
traditional academic teaching “about”, making it clear that she considers the knowledge
transmission approach inadequate for the teaching of entrepreneurship, evidenced in the
following words:

the majority of textbooks were talking about entrepreneurship in abstract
terms. About, all this about (entrepreneurship) stuff. But to what extent is it
relevant? To the people that you really do need to develop businesses...I'm not sure.

It is notable that she assumes teaching for business start-up as the default objective for teaching, rather than the academic approach of teaching “about”. She questions the capability of faculty teaching “about” to migrate into teaching “for”:

the problem is...members of staff that have been teaching ABOUT entrepreneurship but are then overnight transitioning to teach the practical tools...(breaking voice) is that possible? No. Are they (the teachers) suitable is a big question.

Katya argues that a teacher’s ability to interpret entrepreneurial context is a critical element in teaching “for” entrepreneurship, and that it is not possible to do this without commercial experience: she refers to this as “making it real” in the classroom. In this, she evidences Starkey and Madan’s (2001, p. 8) observation that because management in action is complex, cause and effect relationships are difficult to establish, and therefore the predictive validity of theory is low, skilful management practice involves “intuition” as well as rational analysis. Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) argue that “intuition” is based on pattern recognition.

Consistent with this is that, in this research, entrepreneurship teachers who have significant commercial experience are those who are able to recognise and interpret patterns for their students (this is discussed in detail in Chapter 8). Katya is expected to teach a neoliberal version of entrepreneurship, uncomplicated by wider social implications, however, she resists this by communicating the “dark side” of entrepreneurship to her students, making them aware of the inequality based “traps along the way” and the hidden dangers of consumerism. She observes that in order to achieve this, she has to operate transgressively against the system, evidencing Morley’s (2003, p. 49) observation that neoliberal orthodoxy requires the suspension of critical thought. For instance, although it is required, she does not record her lectures, but instead spends her own time preparing a recorded summary for her students. This is because, as she observes:
I’m actually quite cynical in my teaching. I do, I mean, I toned it down for today but…I normally say quite a lot of things that are (pause, sigh) questioning of the establishment, questioning the whole notion of this… I mean, I completely disagree with why, for instance, we are teaching entrepreneurship…

...(there is):

a very strong neoliberal discourse that everybody should be starting businesses, but why? Nobody questions!…the precariat is increasing…the whole thing is out of control…that’s part of what we have to teach, and we don’t!

She is prepared to take extra time to fully inform her students, at a direct cost to the time she spends on her research, which seems to arise from a pressure introduced by rewarding research disproportionately over teaching (Collini, 2010, p. 1). Katya’s objective for students is to prepare them for business start-up, to build businesses that last through generations, and which give something back to society, rather than continuing to stimulate consumerism, “buying more stuff... we don’t need that many things”: she makes her social purpose clear through this. She explicitly states that she supports interactive teaching, evidenced by the examples below, describing her teaching style as a “very practical” “coaching” approach, which reproduces commercial methods of team management (Berg and Karlsen, 2012). However, this type of context-based knowledge production locates Katya’s teaching within the neoliberal threat to traditional university structures, on the grounds that it is generated outside the privileged enclosure of academia (Greenwood and Levin, 2001, p. 435), which makes it vulnerable to substitution by commercial operators such as management consultancies (Starkey and Madan, 2001, p. 6).

Assessing the commercial demands imposed by teaching for start-up, Katya observes “we don’t challenge students enough”: she addresses this through her programme of teaching, which places a large amount of responsibility on them, and sets them ambitious goals. She achieves this
in part by the way she triangulates her position in relation to her students: as discussed above, she is willing to take risks in saying things she feels she should not in order to ensure her students are fully informed, and then to spend her own time to make sure the cost of this is not passed on to them. This evidences how she sees her relationship with her students: she refers to students not as “they”, but as “we”, seeing herself and them as a team. This way of working represents Scheff’s (1997) comments on the centrality of a social bond in establishing confidence, evidenced by her students’ willingness to address the lecture theatre in groups or singly to present the development of their business ideas. She also embedded a team ethos in her students by innovating a system whereby “bonus” marks could be earned by teams feeding back online to other teams on their progress. Katya shapes her teaching time, discussed next, to maximise interaction between herself and students, and also between students, in order to generate understanding, which is a core principle of constructivist teaching and learning, representing the constructivist sharing of experience as well as knowledge (Derry, 2008, p. 54).

Katya's teaching hours comprise 22 hours of lectures, and 8 non-lecture hours, to include two consulting sessions where she coaches students in developing their business ideas. To extend interaction with her students, she uses lecture time interactively: she uses the first part for lecturing, however she converses with students during this, and in the second part of the session, she gets students to present, for her and other students to feed back on their progress. As a result of this repurposing of lecture time, students get around 15 or so hours of interactive coaching per term, which represents a greater percentage than the knowledge transmission teaching, and a greater percentage than most of the other modules that I observed. Katya immerses her students in the context of entrepreneurial decision-making in order to develop their understanding of when and how decisions need to be made. She engages them in real life commercial challenges: mounting a Kickstarter campaign, critiquing an additional current campaign, and producing a 3-minute advertising campaign for their business. These are consistent with Katya’s aim of making the teaching as “real” as she can, and her understanding of the value of this is demonstrated by her
incorporation of a real-time reflective exercise into the teaching, not a formal reflective essay, but an exercise that demonstrates the extent of students’ learning through their actions: they interview an entrepreneur initially with questions set by Katya, and then do a follow-up interview sometime later, with questions that they devise. Katya regards understanding competitive advantage as the test of whether students have engaged with and understood her teaching and looks for evidence of this in students’ business ideas and execution. She gives “extra” marks for learning through teamwork and understanding what gives a new business a competitive edge. In this way, her teaching reproduces two significant drivers of commercial success in start-ups. Katya’s deployment of lecture time to interact with her students, and the intense experiential nature of her teaching resists Collini’s (2010, p. 1) observation of a minimal meaningful contact with students that arises from the neoliberal increase in class sizes. She has filled her teaching with opportunities for students to negotiate entrepreneurial context in real time, individually, with her, and with each other. This supports her belief in the value of experiential learning in building students’ commercial judgement: guiding students through Kickstarter requires being able to mentor students through this terrain in real time, evidencing Neck and Corbett’s (2018, p. 20) argument for the value of co-creation to build entrepreneurial understanding. Katya has chosen to substitute knowledge transmission time for more time-heavy coaching. She incurs this cost because her actions suggest she feels it is justified by its benefit to her students, evidencing her resistance to the incentives observed by Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd (2012) that marginalise teaching in favour of research.

Her research and teaching seem to be ideologically opposed: her research is into inequality of opportunity, while her teaching, discussed above, negotiates a commercial version of entrepreneurship. However, it is clear from her commentary that she does not feel a sense of inherent inconsistency arising from this, and as evidenced through her teaching, she seems to believe that developing entrepreneurship capability is valuable, as long as its dangers and traps are communicated, as well as its benefits. In this way she triangulates her position simultaneously
towards commerciality but away from the unreflective neoliberal version of entrepreneurship she is required to teach.

5.2.3: Rachel

Rachel’s role involves teaching an international entrepreneurship module, mainly “about”, with some “for” entrepreneurship teaching (her categorisation), at a Plate Glass university. Prior to becoming an academic, she had an international management career with blue chip companies, that involved some training responsibilities. Her research is into commercial issues, and correspondingly does not share the social perspectives of some of the other participants. She is under the same pressures as Shona in relation to her academic identity, however, she chooses a different path from the academic researcher one that Shona chooses.

Rachel has to mediate tensions that are caused by her position as commercially experienced and also “loving” teaching, in a system that rewards research (Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd, 2012). She expresses her belief, evidenced by her teaching, that her commercial background benefits her students (Jack and Anderson, 1999), however, when asked if it is valued for promotion she comments:

unfortunately not, I wish it were...for me it’s very relevant because I think I can... talk about many things in a business sense that I teach, right, and it gives me an ability (to) take many of the topics...and use lots of real business cases and examples when I lecture... because I know what’s happening in the work environment.

Arising from this understanding, Rachel seems to recognise that it is likely that her progression will be based on undertaking management responsibilities, reflecting Olssen and Peters’ (2005, p. 325) observation of the fragmentation of academic roles, linked with the diminution of academic professional authority. For Rachel, however, the neoliberalisation of higher education has provided opportunity, because a primarily management and teaching role will allow her to use her commercial experience to negotiate her future.
Rachel’s teaching has “100% the objective of sharpening up their (students’) business judgement”, and she cites the following issues as important to achieving this: “understanding competitors, implementation, access to resources, pitching to funders and recognising opportunity”. This type of practice-based approach is evident in her teaching, discussed below. However, she also has “academic” objectives for students, to be “able to critically think about things that I’m asking them… and to defend their ideas”. Her sources of information are academic as well as commercial, for instance, she uses the same academic internationalisation paper that Shona does, but also a McKinsey study to illustrate the same issue. Rachel aligns herself with a constructivist understanding, although, while she references its form and meaning, does not explicitly name it. She comments:

> learning through doing... it is always the best way to learn it, right?...it’s always about real life, if you can relate it to examples, examples are the ones that will really stay with you...who cares about students memorising the tools and frameworks when in their business life? They’ll have access to these tools and frameworks just by googling them or looking at some of the books. It’s application that I’m really interested in.

Her commentary indicates that she believes that the purpose of her teaching is to prepare students for commercial life, and she achieves this through a “making it real” approach to teaching (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 62). This is evidenced by her widespread use of cases in class, which she chooses carefully to include products and services that have meaning for students, for instance, illustrating the “born global” principle by referring to Google, Skype, Amazon and Airbnb. To demonstrate internationalisation, Rachel uses a class case study about SAB Miller, a global beer company. While in theory her 3-hour teaching sessions combine knowledge transmission and experiential teaching, in reality she takes her slides as a loose start point and spends almost all the teaching time talking with students about commercial situations that illustrate the slides, familiarising students with threshold concepts (Meyer and Land, 2005, p. 373) by weaving these examples into her commentary. Rachel’s development of her students’
entrepreneurial judgement through repeated exposure to entrepreneurial context enacts Eraut’s (2005) insight that the ability to “read” a situation is built up over repeated exposure to different situations. She expresses the value that her commercial knowledge (Jack and Anderson, 1999), gives her in achieving this:

Besides giving them those entrepreneurial skills...we try to bring together
many subjects, we talk very often about financials, we talk very often about
balance sheets and income statements and all of these things, right? I was
talking about the foreign exchange market as one of the topics, and, you
know, understanding the foreign exchange market and then how to get
financing and all kinds of different things. So, you know, it’s important…it
shapes them with those right business skills, the business acumen they can
use. It’s all the package, right?

The way Rachel triangulates emotionally with her students is crucial to their learning, and
similarly to Sara, her teaching behaviour expresses the understanding that “to value the learner is
to value the whole person”, which disposes students to respond positively (Ingleton, 1999, p. 1).
However, she takes a different approach from Sara to achieve this. While Sara takes a number of
measures to minimise her position of authority in the classroom, Rachel triangulates the
emotional distance between herself and her students by being informal, while remaining in a
position of authority. She works consistently to create a conversational connection with her
students, an approach observed by Jeder (2015, p. 632) as having “more force to transmit than
classical teaching methods”, which reinforces her constructivist teaching by maintaining her
students in an engaged state. She makes conversation reciprocal through measures such as
knowing and using students’ names and linking what they like doing to the case. The following is
an example of this, where Rachel asks if the class enjoyed a case based on beer:

It was a short case, it wasn’t too bad, did you enjoy it? NO? Why not, what’s
your name? (student) Matthew. (Rachel) Matthew, why didn’t you enjoy it?
You ever drink beer? (student) Yes. (Rachel) “You DO drink beer, OK! What’s your favourite brand of beer? (delivered in a joshing but friendly tone).

In this way, Rachel breaks down the barriers of distance between her and her students.

Another example is Rachel joking about how not having enough chairs in the classroom will incentivise students to arrive on time, asking “is it because I’m so popular?” This type of willingness to clown slightly in her teaching communicates confidence, which emphasises through a light touch her pre-eminent position in the classroom.

As Sara does, Rachel also decreases distance between herself and her students by being willing to abandon her expert status (Mason-Bish, 2019), exemplified, for instance, by her observation to her students that she does not know a lot about Logitech, a company that a student proposes as an example of being “born global”. The following exchange with two students who arrived late supports Baker, Jensen and Kolb’s (2005, p. 34) observation that for learning to happen “perhaps the challenge is to stay in that transition phase between order and surprise”:

“WELCOME GUYS! Did you bring me anything? No? (playfully laughing) Bad, bad!”. This serves to mildly but humorously disconcert the students, but by framing her teaching in terms of hospitality, Rachel communicates to the students that they have transgressed against these conventions. Her use of humour creates a bond between her and her students, intentionally mediating her position of authority, which seems to contribute significantly to the power of the conversational learning in her classes (Schwitzgebel and Kolb, 1974). Her humour also functions recursively for students, offering them a different and memorable idiom through which to recall their learning (Rorty, 1980, p. 360). Another communicative function used a lot by Rachel is storytelling, for instance, illustrating different cultures through Pampers’ introduction to Japan:

Japanese consumers for diapers were confused because they didn’t understand the fact of storks delivering babies, because in their culture it
doesn't happen. In their culture, giant floating peaches deliver babies. How can something like this be missed? But very often it does happen.

She also uses personal stories to illustrate theoretical points, for instance, relating her experience of working in Germany where colleagues habitually emailed each other:

how different is that! At home someone would just pick up and come to me and talk about it, let’s go for coffee and we’ll talk about it. In Germany everything had to be quite official, there had to be track of the emails and plus I think it was less personal as well.

Rachel observes that:

I bring in a lot of my personal experience into the classroom, and all that is towards the goal of helping them (students) to understand better the concepts and frameworks and everything else that we teach in the lectures and in the classes here.

In this way, Rachel’s storytelling creates an emotional bond with her students (Landrum, Brakke and McCarthy, 2019, p. 2). Her understanding of her communicative engagement with her students is evidenced in the following comment:

I try to make a combination of fun and strict at the same time which is not always very easy...you want the students to have fun. I do think that fun is important (Neck, Greene and Brush, 2014, p. 11), I’m not the best joker ever, but I try to make some jokes and keep the light atmosphere...but I’m really strict...because I love teaching and I don’t want them to ruin it for me.

It is clear from this that Rachel recognises the power that conversation, humour and storytelling give to teaching (Jeder, 2015, p. 632), and that she consciously deploys these as part of her teaching methodology. The effectiveness of this is evidenced by the extent to which students were willing to participate in the conversations during the teaching that I observed. Rachel’s
conversations and questions with her students provides “real-time” reflection on theories and cases (Kolb and Kolb, 2005, p. 208), argued for by Eraut (1995, p. 16) as developing deep reflective thinking, and seemed particularly well-adapted to leading students towards “entrepreneurial cognition” (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 60) in the many case studies that she used. Rachel tended to keep her relatively small group in conversation with her, rather than with each other, so there was no observed student-to-student social learning to accompany the strong teacher/student social learning that was consistently evident.

The overall picture I took away was that Rachel has incorporated professional learning from her commercial background into her teaching, enacting understandings from Eraut (1995, 2005). She demonstrates a strong engagement with the process of learning through doing, developed by Dewey (1916), Piaget (1972) and Vygotsky (1978), and adopts the position of guide to her students in order to develop their own insights during that process, enabled by her ability to maintain reciprocal communication. While Rachel did not name any teaching approaches, her widespread use of cases and her verbal interaction with students, particularly the way her questions made students develop what they thought, evidenced that she relates to constructivist teaching methods.

5.2.4: Shona

Shona’s role involves teaching an international entrepreneurship module, taking a primarily “about” entrepreneurship approach, at a Russell Group university. She has had a primarily academic career, with qualifications in different disciplinary areas, and non-academic work providing training to SMEs. Her experience generated an interest in feminist concerns and resulted in her research interest in the differential in opportunities for women entrepreneurs. Shona identifies as an academic, and secondarily as a practitioner: this may be because her success in the new economy of academic capitalism (Morley, 2003) relies on a consistently authentic academic identity, and the commercial elements in her background not only offer no leverage for success, but also serve to threaten that identity. This is suggested by how Shona repeatedly minimises the contribution of her practice background to her teaching, perhaps
evidencing her recognition of research-based academic power structures (Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd, 2012). This distancing from practice is evidenced, for instance, by her comments about what value her business background gives her teaching: “I’m not sure it’s much (laughing)...I’d like to think if nothing else, it probably gives me some sort of legitimacy”. It is notable that she does not frame her commercial experience in terms of providing a substantive benefit to her students, as Katya and Rachel do, but only in relation to how her students see her.

Consistent with Shona’s academic identity and her teaching “about” entrepreneurship, she uses a predominantly knowledge-transmission mode of teaching. However, this is mediated by her communicative ability, exemplified by her conversational tone and telling of stories, demonstrated, for instance, by her illustration of Sarasvathy’s (2001) theory of effectuation, which she compares with going to the fridge to see what ingredients are there, in order to work out what she can cook for dinner. Through this domestic idiom, she provides a structure for students to recall module material, which creates a more personal connection with her (Landrum, Brakke and McCarthy, 2019, p. 2). However, the potential for this conversational approach to contribute is limited by the primarily one-way nature (Baker, Jensen and Kolb, 2015, p. 15) of communicating cognitive information into the minds of students.

Interestingly, Shona’s expressive and emotionally communicative approach (at one point, she refers to a poet to illustrate her meaning) contrasts with the fact that she offers rational rather than emotional answers to most questions, which may be another example consistent with her academic identity. However, reflecting her research interests, Shona became animated about the issue of neoliberalism’s links with entrepreneurship, specifically its individualistic, masculinised, heroic discourse (Ahl and Marlow, 2012, p. 9) and its resulting distancing from issues of gender and inequality of opportunity. In answer to a question about what entrepreneurship is, Shona comments:

I think the word itself is quite off-putting, there’s research into this which is very interesting. Gorillas beating their chests, “I am the entrepreneurial myth
...hero, and I'm aggressive and I'm go-getting“...it had that sort of Del Boy sort of connotation.

While she reflects that the current characterisation of entrepreneurship is more cerebral, in terms of technology start-ups like Facebook, she explicitly rejects its neoliberalism, commenting “it's not that I want to teach them to go out and set up businesses so that they're living in poverty, because that's the side that isn't talked about”, and expresses reservations about the fact that the business school offers commercially endowed entrepreneurship scholarships. She resists this agenda by focusing on developing enterprise rather than entrepreneurship skills in her students, with the objective of developing:

- their skills, and perhaps leaving them a wee bit more switched on and more likely to fulfil whatever their potential is... that's all you can hope for in a role as an educator.

This orientation towards enterprise skills expresses a resistance to the neoliberal values of entrepreneurial skills (Jones, 2010, p. 11).

Her commitment to an academic ethos is evidenced in the objectives for her teaching, for instance, she focuses strongly on teaching her students to do academic research, and to think critically: “trying to get them to engage their brain, and not just accept received wisdom”, and to be able to make arguments. Consistent with this academic orientation, when asked what entrepreneurship education is for, she defaults to thinking about developing students academically towards Masters or PhD study, and in answer to a question about what practical skills she wants to build in her students, she cites the academic issue of their writing style. However, she recognises that there is a tension between the experiential approach that her students prefer, and her own academic approach:

if people are *doing* something...you're more likely to get greater engagement, they're more likely to actually turn up to class, you know, the research shows this. They're much more likely to find it interesting, and they're much more
likely...to come away with some sort of depth learning. But I'm a sucker, I'm a sucker for the research!

This academic and theoretical, rather than experiential, teaching approach was enacted in the seminar session that I observed, where the students were studying an academic paper.

Shona’s academic approach to teaching is evidenced by being the only participant who explicitly references pedagogical theory, or who expresses support for a reflective component in learning (argued for by Dewey, 1916), and her recognition of pedagogical theory functions is an indicator of her academic thinking. Shona’s teaching is split into 16.5 hours of lectures and 4 hours of seminars, focusing on knowledge transmission, evidenced within the observed seminar session, which was, in Shona’s own words “more like a mini lecture”. Its purpose was to engage students with theory, and as a result did not make use of case studies or videos, although Shona illustrated this by reference to company activity. Experiential elements of the module were represented by a group development of an internationalisation plan for an Asian company, and a question-and-answer session with its founding entrepreneur. However, these experiential activities seem not to reflect the teaching style, which takes a traditionally academic “theory transmission” approach.

Congruent with the nature of her teaching, there is little engagement with constructivist principles like experiential learning, which seems to reinforce her research-based identity, based on traditional academic values.

5.2.5: James

James teaches social entrepreneurship at a Russell Group university. His career started out with 2 years in a banking graduate scheme, followed by further degrees, and subsequent entry into teaching and commercially focused research. His commercial family background seems to imbue his academic approach with an understanding of commercial rationale, particularly in relation to the purpose and teaching of entrepreneurship, although this is a counterpoint to his primarily academic, research-based approach. A theme running through James’ commentary is an alignment of his teaching with traditional academia, and away from a vocational orientation that is
represented by teaching “for” entrepreneurship: he comments “that’s not really what we’re there to do, that’s not the university. We need to have that theoretical side, the critical side”. This seems to speak of the competitive divide between vocationally and traditionally oriented universities (Collini, 2010, p. 3), and the linked academic specialisation within the latter. This is exemplified by the fact that the practice-focused, outward-looking entrepreneurship centre that James was hired into, which traditionally had a reputation for teaching and links to enterprise, “might have been fully teaching, now...there is a push on research... people like me have been brought in because of publications, or potential to get publications”. It can be seen that the “practical” purpose of the centre, to work with small businesses to achieve growth, is likely to be diluted as a result, representing the ascendance of research as a metric for success within academic capitalism (Morley, 2003).

While not using the terminology, James recognises the functionalities of neoliberalism, evidenced by his comment “the general narrative in society is that you can be an entrepreneur”. He resists this through his focus on the academic approach of teaching about, however, this is mixed with commercial elements, for instance, he cites the “how to” skills of business planning and commercial awareness as important for his students. His orientation towards knowledge-transmission teaching is evidenced, for instance, by the fact that he does not teach students to navigate entrepreneurship context, observing “we kind of expect them to do it themselves?”. This is also demonstrated by the fact that his (inherited) social consulting module, understood by students as “how to do” consulting, is significantly weighted to “about” entrepreneurship:

It probably seems surprising, given that it’s a consulting module...but we actually did very little about how do you be a consultant...I think it did need more of the “how to” element.

Separately, in relation to competitive advantage, James observes “I don’t think you can teach it, in the sense that I can stand at the front of the room and they will suddenly be able to do
it”: it is consistent with his academic approach that James defaults to a cognitively based view of teaching, and by doing this, excludes the space for tacit learning that Eraut (1995, p. 18) argued can build the capability of being able to “read” situations. Instead, it seems that students’ work with social entrepreneur client companies, to develop economically competitive income streams, performs this function. The previous discussion seems to represent the fact that the classroom is reserved for learning about, and that learning for is distanced from this activity.

James refers to case studies in his teaching, however, these were primarily used to illustrate theoretical points rather than as an immersive way for students to experience entrepreneurship context. He also used a video, performing the same sort of cognitive learning function, setting out the ways in which value can be measured in social entrepreneurship. While these were both constructivist teaching, they functioned as ways to advance cognitive rather than professional knowledge (Eraut, 2003). Baker, Jensen and Kolb (2005) discuss the way that conversation provides an experiential and emotional character to the classroom: I was struck by how cerebral and contemplative the teaching was, arising in part from James’ way of communicating, maintaining a level tone, punctuated at times by gentle humour, which serves to encourage other voices through minimising his position of authority (ibid., p. 31), and took care to ask questions intermittently so that students could contribute.

The impression I took away from James’ teaching is that he seems a clear and insightful theoretical teacher, whose narrative and teaching suggest a relative exclusion of practice, which is striking given that this is explicitly a teaching “for” module. James’ commentary contains a number of references to closing the distance between theory and practice, evidenced, for instance, by his confirmation that he is co-writing a case study with an entrepreneur and sees “huge opportunities” for the co-construction of research with entrepreneurs. I came away with the impression of a commercial sensibility that occasionally peeped out of the folds of the academic gown, but which was not substantively part of it.
5.2.6: Naomi

Naomi’s career started in the creative arts and preceding the start of her research related academic life, she worked as a franchisee of a food chain. However, the aftermath of the 2008 economic crisis damaged the business, and she observed “we didn’t feel equipped...to run a business, so we thought if we bought into a franchise, we’d get the support of the organisation...it was a lot harder than that”. At that point she received 3 years of funding for a PhD, which offered her a refuge from the precariousness of her franchisee position, and which was the turning point to becoming an academic, leading to her current research into familial entrepreneurship.

A number of issues seem to have combined to reinforce Naomi’s support for teaching entrepreneurship theory, discussed below: her background in theatre and related interest in interpersonal dynamics, interest in feminism, her difficult experience of being a franchisee and lack of management experience seem to turn her away from teaching students for start-up, and towards teaching them about entrepreneurship. These elements coalesce into her anti-neoliberal perspective, evidenced, for example, by her interest in feminist issues, assertion of the right to be individual, and rejection of the predominant gendered and exclusive archetype of entrepreneurship (Ahl and Marlow, 2012), although she comments “if you’ve got a gender perspective, or if you have a relational perspective, well good luck to that”. She resists this by focusing on women entrepreneurs, commenting:

I’m one of the few who would invite a woman entrepreneur to talk to my students...What are the institutions doing to push against that? Not a whole heap at the moment, and I think that’s very problematic,

evidencing the tenacity of the entrepreneurial archetype (ibid.) discussed above.

As a result of this understanding, Naomi works to create a non-heroic version of entrepreneurship in her teaching, commenting “what is the day-to-day experience of the people who talk about this? That’s very different to saying, ‘to be an entrepreneur, you need to be...heroic, white, middle-class, male’”. The issue of identity flows through her commentary, and
her continued references to visibility and voice seems to express a sense that her commercial experience denied her this: “a lot of the identities...daughter, wife, mother...accountant...If you looked in the mirror, who are you?” Naomi’s teaching demonstrates Dewey’s (1916) linkage between experience and intelligent action: she synthesises her experience to produce intelligent teaching that will reinforce her students against her own experiences of disarticulation, evidenced in her assertion “we shouldn’t diminish their (students’) voices...today...I really heard their voices coming through”, which links with her objective to teach her students life skills. Consistent with carving out a space to have an individual identity, as discussed above, she also develops wider “soft” skills in her students:

my goal when I’m teaching is to send them out believing in their ability to innovate and create, first and foremost...it isn’t about saying “right, I’m going to teach you all to be entrepreneurs”.

This is evidenced by, for instance, her focus on getting all students to present, and giving them feedback based on her acting experience: she comments “if you don’t give them confidence...they are NOT going to learn”. Consistent with her seemingly anti-neoliberal orientation, these are enterprise rather than entrepreneurship approaches, consistent with liberal educational ideals rather than the libertarian values that are associated with entrepreneurship education (Jones and Iredale, 2010, p. 12). While she observes that “it’s really good to teach the social enterprise side of entrepreneurship”, her awareness of the commercial imperatives that dominated her franchise employment seems to have stayed with her: she comments “you need to make a profit and there’s nothing to be ashamed of in that process”, however, her words suggest that a lack of engagement with profit is implicit in the social entrepreneurship business model that she teaches, and is consistent with her exclusion of “how to” teaching, exemplifying a pattern within participants’ teaching, that engagement with academic teaching “about” correlates with a disengagement from the idea of profit and competitive advantage.
Naomi has 2 hours a term to work with her students on their business plan, which is consistent with fact that the module is 70% “about” and 30% “for” (her own categorisations), and a correlating focus on knowledge transmission teaching. Each of the main 2-hour teaching sessions is a mix of this and interaction with students: however, students’ learning from these is primarily cognitive rather than experiential (Dewey, 1916). The constructivist element in her primarily cognitively focused teaching arises from her theatre background, which she draws on for experiential teaching to develop innovation and presentation skills in her students. Her emphasis on developing presentational skills and confidence in her students through these type of acting techniques enacts Dewey’s (ibid.) insight that intelligent action results from experience: in this way she is stepping beyond knowledge-transmission modes, and teaching students how to “be”, exemplifying the tacit understandings that Eraut (1995, p. 18) categorised as professional knowledge: these interpersonal skills are designed to support her objective of developing enterprise skills in her students rather than entrepreneurial cognition skills (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 60).

The impression I took away from Naomi is that her research and teaching are profoundly shaped by her franchise experience, which seems to have enforced values of profit significantly above individual concerns (Brown, 2015), and how she uses her response to this in order to reinforce her students’ life chances. This experience also seems to contribute to her rejection of the neoliberally framed male characterisation of the entrepreneur and drives her focus on using female role models in her teaching. There is a contradictory counterpoint that emerges from time to time, of her awareness of the need to make profit in order to survive, that exemplifies the tensions between the commercial understandings from her franchise background, and the socially focused norms of her teaching of social entrepreneurship.

5.2.7: Sara

Sara’s role involves teaching mostly enterprise, with some entrepreneurship teaching (her categorisations), at a post-1992 teaching intensive university. Her career has moved between lecturing and professional service roles, and her recent background has involved embedding
enterprise into other disciplines, as well as teaching it within her own modules. Her pattern of employment reflects the increasing move towards an “uberisation” (Morley, 2018, p. 15) of academic workers within higher education that obscures traditional boundaries between roles. Her journey into enterprise teaching encompasses both poles of the neoliberal arc: she started her academic life thinking that “business is evil”, however, she reflects that her initial belief was based on a misunderstanding of what business and commercialism is. Her current position is “I believe in enterprise for all”, an almost evangelical approach reflecting Farny et al.’s (2016, p. 6) observation of a cult-like nature to entrepreneurship teaching. As part of the employment pattern described above, she has worked in different disciplinary areas, which has resulted in her self-perception of being an outsider. However, this seems to give her the perspective to question settled assumptions in each new discipline: “I can teach PESTEL because that’s what’s done, but at the same time, I ask why is this there? How is it useful?” Sara talks at length about the exclusionary nature of each discipline’s boundaries and language:

> every one of those...disciplines has its set languages, and if you’re not embedded in that, it can be very difficult to break through and understand what you need to do to get published. And I think because enterprise education is so, an orphan child, we don’t have our own language, we don’t have our own discipline. And we have to fit into others.

Transdisciplinarity is seen as a neoliberal threat to traditional disciplinary structures and therefore the university (Lenoir, 1997, p. 3), which Sara represents both as a result of her own multidisciplinary background, and also because she represents the transdisciplinarity of entrepreneurship. Her use of the phrase “orphan child” to describe her research seems to also communicate a sense of estrangement from the academic mainstream, discussed above.

Sara’s awareness of being an outsider seems to also give her the perspective to see learning from the students’ point of view, evidenced in the following comment:
almost all my teaching has been of not knowing the subject, or not knowing it well, and having to come from behind in terms of knowledge, and when you do that, I actually quite enjoy it, because as a learner I'm there going “why is this here, why does it matter, why am I doing this? I don't understand, I'm going to have to find out how to understand”, and I think that helps then to put you in the mind of a student...so then you can understand what others are likely to struggle with, or the fact that people do struggle, how you need to communicate difficult concepts, because you had to, a couple of weeks before, go through the same process.

Her experience of constantly having to learn new subjects in order to teach them means that she is familiar with the process of how the construction of knowledge happens, and although she does not explicitly reference this, the student-centred nature of her teaching is a constructivist approach. Her actions demonstrate that she understands the salience of these types of teaching methods (discussed later in the analysis) and her experience of learning new subjects enables her to understand how the teaching appears from a student’s point of view.

The constructivist, student-centred nature of Sara's teaching is explored in the following writing. The way she triangulates emotionally with her students seems to be a generative part their learning: it is expressive of the understanding that “to value the learner is to value the whole person”, observed by Ingleton (1999, p. 1) in motivating students to respond positively. She achieves this through a strong interpersonal dimension, evidenced by the fact, for instance, that she smiles, often sounds on the edge of laughter, and exhibits infectious enthusiasm (she is termed "Energiser bunny" by her students). However, Sara seemed unaware of the degree to which her manner projects into the classroom, and it is therefore not possible to understand to what extent this is intentional, instrumental behaviour, or unconscious. However, these teaching behaviours are well designed to achieve her objective: for teaching sessions to be "more interactive and discussive...to ask questions, to challenge...I like to have conversations...I want
them to think, it’s to make it more interactive”. It is significant that Sara identifies interactivity with learning, emphasising her constructivist approach to teaching.

Sara ensures that her students do not suffer from her own previous misunderstanding of what business is. She achieves this by demonstrating the relevance of commercial activity to students’ lives, getting them, for instance, to think about the eradication of the vacuum “splat” from a yoghurt, or the design of the stairs outside their classroom. To do this, she uses a range of teaching media, for instance, video and case studies: she used a video about Porter’s Five Forces during a session I observed. She also engages students by using a “live” case that students know, of a local coffee shop, to compare with the advance of Starbucks, and gives her students printed exercise sheets because “I want them to sit there in front of me and use pens, and I make them underline the concepts that they think are important”. Apart from offering variation to her students, the use of video and case studies is intended to familiarise her students with the context in which entrepreneurial decisions are made, and students also visit a business fair for the same purpose. It is consistent with the fact that Sara works at a teaching intensive university that there is considerable effort made to provide students with proxies for entrepreneurship experience as discussed above, and that experiential teaching is provided even though the module is mostly about entrepreneurship. Sara seems to mediate her lack of commercial experience her use of a live case study that is well known to her.

She also engages her students by not positioning herself as an expert:

so, if we all sit and watch a video, and then discuss it, for me that’s a more interesting learning experience. And I think as well, if I stand up and say, or if I do a video of me talking, I’m the expert and the students respond to me as the expert. Whereas if we’re all in this watching this video, and then if we all discuss what we think about it, it becomes a far more democratic learning process…I want people to be enabled…to critically evaluate. And I don’t necessarily think students critically evaluate if it’s the lecturer. As soon as I’m
in that room, I'm the expert. And I want them to challenge and think and critically assess,

the issue of building critical ability in her students emerging repeatedly in her commentary. This seems to evidence her recognition of the implications of the way that she triangulates the emotional distance between herself and her student, and her sensitivity to the emotional environment of the classroom is fundamental to the formation of confidence in her students (ibid., p. 2). Her teaching objectives are correspondingly based around emotional objectives: “learning...inspiration and fun”. However, a theme that ran through her commentary was an explicit alignment of her teaching with traditional academia and away from the vocational teaching that was the origin for the new universities (Delanty, 2003, p. 78): “if you go too far down that practical route, why do you need a degree? You can just do this as a night school class”. This seems an expression of the competition between vocationally and traditionally oriented universities, which forces the former to have to “ape” the better-resourced traditional universities, and this structural inequality seems to significantly shape Sara’s academic life.

Sara is located within the neoliberal argument in other, significant ways: she has migrated from thinking business is “evil” to being an evangelist for universal enterprise, and while she does not relate either position to a philosophical context, she has, at different times, been enfranchised by anti-neoliberal and neoliberal ideologies, although she mentions these only in terms of their functionalities. This may provide evidence to support the argument made in the writing on neoliberalism in Chapter 2, that business schools are a-philosophical (Fotaki and Prasad, 2015). Sara represents another neoliberal issue, that competition between universities drives a research agenda (Morley, 2003), which shapes her work in the sense that her teaching workload prevents her from doing the research that may gain her promotion. While she does not explicitly express unhappiness, she is likely to be blocked from advancement by perverse incentives that induce academic staff to systematically marginalise teaching (Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd, 2012), and she comments that her commitment to teaching therefore may come at a cost to her future promotion. Another issue that features in the neoliberal argument is the emergence of students as
consumers (discussed in Chapter 2). Sara observes that even though her module is positioned as “pracademic”, the students find it inadequately practical, and her expressed prioritisation of academic principles, evidenced, for instance, in her comment “I was absolutely adamant that we needed to keep in the dissertation” seems to locate her objectives at odds with those of her students. The overall picture I took away from Sara’s discussion and teaching is that she is mediating the conflicts introduced through aspects of neoliberal activity through her thoughtful and effective teaching, and that therefore her students enjoy the benefit created by this, at a possible cost to her advancement. Sara exemplifies the conflicts generated between the “dual accounting systems” of research and teaching (Morley, 2003) that have been imposed by neoliberal activity in the higher education sector.

5.2.8: Ita

Ita teaches “about” entrepreneurship at a Plate Glass university, in a recently inherited module. Her career has been academic, progressing through successive qualifications, followed by entry into teaching and socially focused research. A theme running through her commentary is an alignment of her teaching with what she perceives as traditional academia, and away from the applied teaching that is represented by teaching “for” entrepreneurship, which mirrors the divisions between vocationally and traditionally oriented universities (Collini, 2010, p. 3), and the linked assertion of academic specialisation within the latter. Ita evidences her support for traditional educational values (Little and Brennan, 1996, p. 33) in her observation that “valuable knowledge…(is) about opening eyes…not preparing you for a job”. While not naming it, through her strong focus on valuing knowledge for intrinsic rather than instrumental reasons, she opposes the functionalities of neoliberalism. This emerges through her academic, knowledge-transmission teaching approach, however, she reflects that she values the “how to” skills of managing money, creativity and networking as important for her students, although the academic nature of the module I observed seemed to preclude incorporation of these. Ita’s 2:1 allocation of lecture hours to seminar hours (22 hours of lectures and 11 of seminars) and 60% exam component within the assessment are efficient methods of processing the large number of students on her module,
however, she pointed out that she tries to make lectures as interactive as possible by asking questions and using videos and images. The seminar sessions which I observed continued a predominantly lecture-style approach, punctuated by some questions from students. Ita’s observation that the 2:1 lecture to seminar split was developed for smaller class sizes, and her reticence on the subject may suggest an awareness of the discourse about trade-off between class size and quality of teaching (Collini, 2010, p. 1).

The following section relates to the teaching that I observed, first in relation to its communicative qualities, followed by a discussion of its structure. I was struck by how cerebral and contemplative Ita’s teaching was, and while it is comparatively less characterised by the experiential devices of conversation and humour that give emotional depth to teaching (Jeder, 2015, p. 632), in the same way that Rachel tells stories to illustrate the theoretical points she is making, Ita also does, particularly in relation to the female entrepreneurs in Asia that she researches. In terms of constructivist devices, Ita uses case studies, however, primarily to illustrate theoretical points rather than as an immersive way for students to experience entrepreneurship context. She also used video, performing the same sort of cognitive learning function, illustrating innovation through reverse engineering a shopping trolley: these experiential teaching devices (Dreyfus and Dreyfus, 1986), function as ways to advance cognitive rather than experiential knowledge, consistent with the theoretical nature of the module. Continuing the exploration of triangulation of theory and practice, Ita comments that:

students want to hear from one entrepreneur, but this is not useful for them...somehow, they think rather than learn theory, if they hear from this entrepreneur, they would get more out of it.

It is possible the students may want a view into the entrepreneurial environment that the entrepreneurs represent as “the enactment of the kinds of activities and interactions that constitute the occupation” (Neck and Corbett, 2018, p. 18). Consistent with Ita’s theoretical teaching, she comments in relation to competitive advantage “I don’t go into the detail on the
idea….you don’t need to have a radical idea, you just need to have some idea that you think will make money”, a framing of opportunity that seems to relate more to necessity entrepreneurship, undertaken to make enough money to survive (Xheneti, Karki and Madden, 2019, p. 262), rather than to scale up and make a profit, and where competitive advantage is therefore not so crucial.

Ita’s teaching seems to achieve her expressed purpose of opening students’ eyes through exposure to theory and is richly informed by her research. Both this and the allocation of lecture and seminar time are consistent with the knowledge-transmission nature of the teaching. Her commentary is slightly tentative in this respect, which may be a result of trying to mediate my alignment with teaching, or possibly the influence of constructivist teaching’s status as educational orthodoxy (Pratt, 2002), however, the discussion suggests that unrecognised divisions between practice and theory are operationalised in the classroom. My overall impression was that Ita is an effective ambassador for research, developing students’ interest in it through her teaching.

5.3: A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THEMES FROM THE ABOVE PARTICIPANT PROFILES

To summarise themes from the individual explorations above, the following emerge: the divisions between theory and practice, the negative correlation between socially oriented research and commerciality, the role of the teacher (interpreter? guide? authority?), the use of entrepreneurial context in teaching, and the role of knowledge and the purpose of teaching (theory? entrepreneurial or enterprise capability?). These will be explored in the following analysis chapters (Chapters 6–8).
CHAPTER 6: WHO IS ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH FOR?

The discussion in this chapter folds into a major theme in this thesis: the division between practice and theory within entrepreneurship teaching, which seems worthy of attention given policy support for entrepreneurship education to stimulate economic activity, and the desire of students to improve their commercial skills. A theme emerges from participant discussions of entrepreneurship research being separated from entrepreneurial activity, tending instead to be oriented towards the phenomenon of entrepreneurship. Anticipating later discussion, this division seems shaped by the research agendas of teachers.

6.1: RESEARCH THAT INFORMS TEACHING “ABOUT” AND “FOR” ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Participants’ discussions evidence that the theory which informs how to “do” entrepreneurship comes from strategy research, in citing strategic analysis techniques such as Porter’s Five Forces and the value chain: this is corroborated by Brush, Greene and Hart (2001, p. 7) who observe that most research about how to start and scale up a company arises from the field of strategy (rather than entrepreneurship). Significant to the discussion in this thesis about the division between teaching “for” and “about” entrepreneurship, Venkataraman and Sarasvathy (2001, p. 1) observe that these research approaches “have developed largely independent of each other”. As observed in Section 2 of the literature review (Chapter 2), for entrepreneurship academics to have a field of research that they own, it is likely to be about entrepreneurship, reinforced by incentives to publish in order to be promoted (Morley, 2003), and reflected by the fact that journals for strategy research tend to be separate from those for entrepreneurship research, reflecting the disciplinary divisions described above.

6.2: THE NATURE OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH

Meyer et al.’s (2014) analysis observes that this is primarily “about” the entrepreneur or the entrepreneurial process, borne out by Ita’s observation that (entrepreneurship research) is “much more about understanding entrepreneurial behaviour, the phenomenon of
entrepreneurship...it’s not related to the individual undertaking”. The implications for this for the teaching of entrepreneurship are captured by Neck, Greene and Brush (2014, p. 7), who observe that “theory...without consideration to practice or real application (to entrepreneurial activity)...is simple and pure theory that just describes and explains...how boring for our students and how irrelevant for entrepreneurship education”. Meyer et al. (2014) observe that entrepreneurship research relates to the behavioural, demographic, human capital, social and personality related aspects of entrepreneurship, as well as conceptual papers proposing different “theoretical lenses to study the origins, process and impacts of entrepreneurship” (ibid., p. 478). They observe that the smallest body of knowledge about entrepreneurship relates to entrepreneurial finance, which seems the only field that could potentially inform an entrepreneurial new venture, however, this seems at a level of abstraction that is unlikely to be sought out by entrepreneurs.

6.3: THE RELEVANCE OF STRATEGY AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH TO “DOING” ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Participant commentary supports Neck, Greene and Brush’s (2014) observation of the separation of strategic research for business start-up from academic theory about the phenomenon of entrepreneurship: Naomi comments:

so, it’s the doing of something...so what do we mean by the doing of running a business, developing an idea. Because that’s different to what we say is entrepreneurial theory.

Katya contrasts strategic research oriented towards start-up with what she terms the “theoretical abstraction” of entrepreneurship research, commenting that “What I teach the students is that they have to understand the markets and the consumer”. Similarly, Sara reflects that research relating to start-ups will be strategy based commercial research rather than academic entrepreneurship research, and consistently again, Ita categorises entrepreneurship research as irrelevant in the pursuit of the objective of evaluating whether a business idea is likely to make money:
(the students) need to do marketing research...I think rather than entrepreneurship research, they need to have a certain understanding of opportunity. Whether the idea that they have, whether it will make money or not.

6.4: IS ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH NOT FOR ENTREPRENEURS?

Participants in this research generally reject the idea that entrepreneurs starting a new venture would seek out and benefit from entrepreneurship research: Shona comments “in terms of entrepreneurship theory, nobody really cares”, observing that:

no one’s going to lift a textbook down off the shelf and say, “how does Schumpeter define entrepreneurship, and am I engaging in creative destruction?” No. They’re not going to give a damn.

Participants consistently report that entrepreneurship theory is not for “doing” entrepreneurship, the following commentary capturing some of their comments in this respect: James observes “I don’t think entrepreneurs need a huge amount of (this sort of) theoretical knowledge”, and Naomi, Sara and Ita also reject the idea that entrepreneurship research would be sought out by or inform a new venture. However, James and Edward argue for some specific elements of entrepreneurship research in informing “doing” entrepreneurship, for instance, Edward argues for both the value to “doing” entrepreneurship of Sarasvathy’s research (2001) and also, evidencing the findings of Meyer et al. (2014), for entrepreneurial finance research in terms of potentially being helpful:

I guess...things like cash flow, entrepreneurial finance, growth stages, never follow that but it’s useful to think about a start-up being different from a small business being different to a giant business. And I think the Sarasvathy stuff about effectuation...I think the key thing for the Sarasvathy thing that I like and that the students get on to is what do you know, who do you know, what are you good at, what do you have already, and what's affordable loss. So
don’t think about how much money you want to make, and in 5 years’ time I’m going to have a half million-pound turnover, but I’ve got this amount of money, I can afford to lose it.

James also argues that Sarasvathy’s research (2001) could help to clarify the choices available to an entrepreneur. However, the likelihood that an entrepreneur “will lift a textbook down off the shelf” to access this research should be viewed against the context of James’ comment “I do research in dynamic capabilities, and I think it’s more that entrepreneurs are already doing these things and we’re learning them and putting labels on them”: his view is that entrepreneurial practice is informing the research, rather than vice versa.

6.5: IS IT NOT FOR STUDENT ENTREPRENEURS?

Participants reported a conflict between the expectations of student entrepreneurs wanting to learn how to do entrepreneurship, and teachers’ interest in teaching about entrepreneurship. Sara articulates this tension:

we think that our venture creation programme and others that we’ve looked at are highly practical. Students don’t…it’s not practical enough for them, so there is a tension within there.

Ita comments “I think the challenge is students’ expectations…there is an assumption that it’s about creating a business”. James observes that “students…favour the practice, they almost want a ‘how to’ become an entrepreneur, that sort of education. Whereas that’s not really what we’re there to do”. The context for this is that research about entrepreneurship, discussed above, shapes the teaching: participants’ discussions and observed teaching evidence this, confirming that most of the teaching is “about”. This about orientation reflects participants’ research interests as well as wider entrepreneurship research.

Participants’ research is about the phenomenon of entrepreneurship, with the exception of Rachel’s and James’. The following are examples of this: Katya’s research is into identity theory and mothers and entrepreneurship, and while James’ current research interest is strategic, he
wants to explore how entrepreneurship can be a means of overcoming social exclusion, and Naomi’s is into familial entrepreneurship. No participant, except for Rachel, is intending to maintain research into a “for” entrepreneurship subject, and hers is into corporate entrepreneurship, which informs at organisational and policy level, and therefore is not aimed at start-up activity. To summarise, the previous discussion demonstrates that there is a strong orientation within the participant group towards both researching and teaching “about”.

Related to this, there is an awareness, sometimes emotionally expressed, that students are not being supported by the research. Katya questions the role of entrepreneurship theory’s usefulness to students, saying:

but are we preparing them enough, with our exciting theoretical knowledge? About how the world should work, and are we actually teaching them the reality of what it’s like? Don’t think so (quietly).

She observes that “entrepreneurship research is responding to a particular group, not necessarily the traditional group that we should be targeting it at, which is our students”. Naomi asks “Whose boxes are we ticking? Because I really don’t believe it’s the learners’ boxes”. Sara, who researches entrepreneurship education, provides some potential context for this:

because enterprise education and entrepreneurship education impact research doesn’t fall within the standard unit of assessment in the REF...means that it’s not sexy, it’s not supported...which means it’s really difficult to get any money in to do research, research grants are not there, you can’t build up an ongoing programme and so...we are seriously devoid in actually what works in terms of the enterprise and entrepreneurship education agenda.

This is evidenced by Béchard and Grégoire (2005, p. 6) who observe that “research at the interface of education and entrepreneurship is not likely to generate...much interest (or) professional rewards”. The insight from the above discussion is that entrepreneurship research
seems not to be for students, given their interest in knowing how to “do” entrepreneurship, and that additionally, research on entrepreneurship education is systematically marginalised.

6.6: IS IT FOR ACADEMICS?

Some participants observe, in a way that is often strongly expressed, that entrepreneurship research has an “ivory tower”, closed-circle quality, which excludes students, and who correspondingly question whether entrepreneurship research is for academics: Edward reflects “in terms of who’s it for, I wonder whether it’s just for academics. I don’t know, the danger is they’re talking to themselves or talking to each other”. James observes that:

it’s for the academic community... when it comes to the students who are going to be entrepreneurs, I think the amount of insight they will take from theoretical input is going to be limited.

Katya comments that:

the research is part of the job (laughs). Various groups of people who come together, for instance, academics who like to talk about certain things, and like to challenge themselves intellectually? I’m being ironic, but that’s how it is.

Naomi reflects: “when you’re in the educational institution? I would say for the educational institution”. These concerns are corroborated by Fisher (2020, p. 418), who reflects that:

I am puzzled that many business schools give faculty almost no credit or recognition for publishing practitioner-focused articles. This makes no sense at all. The mission of a business school is to generate and share knowledge to make organisations more effective, and practitioner-focused articles contribute directly to this mission.
Edward cites the effect of academic writing in contributing to the estrangement of entrepreneurship research from students:

that’s…a problem with academic writing. I have to publish a little thing for my students in the first year on how to crib from someone else and how to read academic papers, yes, they are boring, most academics aren’t good at writing, here’s how you can get something useful from them.

This problem is noted by Fisher (ibid., p. 1) observing that:

many business professors write only for a scholarly audience and publish exclusively in academic journals, which just a few other scholars will read…If this practice persists…it could be the demise of business schools as we know them. We will become irrelevant.

However, pre-empting the discussion at the end of this chapter, this seems unlikely given the power of the academic enterprise and entrepreneurship research’s relevance to policy.

6.7: WHAT IS ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH FOR?

The situation therefore seems to exist that entrepreneurship scholars are researching a subject that is disciplinarily abstracted from its application: most entrepreneurship research seems not intended to be applied to “doing” entrepreneurship, but is intended to develop knowledge, for its own sake and potentially to influence policy (Audretsch, Grilo and Thurik, 2007). This is evidenced by Katya, who comments:

there are certain projects that would be addressing the needs of the policymakers and…wider stakeholder groups…and there are certain things that we as academics pursue out of our interest that have no relevance, or visible, or thought through, relevance to those outside and those inside, but it’s something we feel passionately about, and that’s actually what drives the job forward. And our livelihood as an academic forward.
Ita similarly observes that “entrepreneurship research is really for policy...it’s not related to the individual undertaking”. The following are other participants’ observations of the orientation of entrepreneurship research towards academic understanding and policy: Katya comments that:

there are lots of things that we start to do nowadays, that's working with local communities, so, for instance, you know, the project that I'm involved in at the moment, with the Institute for Super Diversity, on Brexit and EU migrant families. So, it's understanding how people are coping with the process, how the resilience is developing, and...this research...enables respondents to articulate their worries, emotions, to the people, community.

Consistently with her commercial research, Rachel takes a slightly different perspective, arguing that the research:

objective is to study...because this has not been studied before and to see how it can influence not just the policy but also the person setting up a business.

So, it’s both sides at the moment. I wouldn't say one side is leading the other, but it is entrepreneurship research, right?...I’m hoping I can use in my teaching when I talk about entrepreneurship...talk about possibilities for funding...these new government initiatives and how successful they are, do they really stimulate innovation, and do they really stimulate the growth?

The above commentary provides a strong narrative that entrepreneurship research is for policy, for developing areas with no obvious application, and to study the socio-economics of particular groups.

**6.8: SYSTEMIC BARRIERS TO RESEARCH INTO ENTREPRENEURSHIP PRACTICE**

The discussion in Section 6.7 has been about the applicability of entrepreneurship research, the divisions between “for” and “about“, and its multidisciplinary origins. The following
discussion illuminates the role of context and language in enabling the dominance of research about entrepreneurship. While Bjørnskov and Foss (2013) highlight the role of context in explaining entrepreneurial actions and their outcomes, Zahra, Wright and Abdelgawad (2014, p. 480) observe that:

the fundamental influence of context in understanding entrepreneurship practice is an issue that is difficult to incorporate into research, because there is no agreement on these contextual influences... a multitude of variables are likely to influence the outcomes,

however, they obscure that "without contextualization, the different effects of individual, situation and serendipity are unclear". This inability to embed consistent contextualization seems a systematic barrier to research into entrepreneurship practice, and commentary from participants in relation to entrepreneurship research supports this. Katya observes "I do a lot of reviewing and the papers that I receive are absolutely horrendous sometimes, and you read it and you think:

    Oh my God, I can't believe it, you clearly do not understand the whole idea, the tendency to conceptualise things in various variables that you think are making sense, but they're not because they're kind of extracted from, you know, kind of plucked out of something, but the something is forgotten. You know, the bigger picture, the context is inappropriately forgotten.

Sara reflects on the reasons for the sometimes-poor quality of submissions to an entrepreneurship journal where she is an editor, observing that discipline-specific language is a source of problems with the quality of submissions:

    every one of those sub-disciplines has its set languages, and if you’re not embedded in that, it can be very difficult to break through and understand what you need to do to get published. And I think because enterprise education is so, an orphan child, we don’t have our own language, we don’t
have our own discipline. And we have to fit into others…I sometimes think put a bit of rigour in this.

6.9: **ARE THERE ANY INDICATIONS THAT ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH IS LIKELY TO CHANGE?**

Participants observe the changing nature of entrepreneurship research, noting that research relating to start-up and scaling up, (which, as observed by Brush, Greene and Hart, 2001, is based in strategy theory), has been superseded by research that arises from entrepreneurship scholarship within a primarily socio-economic context. James evidences proliferation of research activity at the margins of the subject:

there's a lot of new-preneurships emerging. There's always new terms emerging, so you've got social entrepreneurship, you've got philanthro-preneurship, you've got co-preneurship. It's expanding in terms of lots of areas, and the sense that I get is that there's a movement away from the mainstream. So, the mainstream is about looking at the founding of a new company, looking at how that can be scaled-up, for example. And I think there's much more interest now in what I would say is more like the margins of entrepreneurship. So, different forms of entrepreneurship are there, and how can they contribute to, or how do they take away from society. So, things like illegal entrepreneurship for example…I think they're the emerging topics.

Katya comments "it is evolving and is moving in different directions because there are probably fields that have been researched so much that they are saturated in a way". Corroborating this, Rachel observes:

maybe research on the tools how to start up your business, how to, what are the characteristics of an entrepreneur, and like, all these types of things that have not changed so much over time, so the amount of papers that analyse
them, you know, is probably sufficient, right, so there can’t be that much breakthrough, I would say.

Contrastingly, she reflects on the research into corporate entrepreneurship:

if you look at corporate entrepreneurship, and if you look where it's moving to, like this latest research...(it) has had research on corporate venture capital, has had research on hackathons and accelerators, it's had research on...different partnerships with different start-ups and all kinds of stuff, so now...the new studies are trying to put that all together.

6.10: FINDINGS

The above discussion elucidates the divisions between strategic research which is “for” doing entrepreneurship, and entrepreneurship research which is mostly “about” entrepreneurship. It finds that, primarily, entrepreneurship research is not for entrepreneurs or student entrepreneurs, and that there is a structural conflict imposed on teaching that arises from the division between this and student expectations. The research finds that entrepreneurship research has an "ivory tower“ quality, arising from the fact that it is intended to inform policy, the socio-economic analysis of particular groups, and is for the academic community, rather than entrepreneurship practice. However, participants all defended the situation of primarily teaching "about", Sara observing “If you go too far down that practical route, why do you need a degree? You can just do this as a night school class”, which recalls the theme of academic legitimacy in the literature review (see Chapter 2) and the discussion of academic enclosure above. To draw together the themes from the discussion: research “about” and “for” entrepreneurship are drawn from different disciplinary bases, the latter primarily from economics and strategy, and disciplinary divisions (Hark, 2007) maintain the separation of strategy and entrepreneurship scholars. Research about entrepreneurship is predominant, oriented primarily towards policy, the development of areas with no obvious application, and the study of socio-economics of particular groups, and seems mirrored within teaching. Additional to the issue of non-applicability to practice, research operates at a level of theoretical abstraction that makes it inaccessible to
entrepreneurs, and this issue of the enclosure of academic knowledge is a recurring theme in relation to entrepreneurship research, possibly expressive of a desire for academic legitimacy (Neck, Greene and Brush, 2017, p. 7), and consistent with academic advancement (Morley, 2003). The implication of the above analysis is that entrepreneurship research seems constitutionally unable to inform practice, and that the gravitational pull towards it exerted by academic capitalism (Slaughter, Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004, p. 29) imposes a pressure that systematically locates practice as marginal to the academic enterprise of entrepreneurship. This correspondingly focuses attention on the gap between the nature of entrepreneurship research and teaching, and the expectations of students and policymakers, who look to entrepreneurship teaching to stimulate start-up activity.
CHAPTER 7: ENTREPRENEURSHIP KNOWLEDGE AND ITS LINKS WITH TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

7.1: INTRODUCTION

As discussed in the entrepreneurship knowledge section of the literature review (Section 2.4) and the chapter on constructivism (Chapter 3), a key differentiator within the observed teaching is the divide between experiential, tacit knowledge that operationalises strategy theory, and traditional cognitive knowledge based on entrepreneurship theory. Correspondingly, where teaching instruments from practice are introduced into modules that are based on entrepreneurship theory, these jump disciplinary boundaries, mixing idioms that have different norms and forms of expression: this can be seen in the role of "entrepreneurial cognition" (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 60) in what DeTienne and Chandler (2004) and Neck and Corbett (2018) consider the crucial capability of identifying competitive advantage in a new business idea, and the role of experiential teaching in achieving this cognition. In particular, Eraut's (2005) understandings of professional knowledge and the ability to "read" professional contexts seem critical. Given these divisions between the knowledge deployed in teaching “for” and “about”, this chapter explores the role that different types of cognition perform within teaching approaches, using Pryor and Crossouard’s (2008, p. 10) observation that the nature of participants’ teaching can be accessed through its assessment, given that these are formed by decisions about what knowledge is valuable. Insight into this will consequently be sought by exploring assessments in relation to teaching, and also to research participants’ commentary. In order to do this, it seems critical to understand the role of context and reflection in documenting learning, so these are briefly revisited in Section 7.2.

7.2: EXPOSURE TO ENTREPRENEURIAL CONTEXT

Most of the observed teaching reproduces some degree of entrepreneurship context for students, graduating in “experientiality” from case studies, to talking with visiting entrepreneurs, to students working directly with organisations. These are represented in Figure 5 below, which
shows stages of immersion of a student within entrepreneurial context, and also the way the teacher’s role changes to reflect this.

**Figure 5:** Exposure to entrepreneurial context and students’ position within the learning process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Examples in entrepreneurship education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Authority, coach</td>
<td>Interactive lectures, guest speakers, students pitching new ideas with feedback, exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>Motivator, guide</td>
<td>Case studies, simulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Feasibility projects, lean start-up, problem-based learning projects, starting a business as course project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Self-directed</td>
<td>Consultant delegator</td>
<td>Starting a new venture outside class, students on challenges facing a new or young venture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 5 communicates the interrelatedness of context to professional knowledge, expressed by Eraut (2005, p. 3) as “recognition, interaction and interpretation...of frequently encountered patterns...(and) discrimination of differences within those patterns”. The interpretive and discriminatory skill displayed in Eraut’s example (ibid.) is enacted, for instance, by being able to “read” (Eraut, 2005) case studies or commercial contexts, regardless of the changeability of their set of particularities. Table 5 communicates the interrelatedness of context to professional knowledge, expressed by Eraut (ibid., p. 3) as “recognition, interaction and interpretation...of frequently encountered patterns...(and) discrimination of differences within those patterns”. The interpretive and discriminatory skill described in Eraut’s example (ibid.) is enacted, for instance, by being able to “read” commercial contexts, regardless of the changeability of their set of particularities. Because a key point of insight into the nature of assessments is the way they conceptualise reflection, and because how this is understood communicates teachers’ conceptualisations of knowledge, Table 5 sets out understandings of task-based learning and the role of reflection in them, in order to be able to understand the difference between these and traditional Deweyan (1916) reflection.
Table 5: Categories of task-focused knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Implicit</th>
<th>Conscious reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schon and Eraut</td>
<td>Situational understanding, ability to “read” context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eraut</td>
<td>Intuitive, problem-solving</td>
<td>Analytic and deliberative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clegg, Tan and Saeidi</td>
<td>Intuitive action</td>
<td>Deliberative action capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implicit representational awareness</td>
<td>Explicit representational awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3: ASSESSMENTS AND THEIR RELATION TO KNOWLEDGE TYPES

This paragraph compares assessments to types of knowledge developed in the teaching, including Deweyan (ibid.) interior-focused, retrospective construction of action into cognitive knowledge. The following discussion will take Gipps’ (1994) definitions of assessment: those which test what learners know (summative), and a second mode that forms learners’ understanding (formative), expressed by Pryor and Crossouard (2008) as “coming to know in different situations”, the latter seeming to fit closely to teaching that develops entrepreneurial judgement. The discussion in this section will explore the types of cognition that are developed by assessments, for instance, that a constructivist assessment such as a case study can be used as an “object” for applying cognitive knowledge, or in order to “read” (Eraut, 2005) its patterns of particularity, a “coming to know” inextricably bound up with the texture of that particular context. Given this observation, it seems that exposing students to case studies and businesses within a primarily knowledge-transmission module with little “how to” teaching is likely to use the case study for the exposition of cognitive knowledge, and therefore that this iteration of “coming to know” is partially a test of what students know: this reflection observes therefore that in entrepreneurship teaching, “coming to know” can express a range of positions on the spectrum from formative to summative assessment, although Pryor and Crossouard (2008) characterise this sort of assessment as formative.

In the following discussion, where assessments require significant “reading” of context, they are termed “formative R”, and where they are used primarily as objects for the application of cognitive knowledge, these are termed “formative C”: this is irrespective of whether the
assessment is “live” or retrospective, although this distinction is made clear in the discussion. This reflects Pryor and Crossouard’s (ibid., p. 2) observation that the difference between formative and summative assessment lies in their purpose, and that formative assessments develop students’ understanding, however, assessments whose purpose is to measure that learning has happened, to pre-agreed standards, are summative. Assessments in the observed teaching tended to fall into four categories: those that “live” tested students’ ability to “read” situations through reflection in action (for instance, recognising commercial patterns within unseen case studies). The second category of assessment evidences that this type of “reading” has taken place, for instance, via a retrospective project report for a client: in this case, it seems that that it is formative because additional to the formative nature of the learning being reported, the deliberative nature of the retrospection also develops students’ understanding. However, it seems that these assessments test different types of knowledge: “live” testing seems to test entrepreneurial cognition (Neck and Greene, 2011) most closely, given its requirement for students to “read” a situation and make decisions, however, retrospective assessment seems slightly different in nature, in requiring deliberative thought that acts as post-rationalisation, and therefore may not be as accurate a way of evidencing a student’s ability to “read” a situation. The third type of assessment, for instance, an exam or a theoretical essay, tests that learning has happened and seems therefore to be a summative assessment, and the fourth is a formal Deweyan (1916) interior-focused reflection on the process of learning, retrospectively developing cognitive information out of action.

As discussed in the literature review in Chapter 2, the difference between a Deweyan approach and the first two categories of assessment is that it traces the development of a student’s awareness of learning. However, these assessments seem to test separate things that may not coincide: the first categories demonstrate the nature and extent of the learning and by definition that it has happened, however, Deweyan assessment is not structured to evidence the nature or degree of entrepreneurial ability developed by the student, but instead his or her interior-focused perceptions of the process of learning. It is therefore possible that the student can, for instance, have contributed little to a client company, but simultaneously been attuned to
his or her own learning (in other words, the awareness of learning can be significant but not related to the results achieved), which suggests that these processes do not have an intrinsic connection, and therefore that Deweyan reflection is not an indicator of the development of action related capability within a student. This correlates with my own teaching experience, where students found it impossible to relate an interior-focused reflection on learning to the commercially oriented activity they had been undertaking, exacerbated by the potential inarticulability of this process observed by Schon (1984).

**7.4: EXPLORATION OF THE KNOWLEDGE THAT IS TAUGHT AND ASSESSED IN THE PARTICIPANT GROUP**

Edward and James have inherited their modules recently (this is termed “inherited" in the commentary), so in these cases, the teaching does not necessarily reflect their views and beliefs. However, it seems to me that these modules remain valid subjects for exploration, because they reflect either choices made by another teacher, or institutional decisions about teaching, and therefore enact others’ views: additionally, because of this, they draw out interesting perspectives from these participants. The following discussion groups together Ita, Naomi and Shona’s teaching as, differently from the rest of the participant group, they focus almost exclusively on knowledge-transmission methods, which exclude substantive use of constructivist teaching intended to teach students to “read" commercial situations. Two pairs of participants, Rachel and Shona, and Edward and Katya, teach the same subject at different universities, so their teaching and assessment are also grouped. There are also points of comparability between Shona’s and Naomi’s teaching, and between Edward’s and James’, so their teaching approaches are also compared. Each participant’s teaching is also explored individually. However, there is a potential interrupter of these patterns: where strategy theory is taught (by Edward, Katya and Sara) it is intended to inform action, and therefore knowledge-transmission teaching within their modules is not as removed from entrepreneurial action as teaching of entrepreneurship theory. While this does not disrupt the following analysis, it seems necessary to make this clear.
7.5: SEQUENCE

- Ita’s teaching
- Naomi’s teaching
- Shona’s teaching
- Exploration of comparison between Shona’s and Naomi’s teaching
- Rachel’s teaching
- Exploration of comparison between Shona’s and Rachel’s teaching
- Edward’s teaching
- Katya’s teaching
- Exploration of comparison between Edward’s and Katya’s teaching
- James’ teaching
- Exploration of comparison between Edward’s and James’ teaching
- Sara’s teaching

7.6: PARTICIPANTS’ TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

7.6.1: Ita

Ita teaches an explicitly theoretical “about” module which, given its focus on the development of cognitive knowledge through lectures, and the fact that the seminars are structured around discussion of academic papers, contains little constructivist teaching. In terms of using constructivist forms, Ita uses some videos and case studies, however, these seem to function to illuminate points of cognitive learning rather than to build students’ situational understanding (Kolb and Kolb, 2005). This theoretical approach corresponds to the module’s summative forms of assessment, as observed by Pryor and Crossouard (2008), being a theoretical essay (30%) of total marks and an exam (70%). Ita’s is an example of a module’s nature mirrored by the assessment mode, theory-based teaching and assessments that document cognitive understanding.
7.6.2: Naomi

Naomi’s module, relating to the understanding of social enterprise “about” entrepreneurship (her categorisation), is made up of 22 hours of blended lecture/seminar sessions, weighted towards knowledge-transmission teaching. However, she also includes drama-based experiential teaching intended to develop students’ “voice”, both in terms of understanding their identity, and their ability to communicate and present: this is reflection-in-action learning, however, is an adjunct to the predominantly formal knowledge-transmission teaching, and is disciplinarily removed. The module is assessed via a group presentation, worth 30% of total marks, of a case study on an entrepreneur that the students choose to exemplify their cognitive learning, and a business plan that the students develop for this entrepreneur, worth 70% (both “formative C” assessments). The business plan seems a disruptor to the entrepreneurship theory-based teaching in Naomi’s module, as it enacts strategy theory and professional knowledge, in that it requires discriminatory analysis to decide the feasibility of a business idea.

7.6.3: Shona

Shona and Rachel (below) both teach theoretical, “about” international entrepreneurship modules: consistent with her teaching of entrepreneurship theory “about”, Shona’s contains little constructivist teaching, and focuses on the development of cognitive knowledge through lectures, with seminars structured around discussion of academic papers. The potential interactivity of the seminar teaching that I observed was affected by some students not having done the reading, and as a result, Shona commented on the lecture-like nature of the teaching session. She used comparatively few case studies or videos, although there is a question-and-answer session with an Asian new venture owner: it seems that this primarily functions as a “live case study” exposition of cognitive information more than to build students’ situational understanding (Kolb and Kolb, 2005). Shona’s consistently theoretical teaching is mirrored by the assessment: an individual report on a theoretical model worth 50% of total marks, corresponding to Pryor and Crossouard’s (2008) characteristics of summative assessment, with the balance being a 50% group report on the
internationalisation of the Asian new venture, based on the application of cognitive knowledge about internationalisation theory, a “formative C” assessment.

7.6.4: Naomi and Shona

Naomi’s business plan and Shona’s group report assessments are examples of constructivist forms of assessment that are used for the application of cognitive knowledge, where a process of “coming to know” does not develop “new ways of being and acting” (ibid., p. 3) because they are not about action but cognition and are therefore classified “formative C”. However, this classification offers insight into Naomi and Shona’s teaching, as they are also open to contextual “reading”; for instance, if Shona’s request to students to “critically evaluate the (company’s) internationalisation potential” is approached as a set of steps in applying theory, it excludes contextual interpretation.

7.6.5: Rachel

Rachel’s International Entrepreneurship module’s teaching is mostly “about”, but with some “for” (her own categorisation), however, her blended lecture/discussion teaching sessions are heavily interactive, with at least one formal case study but also a number of informal ones for each 3-hour session. While Shona (above) teaches her module via a traditional knowledge-transmission approach, Rachel develops professional knowledge (Eraut, 2005) using uses experiential teaching based on case studies and also in challenging and probing two-way conversation with her students that stimulates reflection-in-action (Schon, 1987): coming to know “on the fly” (Habgood-Coote, 2019, pp. 101–102). While not articulating the division between professional knowledge based on strategy theory, and cognitive knowledge-based entrepreneurship theory, this seems to underpin her belief that the module should either teach internationalisation or entrepreneurship, and the fact that Rachel deploys formal information-transmission teaching as only a starting point for its exploration through experiential teaching seems to enact this belief, for instance, she uses class cases to demonstrate internationalisation theory, but also to deepen students’ situational understanding (Kolb and Kolb, 2005) by asking
them interpretive rather than observational questions, such as “how would you interpret Uber’s commercial position?” which engages them in commercially “reading” (Eraut, 2005) Uber’s position. Rachel’s experience seems to give her the professional knowledge (ibid.) to be able to guide her students in whichever interpretive or observational direction the discussion takes from there.

Module assessments are, firstly, a 20% of total marks individual formative project on internationalising a German company, and secondly, an 80% exam based on interpreting an unseen case, both of which seem to be a “process of coming to know in different situations” (Pryor and Crossouard, 2008, p. 3), and to reflect the blend of entrepreneurship and strategy-based knowledge in the module. The exam seems to be “formative R” because it uses the context of a case for students to demonstrate the nature of their learning in “real time”, testing situational understanding (Kolb and Kolb, 2005), as does the report for the same reasons but one step removed in the sense that a deliberative process has also occurred. These assessments reflect the experiential nature of Rachel’s teaching, and while competitive advantage is not taught explicitly, the nature of her teaching builds students’ ability to “read” (Eraut, 2005) commercial situations for its presence (or absence).

7.6.6: Shona and Rachel

Comparing Shona’s and Rachel’s teaching of international entrepreneurship modules, there seems to be consistency between each module’s assessment and the nature of the teaching, Shona offering formal cognition-based summative assessments based on entrepreneurship theory, and Rachel offering two formative assessments based on both entrepreneurship and strategy theory, both of which test students’ ability to “read” a commercial situation: these, respectively, reflect Shona’s engagement with research-informed academic teaching, and Rachel’s with experiential teaching, separate approaches that shape their different iterations of teaching internationalisation planning. Shona’s assessment asks students to “critically evaluate the pathways to internationalisation taken to date, drawing on the literature”, while Rachel’s assessment is positioned in the future, asking students to “imagine you are a successful producer
of solar panels in the EU” who plans to internationalise, and to write a report interpreting the competitive structure within the target market. The retrospective form of Shona’s assessment enables students to apply cognitive knowledge to a known pattern, while the future-based nature of Rachel’s assessment requires her students to interpret patterns of commerciality in their target market and to use this “entrepreneurial cognition” (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 60) to generate future action, a cognition that is also demanded by her case study-based exam, which also asks students to instantaneously “read” situations (Eraut, 2005) as well as apply cognitive knowledge. To summarise, the focus of Shona’s assessment seems to be on students’ knowledge and understanding of internationalisation theory, whereas Rachel’s is on their ability to use their entrepreneurial cognition to apply this, both reflecting the nature of the teaching, and which “signpost” the differing nature of the knowledge that their students gain from each module.

7.6.7: Edward

This section separately discusses Edward and Katya, who teach start-up modules based on strategy theory at different universities and compares their different approaches. Edward’s (inherited) module has the development of “professional, practical skills” as one of its objectives, offering 19 hours of lectures based on strategy theory, and 3 hours of entrepreneur-mentored interaction with an entrepreneurial simulation package (in addition to unlimited interaction with it in students’ out of class time). He and his visiting entrepreneurs seem to prompt different types of reflection in students: Edward’s concern is with the nature of their learning, and the visiting entrepreneurs’ concern is with developing students’ professional knowledge (ibid.), instantaneous, problem-solving ability which shapes their start-up project. In discussion, Edward confirmed that the primary purpose of teaching is the understanding of (strategic) cognitive knowledge, however, the time allocated to teach students how to apply this knowledge was limited to 3 hours, corroborating Edward’s statement that the development of entrepreneurial cognition (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 60) was not the focus of the teaching, however, this seemed to be the role of the simulation package. This was the focus of a group report, worth 55% of marks, which documents the nature of learning, focusing strongly on group dynamics and decision-making, which mirrors
Deweyan concern with the nature of learning: from this, it can be seen that this module is concerned with cognitive rather than professional knowledge. From this, in addition to a formal Deweyan reflection (worth 10% of total marks) and an exam accounting for 35% of marks, it can again be seen that this module is concerned with cognitive rather than professional knowledge.

7.6.8: Katya

Katya’s start-up module, in common with all observed teaching, has a preponderance of lecture time (22 hours) plus 8 hours of seminar time, however, has a strong focus on experiential teaching that develops students’ situational understanding (Kolb and Kolb, 2005). Consistent with this approach, Katya allocates around half of her lecture time for students to present and get formative feedback from her and other students on their project: the reflection that this stimulates is deliberative, informing future action. Part of Katya’s seminar teaching time is dedicated to consulting sessions, where she uses her commercial experience to advise students on their business ideas, co-creating (Bovill, 2019) their commercial plans. In the same way that Rachel does, Katya maintains constant, interrogative dialogue with her students, asking open and interpretive rather than observational questions, for instance, “how would you interpret start-up A’s situation in comparison with start-up B’s?” Katya is able to engage students in this type of open question that requires situational understanding because, like Rachel, she has the professional knowledge (Eraut, 2005), built from commercial experience, to allow her to negotiate whichever practice-oriented or theoretical direction the discussion takes. While competitive advantage is not taught explicitly, the way that business ideas are analysed, Katya’s open questions and “live” commercial coaching develop students’ entrepreneurial cognition (Neck and Greene, 2011).

Katya’s module assessments are an individual feasibility analysis (identification of competitive advantage) of a current, unconnected Kickstarter business idea (worth 50%) and a group report on the students’ own crowdfunding project (50%), to include a 3-minute advertising video. Both assessments task students with identifying the presence of competitive advantage, and in this way document the orientation of the teaching towards professional knowledge. This is particularly so with the individual project, as this campaign is relatively unfamiliar to the student
and therefore calls on their ability to “read” (Eraut, 2005) its commercial terrain, rather than the more deliberative, interpretive process that is required for the group write-up of their own project – however, they both develop professional as well as cognitive knowledge. Both these assessments enact Pryor and Crossouard’s (2008) definition of a formative assessment, as processes of “coming to know” in its fullest sense and therefore seem to categorise as “formative R”. The advertising video, while a formative assessment, in that it demonstrates the nature of the students’ learning, is less reflective of the teaching, on the basis that, similarly to Sara’s poster, it tests “how to” skills that are not taught. However, while both seem to develop students’ abilities in “real time”, the poster assessment in Sara’s module seems to function more as a visual exposition of cognitive knowledge, while the video expresses more tacit understandings about the business idea, “signposting” the slightly different balances of cognitive and professional knowledge in the teaching.

7.6.9: Edward and Katya

To summarise, Edward’s (inherited) teaching has the objective of developing cognitive strategy knowledge that the students apply fairly independently from the teaching: their engagement with entrepreneurial context is provided by the simulation package, which seems to be envisaged as their opportunity to apply strategy theory, while the development of professional knowledge (Eraut, 2005) seems to be independently developed by students through their interaction with the simulation package, documented through a process of Deweyan (1916) retrospective reflection. Because there were no significant amounts of “how to” teaching, the professional knowledge had to be learned rather than taught, and therefore had to be assessed by an interior-directed documentation of learning rather than an action-based assessment. Katya’s teaching seems to have a different emphasis, with her occupying a role of interpreter of context, building students’ entrepreneurial cognition and ability to “read” commercial situations (as well as their understanding of strategy theory). Given the presence of “how to” teaching, professional knowledge is evidenced by actions taken, and therefore both Katya’s assessments use action-
based assessments. In both Edward’s and Katya’s teaching, the nature of the assessment mirrors the nature of the learning in their modules.

7.6.10: James

This section relates first to James’ teaching, and then compares his and Edward’s approaches. James’ teaching is also inherited and is split into 11 hours of lecture theory and 5 seminar hours. Although the module is in social entrepreneurship consulting, James expresses misgivings about the fact that he feels the teaching is predominantly theoretical, on the basis that students are neither taught either about consulting or competitive advantage, and that there is a need for more “for” teaching. Consistent with this, he observes that the mark allocation does not reflect the pattern of work undertaken by the students, in that while the reflective essay contributes 55% to the overall marks, doing the consultancy and writing and presenting the report takes most of the effort and time, and is the explicit purpose of the module, which suggests that James feels Deweyan retrospective reflection is not an appropriate assessment of action. James’ other assessment is a group report worth 45% of marks, a formative assessment reflecting both entrepreneurship and strategy theory, but which does not seem to document professional knowledge, and therefore is categorised as “formative C”.

7.6.11: Edward and James

There is comparability between James’ and Edward’s teaching: they are both primarily about the development of cognitive knowledge, although both modules relate to “doing” entrepreneurship, and correspondingly there is an emphasis on a lecture-based format. They are also similar in the sense that there is experiential content in the learning, which is separated from the teaching – in Edward’s case through taking the form of a stand-alone entrepreneurship simulation package, and in James’ case through students working away from the university, within a social enterprise. The role of the teaching seems to be giving students cognitive knowledge, in Edward’s case based on strategy theory, and in James’, on entrepreneurship theory. While Edward’s and James’ assessments both focus on cognitive knowledge, the “real life” nature of
James’ students’ experience is likely to shape his students’ assessment into more of a contextually embedded narrative.

Although Edward’s module is explicitly for start-up, his module’s assessments indicate a primary focus on theoretical, cognitive knowledge, and while James’ module is based on entrepreneurship knowledge “about”, an element of the assessment documents the development of students’ professional knowledge. However, the role of formal, retrospective reflection seems to provide insight, in the sense that it seems to “signpost” that students negotiate the experiential context of their modules independently of the teaching, and that therefore this professional knowledge is, to varying degrees, exterior to the teaching.

7.6.12: Sara

Sara does not have an obvious comparator within the group, as she is in a teaching-focused university which can be expected to engage with methods of active learning (Howell and Annansingh, 2013), and where curriculum design is done at the department level (ibid.). However, Sara was open about these and other issues, and gave me a good understanding of the elements that shape her teaching, so it seems likely that these potential disruptors of the correspondence between teaching and assessment can be made explicit. Sara’s module is mostly “about” strategy theory, with some “for” teaching (her own definition), so, similarly to Edward’s teaching, the theory is intended to inform action. However, she makes significant use of experiential teaching forms that I observed are, to some degree, intended to deepen students’ situational understanding (Kolb and Kolb, 2005), however, they primarily function as expositions of theoretical rather than professional knowledge, as is the case with all participants except Katya and Rachel. The context-based teaching within Sara’s module illustrates Hartshorn and Hannon’s (2005, p. 618) observation of the paradox of teachers having to be guide in the practice-based learning process of how to “do” entrepreneurship, without having the practice experience to do this: Sara mediates this through observational teaching approaches like “can you see that the organisation is using this marketing approach?”, and her use of a well-known local coffee shop as a case study. Sara’s module is structured into 22 hours of lectures and 11 hours of seminars, the
latter primarily used for application of theory to context: for instance, in the seminar I observed, students applied Porter’s (2008) strategic analysis techniques to the coffee shop case study.

The major assessment is an analysis of a case study (worth 60% of total marks), whose purpose seemed to be primarily as an application of cognitive knowledge to the real-life coffee shop case. The balance of the assessment is a poster (worth 40%) which is less straightforward: as an example of cognitive learning, it seems to function as a summative assessment, however, it also enacts “how to” knowledge of graphic design, which is not taught. What struck me was the number of times that Sara contextualised information, as did Katya and Rachel, in this instance bringing the context of the coffee shop case to the foreground. Sara’s constant referencing of this brought its particularities to the fore, so while the development of cognitive knowledge may have been Sara’s objective, the way she teaches it is expressive of a strong contextual sensitivity. While Sara’s teaching seems focused on developing cognitive knowledge, her continuous contextualisation of this seems to aspire to developing professional knowledge, however, this seems constrained by the observational rather than interpretive nature of the teaching.

7.7: DISCUSSION

The clearest pattern within the observations is that theoretical teaching “about” predominates within the participant group, and that contextually based assessments are also predominant. However, this needs interpretation: insight into the nature of teaching can be gained by the way that context, for instance, a case study, is conceptualised within assessment: at one end of the spectrum, it can be used as an object, a vehicle for the exposition of cognitive knowledge, and at the other as a valid subject for exploration on its own merits, with contextual understanding embedded within its patterns of particularity. Consequently, as represented in Table 6, use of context primarily for the exposition of cognitive understanding is denoted as “C”, and usage for its patterns of particularity as “R”. However, it is necessary to acknowledge that assessments do not necessarily fall cleanly into these categories, and that these “R” and “C” categorisations reflect the predominant mode of the assessment.
### Table 6: Summary of participant teaching modes and assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Predominant teaching mode (self-defined)</th>
<th>Main Assessment</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>&quot;About&quot;</td>
<td>Retrospective cognitive reflection</td>
<td>Formative C: retrospective group report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>&quot;About&quot;</td>
<td>Formative C: business plan</td>
<td>Formative C: group presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>&quot;About&quot;</td>
<td>Formative R: retrospective case study analysis</td>
<td>Summative: poster of main issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ita</td>
<td>&quot;About&quot;</td>
<td>Summative: exam</td>
<td>Summative: theoretical essay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 1</strong></td>
<td>International entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>&quot;About&quot;</td>
<td>Formative R: case study-based exam testing knowledge in real time</td>
<td>Formative R: plan to internationalise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>&quot;About&quot;</td>
<td>Summative: theoretical essay</td>
<td>Formative C: plan to internationalise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 2</strong></td>
<td>Teaching for start-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katya</td>
<td>&quot;For&quot;</td>
<td>Formative R: feasibility report</td>
<td>Formative R: group report on start-up project</td>
<td>Retrospective cognitive reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>&quot;For&quot;</td>
<td>Formative C: retrospective group project report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retrospective cognitive reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: "Formative C" denotes formative assessments that are predominantly for the exposition of cognitive knowledge, and "formative R" where assessments have a significant element of “reading” the entrepreneurial context.

In the six modules that predominantly teach "about" (participant’s own categorisations), there are seven formative assessments, over half of these falling into the category of “formative C”, and which therefore do not significantly engage with context in a way that develops students’ professional knowledge (Eraut, 2005). The modules where all assessments fall into the “formative R” category (requiring students to interpret entrepreneurship context) are taught by teachers with around 10 years’ commercial experience, and this experiential effect seems to override both the intended purpose of the module and the degree to which the teaching is “about", shown in Tables 7a and 7b. This correlation of concern with developing professional knowledge with extensive commercial experience mirrors Neck, Greene and Brush’s (2014) observation of correlation between each entrepreneurship teacher’s path to their current role and location on the practice/theory spectrum.
Table 7a: Research participants’ teaching, assessments and experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Participant teaching mode (self-defined)</th>
<th>Main assessment</th>
<th>Second/third Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>0–5 years, C</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td>Retrospective cognitive reflection</td>
<td>Formative C: group report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>0–5 years, C</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td>Formative C: business plan</td>
<td>Formative C: group presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td>Formative R: retrospective case study analysis</td>
<td>Summative: poster of main issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ita</td>
<td>Career research academic</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td>Summative: exam</td>
<td>Summative: theoretical essay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: "C" signifies commercial experience, working inside companies.

Table 7b: Research participants’ teaching, assessments and experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair 1</th>
<th>International entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Context used</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>10–15 years, C</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td>Formative R: case study-based exam testing knowledge in real time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>5–10 years, QG</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td>Summative: theoretical essay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair 2</th>
<th>Teaching for start-up</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katya</td>
<td>10–15 years, C</td>
<td>“For”</td>
<td>Formative R: feasibility report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>“for”</td>
<td>Formative C: retrospective group report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: commercial experience is categorised two ways. First in terms of time, and second in terms of working in companies (C) or with companies (QG). Additionally, teaching and career academic routes to each participant’s current role are noted.

The conclusion from this is that there is a correlation between having significant commercial experience and valuing assessments that develop professional knowledge. Given that this is supported by Katya’s and Rachel’s views, expressed in interview, about the importance of developing entrepreneurial cognition in their students (Neck and Greene, 2011, p. 60) it seems reasonable to believe that they structure their assessments this way because they understand the importance of identifying competitive advantage in a new business idea, consistent with the views of DeTienne and Chandler (2004) and Neck and Corbett (2018). Another factor relating to this awareness emerges from the above data: there is a (weaker) correlation between this and working in a teaching-focused environment, seen in Sara’s choice of a “formative R” assessment. It seems
to me that Sara’s choice of an additional summative assessment does not weaken the correlation, as the relevant issue is that in choosing a context-based assessment, she chose an approach that was more “formative R” than “formative C”. While Sara comments that she has not engaged with competitive advantage, her choice of a contextually interpretive assessment suggests that she understands context’s role in developing entrepreneurial ability (Zahra, Wright and Abdelgawad, 2014).

Correlation between experience and teaching approach also emerges from analysis of teaching “for” (see the last row of Table 7a) which compares Edward’s and Katya’s teaching of start-up modules at different universities. The comparison shows that Katya and Edward approach their modules differently, notwithstanding that Edward inherited his and that it therefore does not necessarily reflect his views, however, this pattern of teaching was chosen either by another teacher or at institutional level: Edward’s assessments fall into the “formative C” and summative categories, and Katya’s (as discussed above) into the “formative R” category. This observation is consistent with the limited “how to” teaching in Edward’s teaching: he communicates his unease about the inappropriateness of a summative assessment to document this type of learning: “I don’t like using exams at all, not appropriate for…complicated experiential learning”. While not supported by Edward, the deliberate choice of this type of assessment expresses a privileging of cognitive information and a view that experiential knowledge is subsidiary, which contrasts with the focus on professional knowledge within the assessments in Katya’s teaching, the only other explicitly “for” entrepreneurship module within participants’ teaching, evidencing the connection between significant commercial experience and concern with professional knowledge and commerciality.

Orientation away from interpretive assessments is also seen in the teaching of less extensively commercially experienced participants. Naomi, James and Shona adopt a theoretical approach to teaching, and correspondingly exhibit a predominant choice of “formative C” and summative forms of assessment. The role of Deweyan (1916) retrospective cognitive reflection is notable: it only occurs in the two (inherited) modules whose titles suggest that they are “for”
entrepreneurship, and which offer immersive experience within entrepreneurial context, but
where the teaching is primarily based on cognitive information, which results in students having to
independently build their professional knowledge (Eraut, 2005). This suggests that Deweyan
assessment signals that the development of professional knowledge is exterior to the teaching.

7.8: FINDINGS

Given the observations above, it seems difficult to dispute that there is a correlation
between significant commercial experience and a concern with developing professional
knowledge, that cognitive information is valued above other forms of knowledge in
entrepreneurship teaching and that there is a distancing from experiential knowledge. This
pattern of use of commercial context is reflected within assessments, notwithstanding that this is
primarily used as an object for the exposition of cognitive knowledge, perhaps enacting Katya’s
comment about enabling “entrepreneurship academics...to) argue that they have crossed the
(practice/theory) divide”. However, unless this discrimination between usages is understood, it
appears to function for the same purpose, conflating the exposure of students to entrepreneurial
context with developing their commercial judgement, and therefore seems to almost operate as a
“magic sign” in entrepreneurship teaching. Consistent with their concern with professional
knowledge, it seems that significantly commercially experienced participants use context in a
different way from participants who are less or non-commercially experienced. Institutional
influence seems critical to this, given that the academic enterpriser produces research that has
moved away from a practice-focused perspective (Fayolle, Verzat and Wapshott, 2016, p. 10),
contributing to the practice/theory divide that emerges within the data above.

The observations and findings from this chapter seem to illuminate themes in the
literature: a key objective in teaching “for” entrepreneurship is seen by Neck and Greene (2011, p.
60) as equipping students with "entrepreneurial cognition", characterised by Eraut (2005) as
professional knowledge, that enables them to recognise ideas that have competitive advantage
from those that do not, and that immersion into practice develops this. The research finds that a
more complicated situation pertains: while Neck and Greene privilege teaching that develops
entrepreneurial ability, my research finds that it is located outside the main body of theoretical teaching, and that there is no axiomatic relationship of using teaching instruments from practice with developing professional knowledge, which was excluded from the majority of the teaching.

The findings mirror Neck, Greene and Brush’s (2014) observation that teachers’ position in relation to practice or theory arises from their path to teaching, in the sense that significant commercial experience seems to correlate with developing students’ entrepreneurial ability, through significantly practice-based teaching. However, the research diverges from Neck, Greene and Brush’s (ibid.) view in that where there has been less temporally extensive or strategically engaged commercial experience, that the determinant of participants’ engagement with professional knowledge is engagement with socially oriented research, which correlates with an engagement with theoretical teaching and a distancing from commerciality.

This is evidenced by the following observations: the two significantly commercially experienced teachers engage with constructivist teaching approaches that develop professional knowledge, notwithstanding that one of these two modules is “about”. On the other hand, the only career research academic in the group is also the only participant who teaches and assesses using exclusively cognitive information methods. It can therefore be seen that the determinative effects of commercial experience and significant engagement with research are borne out by participants at the poles of the spectrum. The orientation of the other participants, whose path to teaching is more mixed, is interesting: Shona, James and Naomi have different levels of commercial experience, and where this is not so strong, the nature of their research seems to have more of a determinative influence. James is the only participant in this group carrying out purely commercial research, with Shona’s and Naomi’s research having a social dimension, and correspondingly, James is the only one of this group who expresses an engagement with the need to teach students “for” entrepreneurship, while Naomi and Shona focus their teaching on research-based cognitive approaches. These observations support the discussion above about teaching being shaped by the influence and direction of research, and also support Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton’s (2016, p. 8) observation that:
to teach “for” entrepreneurship, teachers need to participate in emotionally engaged teamwork with (students) that requires educators to act in an interpretive capacity. (And that this) ability to negotiate the entrepreneurial context is linked with professional experience.

The findings of this research observe a correlation between significant commercial experience and an openness to the development of entrepreneurial cognition and teaching for entrepreneurial capability through interpretive teaching.
CHAPTER 8:
PRACTICE INTO TEACHING

8.1: INTRODUCTION

Chapter 7 explored the divisions between cognitive and professional knowledge, observing a dominance of the former, and this chapter will explore the ways that practice and commerciality are expressed in the teaching. Similarly to the previous chapter, this will view entrepreneurial cognition, interpretive capability, the recognition of competitive advantage and professional cognition as linked components in the development of entrepreneurial capability. The role of context seems a critical correlate of this, given Zahra, Wright and Abdelgawad’s (2014, p. 481) reflection that it represents “the micro-foundations of entrepreneurial activities…(that) provide the raw material from which entrepreneurial actions spring”, and Bjørnskov and Foss’ research (2013) highlighting its role in explaining entrepreneurial actions and their outcomes. The understandings about professional knowledge explored in the previous chapter position context as critical, exemplified by its example of teaching clinical diagnostic skills (Eraut, 2005), where the nature of the context that was being explored determined the nature of the knowledge that emerged, analogous to “reading” commercial context (ibid.) to identify competitive advantage. Because of this imbrication of context with developing entrepreneurial capability, this chapter explores its function within entrepreneurship teaching and the ways that it is incorporated.

As discussed in Chapter 7, most of the participants in my research teach modules that are primarily about the phenomenon of entrepreneurship, however, five out of six modules in this category contain some “for” teaching, and the remaining two modules are explicitly to “do” entrepreneurship (classifications provided by the module teachers), and given this, and the reflections in the previous chapter the issue of bringing practice into teaching seems expressive of how teachers think. In relation to this, Katya observes that entrepreneurship teaching tends not to focus on the scalability of a new business, commenting that “we have to scale up from the outset…understanding customer perspective…that what you have on offer has to stack up, and be received”, and observes that it is important for students to understand why business ideas might
not work. In making these comments, Katya illustrates her understanding of the criticality of the interface of a new business idea with its competitive environment, reflecting observations of DeTienne and Chandler (2004) and Neck and Corbett (2018) about the importance of competitive advantage for new businesses. The following is a textual clarification: the discussion in this chapter makes reference synonymously to experiential and context-based teaching: these are both intended to communicate situations where the student is immersed in the "enactment of the kinds of activities and interactions that constitute the occupation" (ibid., p. 18).

8.2: DISCUSSION OF HOW TEACHING LINKS WITH ISSUES OF COMMERCIALITY

Corresponding with observations made previously, the issue of competitive advantage was predominantly not engaged with by the participant group, which reflects its focus on cognitive teaching “about” entrepreneurship. While there may be no disciplinary rationale for including this into teaching, as discussed in Chapter 7, its absence seems to link with a wider disengagement from commerciality. The two significantly commercially experienced teachers (Katya and Rachel) seem passionate about its importance, the two less extensively and non-commercially experienced teachers (James and Sara) confirm they do not consider it, and Ita (a career academic) excludes it from her teaching. To return to Katya and Rachel, Katya observes that while teachers in the USA are attuned to understanding competitive advantage and therefore teaching students to scale up from the start, teachers in the UK “never do this from the outset...scaling from the start is a real big problem because people can’t even imagine what it is supposed to look like”. Notwithstanding that Rachel observes that entrepreneurship is the only subject that attempts to teach students to recognise and operationalise competitive advantage in a business idea, Katya observes that “how to do” entrepreneurship tends to be taught as a process, corroborating the observations of Neck, Greene and Brush (2014), and consistent with the prevalence of “formative C” assessments discussed in Chapter 7. Rachel observes that the outcome she wants her teaching to achieve is:
recognising the opportunity!...there are good ideas all over the place, but...are they feasible, is there a demand for it, are they innovative enough...what is the competition doing?...Think about when Uber started, how innovative THAT idea was...tools learned from strategy, finance and many other places that they 100% they need to know and apply...to be able to start this new business and be successful, right?”

Katya’s and Rachel’s commentary demonstrates their strong focus on teaching their students entrepreneurial judgement in pursuit of successful enterprise start-up. However, there seemed to be widespread recoiling from the idea that the teaching might produce entrepreneurs, which seems imbricated in different ways with a rejection of neoliberal values. This was either expressed through commentary, (from Katya, James, Edward and Shona), and/or as support for enterprise rather than entrepreneurship skills, from Naomi and Shona. The reason why this seems a significant choice is that while teaching enterprise skills (skills for life) is consistent with liberal educational ideals, entrepreneurship education is associated with libertarian values (Jones and Iredale, 2010, p. 12), that are identified with neoliberalism. This resistance to producing entrepreneurs emerged through differing constructs, however. Katya and Shona opposed it on the grounds of the pitfalls of entrepreneurship, exemplified, for instance, by Shona’s rationale for rejecting developing entrepreneurs: “they’re living in poverty, because that’s the side that isn’t talked about”. James and Edward seem to conceptualise critical thinking skills in opposition to entrepreneurial skills, and resist it on this basis, articulated in James’ comment “I want them (students) to have developed mainly critical thinking skills...sounds much more academic, but I don’t particularly like modules or courses that look to create entrepreneurs”. It is interesting that where participants are not sensitised through socially oriented research to the political constructions of their teaching, for instance Rachel, who researches commercial and policy-related subjects, or Sara, whose university has absorbed instrumental teaching into its rationale (Delanty, 2003, p. 78), they seem not to feel tentative in asserting their support for teaching that achieves entrepreneurial capability. The prevalent rejection of teaching that develops entrepreneurs seems
to arise as a result of resistance to neoliberalism (even though the term was only explicitly referenced by Katya and Rachel), suggesting that if the participants feel that this is not legitimate, then by implication teaching entrepreneurial cognition is likely to be similarly compromised, unless a strong countervailing pressure is present.

The following discussion relates to Katya, Rachel, James, Sara and Edward, all of whose modules incorporate some element of teaching “for”. James and Sara are grouped because they both observe that they do not engage with issues of competitive advantage in their teaching, exemplified by James’ observation: “I’m not sure that we do, to be honest...I suppose in a way we kind of expect them to do it themselves?”.

On reflection, however, in answering a question about whether he feels that it is important to teach students competitive advantage, he replies: “yeah, yeah, definitely. Definitely. And I think now I’m talking to you, possibly I expect them to be able to do that too much?”.

Sara relates that she is not very familiar with the concept of competitive advantage, and that consequently she does not teach it to students, commenting “competitive advantage is a really interesting thing, and I probably don’t know it well enough to know”. Similarly to James, on reflection Sara comments that she intends to start to get her students to look at issues that may determine why a business will lose or make money. It is interesting that both James and Sara, when they reflect on the role of competitive advantage, seem to attribute value to it: however, this may be an example of the effect of the interests of the interviewer on the interview process (Ball, 1990, p. 159). The implication of James’ and Sara’s commentary is that they teach the “for” parts of their module, not as development of entrepreneurial cognition but as a process, a phenomenon observed by Neck, Greene and Brush (2014, p. 8). To link this back to Chapter 7, James’ exclusion of competitive advantage is consistent with the cognitive nature of his teaching and assessment, however, with Sara, the relationship is not so straightforward: her consistent embedding of theory into context seems to me to engage with the functionalities of competitive advantage, if not explicitly with the concept of it. However, given that both James’ and Sara’s modules are to an
extent “for” entrepreneurship, this lack of engagement with competitive advantage seems to signify a withdrawal from the commercial rationale for teaching “for”.

Shona and Edward are grouped because while their teaching similarly focuses on cognitive knowledge, they express recognition of competitive advantage, although this emerges via different iterations. Shona comments:

if you’re talking about competitive advantage, you’re sort of saying this is what it is, these are approaches where you can get it or you can try to pursue it, strategies for that. There is a mentoring element within that.

Edward approaches the issue of competitive advantage through the medium of critical thinking, asking questions like “Good idea? Done before? Is it because you are a genius and other people have not been?” His approach represents the application of analytical thinking, rather than the ability to "read" (Eraut, 2005) commercial contexts, whereas, although Shona’s teaching is theoretical and therefore likely to exclude competitive advantage, her approach to the idea is consistent with her commercial background working with small businesses. All of the above commentaries, in relation to Katya, Rachel, James, Sara, Ita and Edward, illustrate how their experience directly shapes their understanding of the nature and importance of competitive advantage in a new business idea: the participants who have significant commercial experience prioritise it, participants who have less extensive or no commercial experience do not engage with it, and Edward, a career teaching academic, accesses it via an analytically based cognitive approach.

These participants evidence the hierarchies of experience in forming the sensibilities of teachers, most particularly in the way they view commerciality: strong commercial experience seems to instil strong engagement with commerciality, and engagement with socially oriented research seems to correlate with a turning away from it. This pattern of correspondence is relatively predictable; however, more complex correlations occur within the rest of the participants, Edward, James and Sara. James has 0–5 years of emphatically commercial
experience, while Edward and Sara have experience of teaching routes to their current roles. In this group, research and institutional influence emerge as determinants of engagement with commerciality: James is carrying out commercially focused research, and this orientation is articulated by his explicit recognition that his module lacks “how to” teaching. Edward and Sara are trying to pursue research but are being constrained to different degrees by institutional blocks, so they privilege academic and cognitively based ways of thinking. However, this pattern is interrupted by Sara’s institution’s focus on teaching, which correlates with her consistent embedding of theory within commercial context.

The observations above suggest that markedly commercial or research-based routes through to current roles are the strongest determinants of orientation in relation to commerciality. Where there is a less marked commercial or research background, it seems that the degree and nature of research seems to be the predominant correlate of this orientation. This distribution is observed across the participant group, in which the degree of engagement with commerciality relates to the degree of commercial experience, and away from it with the degree and nature of research, the exception to the pattern being the institutional effects in Sara’s case. The orientation away from commerciality within the participant group, exemplified by the teaching and/or commentary of James, Ita, Edward, Naomi and Shona evidences Neck and Greene’s observation (2011, p. 1), that a fundamental challenge for entrepreneurship education is in creating the ability in students to recognise the presence of competitive advantage, and corroborates Neck, Greene and Brush’s (2014) observation that there is a direct correlation between the pathway to teaching and teachers’ orientation in relation to practice and theory.

8.3: PARTICIPANTS’ VIEWS OF TEACHING ENTREPRENEURIAL CONTEXT

The following discussion briefly explores participants’ views in relation to incorporating entrepreneurial context into teaching, based on Zahra, Wright and Abdelgawad’s (2014, p. 481) reflection that it is “the micro-foundations of entrepreneurial activities…(that) provide the raw material from which entrepreneurial actions spring”. Acknowledgment of its value was articulated widely by the participant group, although varying in degree and nature. Consistent with the
observations in Section 8.2, the degree of warmth and imaginativeness of the support expressed correlated most strongly with the extent of commercial experience in teachers, with a second pattern of correlation related to the degree to which the module is oriented towards entrepreneurial action (warmer) or is “about” (less warm). As in the discussion in Section 8.2, the exception to these patterns of correlation is Sara, the teacher at the only post-1992 university in the participant group, who commented in relation to a module “about” small business functions that experiential learning is “where my heart lies”, which was evidenced through her extensive use of experiential teaching forms, as discussed Chapter 7.

Katya and Rachel both express their support in strong terms, irrespective of whether their modules were “about” or oriented towards entrepreneurial action. Katya comments “I need to tell them what it means in practice”, while Rachel reflects that “it’s impossible to teach just theory without context and real-life scenarios...who’s going to memorise the theories, and to what end?” James has invested his time into incorporating extra teaching sessions on the process of consulting, and developing a business plan, commenting on the absurdity of “expecting them to do a business plan when we hadn’t really taught them how to”. This demonstrates his recognition of the value of entrepreneurial context in the teaching, and his expense of time to achieve this. To summarise, Rachel, Katya, Sara and James explicitly support the use of entrepreneurial context in teaching how to “do” entrepreneurship. Naomi approaches the idea of context from a different point of view, using her background in theatre as context to develop the life skills of confidence and presentational ability in her students, commenting “if you don’t give them confidence...they are NOT going to learn”. It is interesting that Naomi, who researches feminist perspectives on entrepreneurship, teaches using non-commercial contexts to develop life skills, whereas those whose research is more straightforwardly commercial (Rachel and James) teach using commercial entrepreneurship contexts. The insight from the above discussion reiterates the correlations seen above with commerciality: that a significantly commercial path to their current role orients the participant towards the use of entrepreneurial context in teaching, and a less marked commercial path correlates with a determinative role in respect of commerciality for the nature and degree of
the participant’s research. Section 8.4 will examine the ways in which entrepreneurial context is incorporated into teaching, and how this links with participants’ attitudes discussed in this section.

8.4: METHODS USED TO BRING ENTREPRENEURIAL CONTEXT INTO TEACHING

Some form of engagement with entrepreneurial context, defined as the “enactment of the kinds of activities and interactions that constitute the occupation” by Billett (2010, p. 22) was provided in all but one of the participants’ modules, and the following discussion triangulates the nature of these with teachers’ experience. Consistent with the findings in Chapter 7 about types of knowledge, the two teachers with extensive commercial experience used contexts that required them to be able to “read” the competitive environment (Eraut, 2005) in order to interpret entrepreneurial context alongside their students. As discussed in Sections 8.2 and 8.3, where students worked within “live” entrepreneurial environments of, respectively, a simulation package and, in a separate module, a social enterprise, this experiential learning was separated from the teaching by a focus on cognitive knowledge and limited “how to” teaching. Correspondingly, reflecting the findings of Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton (2016) in relation to interpretive teaching, it seemed to me during discussions and observations that case studies, either “live” businesses or written up, tended to mobilise two types of skills – observational or interpretive (although not necessarily exclusively) – which correspond, respectively, with the exercise of cognitive or “how to” knowledge, discussed in the previous section. An example of contextual exposure that demanded situational reading skills (Kolb and Kolb, 2005) was the Kickstarter campaign, where students were operating as entrepreneurs in “real time”, having to make entrepreneurial decisions quickly, on limited information. In the same way, Rachel’s use of very dynamic, unpredictable businesses like Uber, obliges students to make predictions using unstable and incomplete information. Tables 8a and 8b represent the entrepreneurial context offered by each participant, showing that James’, Katya’s and Edward’s modules require students to work within entrepreneurial contexts, and that others functioned as the subject for student’s work.
Table 8a: Participants, teaching and primary mode of context used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Participant teaching mode (self-defined)</th>
<th>Primary mode of context used</th>
<th>Assessment type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>0–5 years, C</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td>In “live” social enterprise</td>
<td>Retrospective reflection, formative C: group report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>0–5 years, C</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td>About “live” social enterprise</td>
<td>Formative C: business plan and group presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td>About “live” local coffee shop</td>
<td>Formative R: case study and summative poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its</td>
<td>Career research academic</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summative: exam and theoretical essay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: “C” signifies commercial experience, working inside companies.

Table 8b: Participants, teaching and primary mode of context used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair 1</th>
<th>International entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Context used</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>10–15 years, C</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td>Multiple case studies, videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>5–10 years, QG</td>
<td>“About”</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair 2</th>
<th>Teaching for start-up</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katya</td>
<td>10–15 years, C</td>
<td>“For”</td>
<td>In “live” Kickstarter new venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>“for”</td>
<td>In simulation package</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: “C” signifies commercial experience, working inside companies, and “QG” working with companies.

The only teacher from a post-1992 university cleverly turned the situational reading process on its head, by taking completed entrepreneurial processes and asking the students to engineer backwards through their evolution, for instance, a yoghurt pot designed to avoid the vacuum “splat”, and the evolution of Starbucks from its beginnings. By having to reverse engineer the process, students shadow the decision-making role in the entrepreneurial process, obliging them to make links between elements in the entrepreneurial environment in order to explain what
happened. By getting students to trace the steps, and therefore the thinking, of entrepreneurs, this builds cognition that while more observational than interpretive, offers insight into the entrepreneurial decision-making process. This is another example of correlation between teaching choices made and the nature of the route to participants’ current role.

Other participants used a mix of case studies and visits from entrepreneurs to expose their students to entrepreneurial context. As discussed above in Section 8.4 Shona’s students develop an internationalisation plan for a genuine business based in Asia, with a visit from the Asian entrepreneur to provide input, and Naomi’s students choose entrepreneurs to exemplify their cognitive knowledge about social entrepreneurship. An observation in the previous analysis was that where modules based on cognitive teaching also have significant experiential content, that this is estranged from the main teaching because of its focus on “how to” knowledge. This is exemplified by James’ students working with a local social enterprise, reporting to and getting feedback from the client: James observes that “we give quite a lot of ownership to the students to manage the process”, suggesting that because of the rustication of “how to” from the main body of teaching, that the students have to relatively independently navigate their own context. All of the entrepreneurial contexts captured in Table 8a and Table 8b expose students to “live” entrepreneurial issues, either at a distance and therefore more observationally, in the case of Shona’s, Naomi’s, Rachel’s and Sara’s teaching, or within an organisation or system and therefore experientially, in the case of Katya’s, Edward’s and James’.

An institutional perspective on this discussion is provided by the Russell Group university where Shona and Edward teach, which seems to be experimenting with a technological approach to providing students with entrepreneurship context: this is in the form of simulation packages and additionally Microsoft teams, (which allows students to work with each other on mind mapping and other issues that entrepreneurs have to negotiate), although it continues to provide “live” entrepreneurship input to students, from entrepreneurs attached to the university’s Entrepreneurship Centre. This seems to suggest an institutional “othering” of “how to” knowledge away from the main cognitive teaching within the module, although this may arise purely from a
rational recognition of the differences in knowledge required for either type of work. However, the widely observed institutional privileging of cognitive knowledge is communicated by Edward’s comment in relation to its use, that “we can’t spare the academics”. It may be helpful to briefly summarise the approaches to providing entrepreneurial context by category of participant. The commercially experienced participants, Katya and Rachel, expose their students to entrepreneurial contexts where, in the absence of full information, the teachers have to work alongside students (Bovill, 2019) to interpret commercial contexts and therefore develop their commercial judgement, and clearly believe that this commitment-heavy method of teaching is justified in terms of its value to students. The other less extensively or non-commercially experienced teachers use a variety of case studies, videos and visits from entrepreneurs which develop, in varying balances, observational, and to a lesser extent interpretive, skills depending on the extent to which the context is being used for exercise of cognitive or “how to” knowledge.

While exposure to entrepreneurial context is considered good protocol for entrepreneurship teaching (Neck and Green, 2011), the forms represented in Tables 8a and 8b need interpretation in terms of the type of cognition that they develop: it is not necessarily the case that experience inside an entrepreneurial context correlates with application of “knowing how”, nor that use of a case study necessarily correlates with a predominant focus on either observational or interpretive skills. Their function is directly informed by the background and experience of module leaders and a recognition of “how to” teaching as valuable, with its corresponding incorporation into teaching. Following on from this insight, the key explanatory issues for insight into the data in Tables 8a and 8b are the extent to which the student has to negotiate and interpret entrepreneurial contexts swiftly and with incomplete information, the extent to which he or she has been given the skills to do this, and the extent to which this is provided by the module teaching.

8.5: CONTRIBUTION OF THE ENTREPRENEUR

The fact that nearly all participants attribute value to teaching entrepreneurial context is striking, however, the structural divide imposed by its use for either cognitive or “knowing how”
knowledge also applies to the roles played by visiting entrepreneurs. Katya observes that: “a lot of entrepreneurship academics will bring individual practitioners into the classroom, and by merely doing that, they will argue they have crossed the divide”, which suggests an element of performativity about their use that recalls the “magic sign” discussion in Chapter 7. It seems that entrepreneurs are used by participants for three main functions: teaching specific skills like financial management and marketing; as role models; and to provide entrepreneurial context. The five participants who expressed views supported the participation of entrepreneurs in the teaching, but with significant variations in their assessments of their contribution, correlating with their degree of commercial experience, evidenced in the following discussion. Neither Katya nor Rachel bring entrepreneurs in, relying instead on their own commercial experience to interpret the entrepreneurial environment (Eraut, 2005) for students, and to provide them with insight into how marketing and financial management play out in start-up businesses, but nevertheless they observe entrepreneurs’ value in bringing real-life context into teaching. Shona and James recognise that entrepreneurs can offer a substantive contribution to student learning, as well as being role models, and Edward and Ita see their contribution in non-substantive ways.

The following writing looks at the roles that teachers assign to entrepreneurs, where Shona’s commentary is representative: she brings in a venture capitalist to teach “how the numbers work” and an entrepreneur to teach new venture marketing and positioning, describing the nature of their contribution as “like a live case study” with:

- a different voice, and it’s that real work example as well...people who they can identify with...somebody rocking up in a pair of Converse and ripped jeans talking about their businesses.

Similarly, James brings in entrepreneurs “to talk about a specific aspect of entrepreneurship, to tell them about their journey”. In relation to bringing in experts in areas of entrepreneurial practice, all participants who spoke about the subject (except Katya, Rachel and James), observe that they are not able to teach the financial aspects of new business and have to
bring in this expertise, James observing “I think finance...that’s one that most people shy away from”. Correspondingly, most participants bring in practitioners to discuss finance in new ventures, as well as many to talk about marketing. The attraction of bringing in particular areas of expertise is explained by the fact that, in relation to finance, even teachers with significant commercial experience may not be financially skilled, as most commercial roles do not demand this. Marketing for start-up businesses is heavily constrained by limits of time and money, and correspondingly is oriented towards social media, where only current practice is likely to be relevant because of its speed of change. For the reasons discussed above, it can be seen that bringing practitioners in to discuss finance and marketing is independent of each participant’s path to their current role.

Ita and Edward view entrepreneurs' roles differently, Ita observing that an entrepreneur’s description of their journey is not useful:

because it’s his or her journey, and each entrepreneur's journey is different.

And somehow, they (students) think rather than learn theory, if they hear from this entrepreneur, they...get more out of it.

Ita’s perspective is consistent with the strong cognitive focus of her teaching. Edward comments that that “they’re very effusive and enthusiastic”, and in reference to an entrepreneur on the team “he’s got a lot more practical experience and, but...I’m not sure, I think maybe that’s played up a bit sometimes”. I observed a teaching session based on the simulation package and was struck by the interpretive nature of this entrepreneur’s discussion with students, compared with the critical thinking focus of Edward’s teaching. The correlation between Edward’s and Ita’s commentary and its correspondence with their career academic paths seems also to enact the insight of the above in the above three paragraphs, that a strong engagement with cognitive knowledge teaching correlates with a comparative lack of engagement with the value of “knowing how”.
The above discussion suggests that use of a visiting entrepreneur for specific skills like finance or marketing is not related to experience, and that a belief that an entrepreneur can contribute substantively correlates negatively with an academic pathway and positively with a commercial one. The use of an entrepreneur as a role model is less straightforward: it appears that because of their own commercial background, Katya and Rachel perform this function themselves, however, this role seems generally accepted by the rest of the participant group. The insight from the above discussion is that, consistently with the discussion so far, the understanding that an entrepreneur’s negotiation of entrepreneurial context can help students to develop the ability to “read” commercial situations seems to correlate with commercial experience.

8.6: VIEWS OF THE NATURE AND CONTRIBUTION OF COMMERCIAL EXPERIENCE

Having observed that a significant correlate of much of the activity discussed so far in this chapter is the degree of commercial experience, it seems relevant to explore participants’ views on this. There is a paradox expressed in the writing below: while nearly all participants articulate the view that commercial experience is important to teaching entrepreneurship, most modules exclude teaching (although not necessarily learning) action-based knowledge. James and Ita express their consciousness of commercial experience in terms of their lack of it, rather than in terms of affirmation. Katya and Rachel identify it as crucial to teaching entrepreneurship, Katya commenting “if you don't have experience, it’s very difficult to make it real”, and Rachel observes:

how hard is it to teach entrepreneurship, especially if you’re doing this new venture challenge, or anything with regards to starting a new business, and teaching these classes, without having tried to start up a new business yourself?...I think having it is extremely valuable!

She cites an example of an entrepreneurship teacher she has known:

the guy had started two businesses before in his life, he started up and failed, then he started up a second one, and it ends up being more successful and he
ends up selling it, he ends up teaching at the university of X. How relevant is that! I think it’s essential!

Katya and Rachel both explicitly link their commercial experience to their ability to develop students’ commercial judgement and ability to “read” commercial situations. Katya comments that because of her commercial background, she is able to understand and share the relevance and implications of new types of current practice with students starting and running their businesses, reflecting “it’s easy to explain because I understand it”. Another example is Rachel being able to use real-life examples when she teaches, being able to understand the implications of what is happening in the work environment:

It definitely gives them (students) more in-depth discussions on certain topics...hopefully they remember some of my examples, because it’s examples that stay in their head later on in life when they find themselves in a similar business situation. “Oh, I remember the example that X gave me in this class!”...because who cares about tools? I think it’s always about real life, if you can relate it to examples, examples are the ones that will really stay with you.

Rachel makes an argument about the drawbacks of career academic faculty trying to teach “how to do” entrepreneurship, commenting:

If someone is teaching business statistics, and they don’t have any experience, you know, they’ve never worked a day in their life, how important is it really that they have any company experience and they applied some of these tools in real life? Not much. But if someone is teaching me new venture challenge, how to start up my own company...I would definitely believe that that’s essential.

Katya exemplifies a sensibility that arises from her commercial experience, observing:

When we teach about competition, we rarely talk about the hyper competitive environment, and highly mediated and political kind of...the dark side...if that
makes any sense? I mean the evils, you know, for Facebook...because you can actually convince people to buy something very easily, even if you don't need it. And that has a negative effect...so, so the practicalities like this are not being taught.

Naomi offers a different insight into the role of commercial experience, that of understanding and communicating the emotional cost of starting a new business to students. She observes "I think that if you teach entrepreneurship, personally (quietly) you should have had your own experiences in running business...because of the emotional side of what it is to be an entrepreneur". In their comments above, Katya, Rachel and Naomi focus on different functionalities of commercial experience: the ability to "read" the commercial environment (Eraut, 2005), the awareness of the real-life implications of aspects of commercial activity and the emotional impact of entrepreneurial activity. The element that connects them is the deterministic role that experience plays.

While unsurprisingly, there is a strong correlation between having commercial experience and enacting its values in the teaching, other participants attribute value to commercial experience in teaching entrepreneurship while also excluding commercially based "how to" teaching from their modules. However, this may arise for reasons unrelated to teaching – it may be that some participants are reluctant to deny the value of a commercial background because of the influence of the researcher on the interview process (Ball, 1990, p. 159). Alternatively, it may arise because of the sense expressed by some participants, discussed elsewhere, that they do not regard teaching “how to do” entrepreneurship as an appropriate subject for higher education.

Alternatively, again, it may arise because of a lack of engagement with the implications of the differences between "knowing that" and "knowing how". Here, Ita’s commentary may provide some insight. She observes that:

One of the challenges is that students say, “how do I translate this?” The thing is, we say, “We don't have experience”. But one thing I don't think I can
understand is how they can't translate what they are learning...that these are transferable skills. Transferable knowledge.

This exchange seems to suggest that the teacher and student are speaking in different languages: Ita’s frame of reference is cognitive knowledge, whereas the student’s request seems to be framed in terms of “how to” understanding. It seems reasonable that the separateness between teaching “about” and “how to”, observed through the whole of the analysis in this thesis, also operates here, offering an explanation for the paradox observed above. These insights should be framed, however, by institutional effects on teaching, discussed in Section 8.7.

8.7: CURRICULAR AND CULTURAL LIMITATIONS ON THE ABILITY TO TEACH STUDENTS ENTREPRENEURIAL CONTEXT

Respondents who discussed these issues cited blocks to context-based teaching that arise from the curriculum, including the fact that entrepreneurship theory rather than practice is increasingly researched and taught. James reflects timetable limitations on giving his students enough engagement in entrepreneurial practice:

to really understand consulting projects and to give the students the level of help that I think would have benefited them, I don't think an hour every other week was enough time.

Edward answers a question about the preponderance of knowledge-transmission teaching in his module, commenting:

To a degree we have our hands tied as a kind of part of the degree programme, that we’re tied in with other types of subjects, and things like accountancy and analytics and stuff like that. So, I guess that limits a little bit what we can do.

Most of the respondents cite the drive to do research, particularly in relation to its determination for promotion (Morley, 2003), as a pressure that limits the amount of experiential,
context-based entrepreneurship teaching, in favour of theoretical, knowledge-transmission teaching. However, James observes that this focus is counter to a student preference for contextually based “how to” teaching. He reflects that his university is:

developing the research side...originally it might have been fully teaching,
now there is a push on research, and I think that people like me have been brought in because of publications, or potential to get publications.

Sara talks about universities having to hire and structure in order to succeed in the REF, and comments that “I don’t do that kind of rigorous research I would like to, because I don’t have the time...you can’t buy out your time...it’s a catch-22 situation”. She observes that she gets loaded with teaching, because:

I haven’t got those 3- and 4-star journals to go down the reader route. So,
some people can kind of do that, I think it’s very difficult for people to be both an excellent teacher and a 3- or 4-star researcher.

Sara’s situation exemplifies the tension between research and teaching, because while she depends on research for promotion, experiential teaching seems to be her instinctive alignment, so she therefore constantly feels the pressure to prioritise her research over what she is passionate about, evidencing Collini’s (2010) observations on the privileging of research over teaching.

Separately from the pressure to carry out research, there seems to be an institutional lack of recognition that entrepreneurship “how to” teaching requires a commitment of time and focus within the curriculum, which was an issue cited by many of the participants. Rachel comments:

The management structure...in our department, they weren’t from the entrepreneurship field. It made a difference because they didn’t realise the best way to teach entrepreneurship, for example the...new venture challenge where you build your own idea with a teammate and you work on a business plan, I think that’s a MUST. Many will understand that this is a must if they
have experience of teaching entrepreneurship. It's one of the most valuable courses in the entrepreneurship programme.

Katya observes that "I'm not sure that a lot of people who are higher than me understand what I'm doing", and that the hierarchy does not perceive the value or implications of the way that she teaches "how to" do entrepreneurship. Ita comments:

Nowadays many universities have incubator or business centres. But how much are we using it?...we are so lucky to have it on campus. But what are we doing about it? Not much! Not much!

Naomi regrets the fact that she only gets 2 hours a term with students to try to familiarise them with the issues arising out of negotiating entrepreneurial context, and Edward attributes his module's ratio of 3 hours of mentored group work to 19 hours of lectures (in a "how to" module) to being "a basic model for how things are" within university scheduling. James alludes to underlying dynamics in his comment:

There's tension between a drive to rationalise education, a drive towards using the lecture/seminar format to get more students in the room...don't think it works as well as having the flat room space with lower numbers...I think that's probably the main tension.

This seems to evidence the competitive pressures for universities to handle large amounts of students through "efficient" teaching (Naidoo and Williams, 2015). Each participant who spoke about this issue communicated negative feelings about the lack of institutional understanding of entrepreneurship's need for experiential and collaborative teaching, and also about the comparatively large amount of knowledge-transmission teaching that is scheduled. Howell and Annansingh (2013) observe that these scheduling patterns arise as a result of institutional culture and its linked role in shaping operating structures, and therefore are enacted at the institutional level. Rachel, Naomi and Sara all observe that entrepreneurship is an "outsider" discipline, in the sense that it is located outside the cultural norms of the business school (Hannon, 2006, p. 298;
Löbler, 2006). This position of being a cultural and disciplinary outsider imposes an implicit pressure to conform to conceptual and teaching norms, picked up in Shona’s comment:

I was teaching one of the modules to first years, creativity...or something, and one of the Profs said to me, “in the name of God, I never heard such nonsense! How can you teach someone to be creative, what’s that all about?”...there was like the old timers close to retirement, and they were going, “I just don’t understand why this was put in! I mean surely to God, it would be better with Management Accounting!

From the above commentary there seem to be powerful institutional pressures that militate against the provision of time and effort to incorporate entrepreneurship context into teaching, evidenced by the fact that only one institution of the five within the research group allocates significant seminar hours, while the others operate systems that can process large class sizes: workshops that combine lecture and seminar teaching, or in the case of one university, a simulation package that handles large numbers of students electronically by engaging them with a digital version of business start-up.

This concern with processing large numbers of students arises from universities’ response to competitive pressures, trying to constantly increase student recruitment, in the face of constrained availability of teaching space and staff numbers (Naidoo and Williams, 2015). This results in pressure to teach students in volume, which in turn suggests that the predominant mode of teaching will be lectures rather than less “efficient” seminar teaching. This is evidenced by the participants, who report that they do not have enough time to teach students in a way that immerses them in entrepreneurial context, because of the interaction heavy seminar settings required to do this. The two commercially experienced teachers actively address this by repurposing their teaching time: Katya makes her lectures interactive and dedicates time during the lectures for student business presentations with student colleague feedback. Rachel has made the decision to restructure her lectures and seminars into 3-hour workshops, which seem
exhausting for teachers and students, but which allow her the flexibility to maximise the experiential, participative aspects of her teaching. Shona, the teacher with slightly more arm’s length commercial experience, relates that she had to fight for extra seminar time to teach her international entrepreneurship module (now 4 hours of seminars to 16 hours of lectures), although as discussed in Chapter 7 this is for cognitively based learning. The other participants’ teaching is based on cognitive knowledge which fits well with the focus on lectures. However, the use of a simulation package in the case of Edward’s Russell Group university seems to show institutional recognition of the need to reconcile processing large numbers of students with exposing them to entrepreneurial context, as discussed above.

8.8: FINDINGS

To summarise themes in this chapter, teaching entrepreneurship through exposure to context seems to be inconsistently engaged with, particularly in the case of less extensively or non-commercially experienced teachers. Having negotiated commercial careers, and as a result understanding the salience of context, seems to give Rachel and Katya the drive to try to get round these institutional constraints in order to embed interpretive entrepreneurship context in their teaching. However, for others in the participant group, the institutional pressures not to teach that way seem persuasive, exemplified by, for instance, the imperative to conduct research (Morley, 2003) which applies pressure to minimise the time-heavy teaching that is involved with coaching and guiding students, and consequently orients the nature of entrepreneurship teaching towards a theoretical “about” approach. Additionally, the processes involved with teaching entrepreneurship context and skills are anomalous to the norms of the business school (Löbler, 2006). To summarise, there are strong institutional pressures that induce teachers away from contact-heavy forms of teaching, and towards processing large numbers of students as efficiently as possible, notwithstanding that some teachers in the participant group have achieved a redistribution of teaching time, supporting Neck and Greene’s (2011, p. 60) view that “the entrepreneurship method goes beyond understanding, knowing and talking, and demands using, applying and acting”. Participants’ commentary indicates that they acknowledge the value of this
activity, but only Katya and Rachel seem to conceptualise their teaching in terms of providing experience of entrepreneurial context to develop students' commercial judgement in order to “read” commercial situations (Eraut, 2005). Participants’ understanding of the contribution that commercial experience makes in achieving this replicates previous patterns of correlation with experience: Katya and Rachel coach their students to identify why one strong idea may be better than another competently strong idea, whereas, as discussed in Chapter 7, Edward, James, Ita, Naomi and Sara, to different degrees and in different ways, do not focus on the importance of competitive advantage, and correspondingly it seems that their teaching is not oriented towards developing students' ability to “read” the commercial environment, except for the illustrative contributions of visiting entrepreneurs.

It seems important to understand the nature of context and the interdependence of contextual factors: “what causes what, and under what conditions?” (Zahra, Wright and Abdelgawad, 2014, p. 483) and additionally that “apparently salient contextual stimuli sometimes have trivial effects, and apparently trivial contextual stimuli sometimes have marked effects” (Johns, 2006, p. 387). An insight from these observations is that the way contextual variables interact can only be interpreted through experiential learning: it cannot be forecast from static information (recalling again Eraut’s, 2005, distinction between teaching clinical and biomedical science ability). Given the findings of my research, a relevant question is to what extent commercial experience is necessary to develop an understanding of this in students, an issue raised by Fayolle (2018, p. 695). The following discussion of teacher classroom practice may provide some insight to this discussion: Bovilll (2019, p. 9) recognises that one of the roles that arises from a co-construction approach is that of consultant, which accurately captures the nature of student and teacher working together when undertaking the challenge of building a new company from an idea. This seems to be the reason why the way that teachers are in the classroom matters in the teaching of entrepreneurship. To teach new venture development and to play their role in building new businesses alongside students, teachers therefore need the following characteristics: the confidence to engage in co-creation teaching, the experience in
order to participate in this type of consultancy work and the ability to lead student teams so that students work and learn as deeply as they can, therefore taking on the role of consulting team leader.

A challenge that arises from this role is that this type of work is not structured or predetermined: progress on building a business is iterative and takes shape in response to the emergence of the contextual variables discussed in the paragraph above. To perform a consulting role, the teacher must differentiate good ideas from the mediocre, or actively damaging, and guide the student team to being able to recognise opportunities, take risks and make decisions (Hartshorn and Hannon, 2005, p. 619), skills central to entrepreneurial capability. However, each of these is bound tightly to a recognition of the context in which it presents itself, as discussed above, which are by definition made up of combinations of constantly changing elements, in changing weightings, and it is the accurate reading of those changing weightings (Eraut, 2005) that enables the ability to recognise opportunities, take risks and make decisions. If the teacher is to act as consultant (Bovill, 2019) interpreting entrepreneurial context alongside the student (Neck and Corbett, 2018, p. 20), it seems important to have the skill of reading commercial context, gained from professional experience. This insight seems to limit Bovill’s (2019, p. 9) suggestion that entrepreneurship teachers should “adapt their...teaching practice”, in that lack of commercial experience withdraws the interpretive capability that is implied by the “more open, relational, collaborative and dialogic” teaching behaviour that Bovill proposes.
CHAPTER 9:
HOW THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS ARE ANSWERED, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

9.1: HOW THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS ARE ANSWERED

9.1.1: Research questions

- In relation to eight higher education teachers of entrepreneurship in England, what are their knowledge and beliefs relating to the subject and to the teaching, and how are these enacted in their teaching?
- What are the case study teachers’ beliefs about the nature and purpose of entrepreneurship teaching and learning?
- What forms of knowledge do the case study entrepreneurship teachers draw on in their classroom practices?

9.2: COMMENTARY IN RELATION TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS

My research observes that a significant differentiator between research participants is their position in relation to practice and commerciality, which is shaped by discourses about philosophies of education, types of knowledge and the functionalities of neoliberalism. Arising from this, the argument within the thesis has been structured around the oppositions between theory and practice. My analysis indicates that within entrepreneurship teaching, professional knowledge (“knowing how”) and “knowing that” tend to be separate categories, developed by distinct processes, with limited crossover. This arises in part from the disciplinary heterodoxy of entrepreneurship teaching, given that strategy theory informs practice (Brush, Greene and Hart, 2001), while entrepreneurship theory is based on the study of the phenomenon of entrepreneurship (Meyer et al., 2014), a division that is reinforced by disciplinary boundaries (Hark, 2007) which maintain the separation of strategy and entrepreneurship scholars. My research finds that teaching of cognitive knowledge is dominant, and likely to remain, given the considerable obstacles observed to teaching “for” entrepreneurship discussed later in this chapter, and also finds that professional knowledge (Eraut, 2005) seems exterior to the rationale of the majority of
modules, resulting in teaching instruments that, while drawn from practice, develop cognitive knowledge rather than entrepreneurial capability. The segregation of practice seems to correspond with a somewhat “ivory tower” nature of research, that is seemingly insulated from a wider context of significant policy support for entrepreneurship teaching to stimulate economic activity (QAA, 2018), and from a linked expectation of students that they will be taught entrepreneurship capability.

Implicated in this segregation, some participant commentary positions entrepreneurs, and therefore by implication entrepreneurship, as disreputable and transgressive, a reflection supported by an observation of my research that, unlike engineering or medicine, whose practice has been incorporated into the academy, entrepreneurship is not a profession and therefore teaching “for” it benefits neither from a professional status nor an agreed way to teach (Fayolle and Gailly, 2008, p. 570). The question that seems relevant is: does this matter? It would seem to be helpful in answering the question to understand how deep-seated the exclusion of practice is, and the following discussion explores this.

9.2.1: Participant groupings, knowledge and teaching

While participant groups are differentiated by the type of knowledge they privilege and the teaching methods they use (as alluded to in Section 9.2), orientations in relation to professional knowledge and commerciality seem to differentiate them most profoundly through articulating the nature of the values they hold. In relation to this, participants seem to belong to the following groupings: those with significant commercial experience, either temporally or in terms of having strategic discretion, those with less extensive commercial experience who have distanced themselves from this through development of a socially oriented research-based identity and a group of participants with a teaching or research background. Figure 6 shows the distribution of teaching to develop entrepreneurial judgement, or focusing on cognitive, theoretical knowledge, across categories of modules from “how to” ones like New Venture Creation, and also ones that study entrepreneurship as a phenomenon.
The significantly commercially experienced participants’ (represented by red ovals in Figure 6), narrative and teaching is premised on the value of commerciality and the validity of building commercial judgement in students, while an engagement with cognitive information, feminist, family and wider social perspectives in research, and a repudiation of neoliberal beliefs and commerciality characterises the teaching and commentary of the second, less significantly commercially experienced group (represented by purple ovals), whereas a privileging of cognitive knowledge and distancing from “skills” is evidenced within the group from a teaching or research background (represented by blue ovals).

**Figure 6:** The pattern of cognitive and interpretive knowledge in entrepreneurship teaching.

![Figure 6: The pattern of cognitive and interpretive knowledge in entrepreneurship teaching.](image)

Figure 6 illustrates my research finding that teaching cognitive knowledge “about” entrepreneurship is predominant, notwithstanding that two of the modules (those entitled “Consulting” and “New Venture Creation”) out of the eight are explicitly “for” entrepreneurship,
and the majority of those remaining also contain some proportion of teaching “for” (participants’ own categorisations). The figure illustrates the close relationship of teachers’ route to current role with an orientation towards interpretive or theoretical teaching. Evidencing this, in the context of a “how to” consulting module, where students work as consultants with companies, a less commercially experienced participant focuses mostly on cognitive knowledge, which demonstrates an additional issue, the orientation towards this type of knowledge in participants who have adopted a research-based identity from a position of commercial experience, discussed further in relation to Figure 8. The relationship between experience and cognitive orientation is also illustrated by the observation that in the context of a new venture development module, the teaching/research-based participant focuses on cognitive theoretical knowledge (strategy theory), while the significantly commercially experienced participant teaches the same category of module interpretively, focusing on competitive advantage. The same pattern of contrasting interpretive and cognitive approaches to teaching is evidenced in “International Entrepreneurship”, again showing the relationship between teaching approaches and route to current role. The overall pattern observed is that modules that are oriented to “how to” knowledge (“New Venture Creation” and “Consulting”) tend not to be taught this way, and that instead they tend to be taught via cognitive, theoretical knowledge, where these modules are taught by teachers without a strong commercial background.

Consistent with the cognitive divisions within entrepreneurship teaching discussed, in participants without commercial experience, there seems to be a lack of recognition of differences between professional and cognitive knowledge. The reason for this seems illuminated by Eraut’s (2005) thinking about the separation between the different cognitive approaches needed to be biomedical scientists, or diagnostic clinicians: he observes that clinical practice teaching trains students to interpret patterns of symptoms, while biomedical science teaches principles defining chains of causal mechanisms, which appear to mirror, respectively, teaching professional capability that develops students’ ability to instantaneously recognise and interpret changing balances of entrepreneurial situational elements, or teaching as a process, linking causal
mechanisms with outcomes. In other words, that the degree of commercial experience in entrepreneurship teachers defines their cognitive skill set and orientation, and consequently the types of cognition they understand and are able to manipulate.

The following discussion focuses on the implications of these differing cognitive approaches within the teaching of entrepreneurial context.

**Figure 7**: Observational and interpretive approaches to teaching entrepreneurship context.

Figure 7 illustrates that commercially experienced participants (represented by red ovals) seem to use entrepreneurial context within their teaching interpretively, while participants from a teaching background (represented by blue ovals) use them observationally, for the exposition of cognitive knowledge. The figure therefore illustrates two issues: the first is that engagement with context should not be assumed to represent interpretive teaching. The second issue is more significant and relates to the foundational role of competitive advantage (Porter, 2008). Teaching students to be able to discriminate between a good commercial idea (that has competitive advantage), and a better one (that has more competitive advantage) demands an ability to
recognise patterns within constantly changing weights of commercial elements: if the teacher explains entrepreneurial contexts through patterns of causation (this situation arises as a result of x, y and z), then what is not being developed is students’ ability to “read” weightings of commercial elements in an entrepreneurial situation. Instead, students are taught to observe their presence or absence, which seems a critical limitation to an observational approach, as what seems to be lost as a result is the ability to infer degrees of competitive advantage within commercial situations, and therefore to be able to discriminate between, for instance, a mediocre and a good new business idea. Given that competitive advantage determines the viability of commercial organisations (ibid.) the loss incurred by teaching entrepreneurial contexts in an observational way seems to be potentially significant.

Cognitive approaches are also explored in relation to visiting entrepreneurs, because this instance of entrepreneurial context seems to clearly express participants’ attitudes. There is widespread inclusion of visiting entrepreneurs in the teaching, which suggests a willingness to engage with practice, however, my research observes graduating views of their ability to contribute, and that the less commercially experienced the participant, the more likely a limited valuation of the entrepreneur’s ability to contribute to teaching. Visiting entrepreneurs are viewed as a source of information about specific capabilities such as marketing or financial expertise, or as a change from normal teaching, or with little potential to contribute, however, none of the less extensively or non-commercially experienced participants who brought them in seemed to conceptualise their embodiment of professional knowledge in action. As these participants’ modules also tend not to engage with competitive advantage, this forms an impression that professional knowledge is exterior to their teaching.

A potential explanatory argument for inclusion of teaching instruments from practice into cognitively based modules emerges from Peterson and Walberg’s (1984) observation that objectivist, theoretical teaching is less effective in developing higher order skills such as reasoning and problem-solving, given that higher education needs to produce students “who do not just remember and understand established concepts...but can also apply these concepts, analyse and
evaluate arguments” (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001, p. 53). However, notwithstanding that using practice-based teaching instruments for the exposition of cognitive knowledge achieves this objective, this nevertheless mixes idioms that have different norms and forms of expression, which contribute to the fluid vernacular of entrepreneurship teaching, discussed below in “Magic signs and fluid terminology”.

The observation above, that participants who involve entrepreneurs in their teaching seem not to conceptualise them in terms of embodiment of professional knowledge, seems to be consistent with the adoption into cognitively based teaching of its forms rather than understandings, and that consequently, the idioms of professional and cognitive entrepreneurship knowledge have become jumbled, discussed below in “magic signs and fluid terminology”.

The next section explores the relationship between engagement with socially oriented research and attitudes to commerciality: the knowledge-based divisions discussed above represent ways of thinking that respondents can either identify with, or in opposition to. This is illustrated by a participant’s comment that “If you go too far down that practical route, why do you need a degree? You can just do this as a night school class”.

The reductivist tone is difficult to ignore: that practical route...just...a night school class, expressing an “us and them” context for theoretical and applied teaching, which is echoed, less emphatically, in much of the non or less commercially experienced participants’ narrative, but not in that of the commercially experienced participants. It is interesting to explore what this represents: it seems consistent with the observation in the paragraph above, that theoretically based knowledge has prestige in the academic enterprise, which practice-based knowledge does not have the same purchase on. This seems to provide an explanation for the pattern shown in Figure 8, of a migration away from practice-based knowledge, and towards cognitive knowledge, that correlates with engagement in socially oriented research.
Patterns of values in relation to commerciality are observed as follows: while what seems to have value for commercially experienced participants is to be able to guide their students through challenging real-life entrepreneurship scenarios, building their commercial decision-making, the larger group, of less extensively or non-commercially experienced participants, who are engaged in socially oriented research, privilege theoretical knowledge and turn away from commerciality, which seems inimical to their beliefs.

However, notwithstanding the observation above of value-based differentiations within the participant group, my research does not observe a binary divide between participants: for instance, half of the significantly commercially experienced group demonstrate simultaneous engagement with commerciality with a consciousness of a postmodern perspective on teaching “for” entrepreneurship. Illustrating the same point, in contrast to the other two groups, the group
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**Figure 8:** The relationship between socially oriented research and orientation to commerciality.

**Key:** Inner Circle (white) - Orientation toward commerciality
Rest of square area (pale grey) - Socially oriented research
with a teaching route to their current role seem to relate to their teaching approaches in a pragmatic rather than ideological way: this is evidenced, for instance, by being simultaneously open to commerciality, while also privileging theoretical knowledge, a position seemingly developed from this group’s engagement with critical thinking. The differing approaches to notionally similar modules illustrated in Figure 8 suggest a significant degree of academic discretion (Bentley, Gulbrandsen and Kyvik, 2015), the implication of which is that the way different types of knowledge are operationalised, and the corresponding variation in use for entrepreneurial context within teaching, express hierarchies of importance for teachers, and arise from their active choices.

9.2.2: Tribes

As illustrated above, entrepreneurship teaching approaches express entrepreneurship teachers’ beliefs about what teaching is for, and by implication, what it is not for. That these sets of beliefs seem to be structured around whether commerciality is a positive or negative thing merits reflection: what emerges from my research is a distaste for commerciality in groups who are less or non-commercially experienced, emerging, for instance, through the reductivist tone used above in relation to practice. The salience of this is that commerciality seems to be viewed on moral grounds, negatively by participants who are involved in socially oriented research, and positively by commercially experienced participants: the understandings of socially oriented research, concern for justice and the development of the individual, stand in opposition to the values of commerciality and competition.

Choices to teach “about” or “for” seem therefore to operate as a manifesto, in the sense that they assert allegiance to one set of values or another. My research observes the strength of this affiliation, in that it seems to override the explicit purpose of the module that participants teach (illustrated in Figure 6). This is exemplified, for instance, within the less significantly commercially experienced group, where a subsuming of commercial orientation seems to occur as part of the process of researching and teaching socially oriented aspects of entrepreneurship. This strength of group values suggests some sort of parity between the “commercial” and “research”
groups, however, it seems worth noting that while the power of academic orthodoxy supports the “research” group, there is a countervailing sense from the “commercial” group that their teaching operates somewhat “under the radar”, and the pressure of academic orthodoxy prompts reflection on what might instigate contrary activity. As observed, within the group that has significant commercial experience, there is an incorporation of professional knowledge into their teaching, however, this group has been intensively exposed “live” to the components of professional knowledge theorised by Eraut (1995, 2000, 2005), Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) and Clegg, Tan and Saeidi (2002). This is the knowledge of pattern recognition and instantaneous interpretation of commercial contexts to make effective commercial decisions, understanding the connection between knowing that and knowing how, and their relevance to commercial capability. It seems that having been deeply immersed in this, engagement with the significance of professional knowledge then structures the rationale of participants, and that it is this understanding of the value of commercial judgement that drives commercially oriented teaching, in contravention of prevailing academic incentives.

As well as through the cognitive divisions discussed previously in this chapter, tribal affiliation is evidenced by there being only one participant who significantly straddles group boundaries (see Figure 8), in expressing reservations about a neoliberal agenda while teaching “for” entrepreneurship with an explicitly commercial rationale. This is also illustrated by exception in the “agnostic” position of the “teaching” participants, who, while they seem not to oppose commerciality, simultaneously privilege cognitive information and traditional scholarship, a position which seems to have been enabled by neither having been absorbed into the tribes of research-driven academic enterprise (Delanty, 2003), nor that of having significant commercial experience.

These observations illustrate that it is not simply a matter of functional pragmatism whether to teach “about” or “for”, but that they represent opposed educational philosophies and ideologies that obstruct moving from one to another, which serves to explain the borrowing of the
forms but not the meanings of practice into cognitive teaching, discussed above, and also the lack of “how to” teaching in the parts of theoretical modules identified by participants as “for” entrepreneurship. This philosophical separation is supported by the observation in my research that it is possible to teach subjectively (Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton, 2018) but use observational approaches, an approach that allows teaching “for” entrepreneurship to be carried out while maintaining traditional, cognitively based, academic values. The observations above signify that the differences between groups arise from differences in ideological values, and for this reason, it seems not to overstate the case to describe these groups as tribes: the implication of this is that participants are defined in opposition to one another.

9.2.3: Other blocks to teaching “for” entrepreneurship

Apart from the cognitive blocks discussed in Section 9.2.2, there are significant numbers of disincentives to teaching “for” entrepreneurship, discussed below: the “trade” status discussed in Chapter 2 is highlighted by shady (fictional) proponents, and the non-fictional entrepreneur Mark Zuckerberg. A participant correspondingly comments “people certainly wouldn’t have identified as an entrepreneur because the word is off-putting”. Another’s comment about it being an “orphan child” carries the implication that it is outside the perimeter of the academic establishment, corroborated by Neck, Greene and Brush’s (2014, p. 7) observation of academic insecurity about entrepreneurship as a legitimate field of study. There are also neoliberally related obstructions to teaching “for” entrepreneurship, as discussed in Section 9.2.5 later in this chapter. As observed above, academic career advancement depends on research into the phenomenon of entrepreneurship, as discussed by Meyer et al. (2014), reinforced by the difficulty of embedding context reliably into research into “doing” entrepreneurship (Zahra and Welter, 2008). Other structural disincentives seem to arise from an institutional lack of acknowledgement that entrepreneurship “how to” teaching requires a commitment of time and focus within the curriculum, and correspondingly, there is a tension between teaching this way and processing student numbers “efficiently”. These institutional pressures seem to militate against the provision of time and effort to incorporate entrepreneurship context into teaching and seem to be an
institutional response to competition (Naidoo and Williams, 2015), trying to constantly increase student recruitment against a context of constrained availability of teaching space and staff numbers (ibid.) that imposes pressure to teach students in volume. The significance of these obstacles to teaching “for” entrepreneurship is that they suggest that some form of considerable countervailing effect would be necessary to make this happen, found in my research as correlating with commercial experience or significant institutional orientation towards teaching, discussed in Section 9.2.6.

9.2.4: Magic signs and fluid terminology

It seems that because of the subordinate status of practice, it lacks established and recognised understandings or language. Because practice's definitional boundaries are blurred in this way, it seems that this has contributed to a lack of recognition of what professional knowledge is, or to understanding the differences between it and cognitive knowledge. This illuminates Hark's (2007, p. 13) observation that a slipperiness of usage and correlatively, meaning, lends itself to operating as a “magic sign” in entrepreneurship teaching, in terms of conflating exposing students to entrepreneurial context with developing their commercial judgement. This seems to be illustrated, for instance, by the observation that strategy theory, “skills”, “how to” and interpretive teaching seem to be conceptualised under a single identity, although my research finds that there is no axiomatic overlap of these categories (see Figure 7). As observed in relation to Figure 6, this is noted within the widespread use of practice-based teaching instruments, among entrepreneurship theory “about” modules, and also strategy-based “for” ones, irrespective of whether these are incorporated into “how to” teaching. While these teaching instruments can function for cognitive or interpretive purposes, unless this discrimination between usages is understood, they can appear to operate for the same purpose: to develop students’ entrepreneurial capability, which, as discussed previously, is predominantly unlikely, given the focus on cognitive knowledge, with the result that it makes it difficult to understand, from the outside, what type of capability is being taught.
This is part of a wider pattern of fluidity in the language relating to entrepreneurship teaching: for instance, “practice” in other disciplines is the enactment of the relevant discipline’s body of knowledge, however, as previously discussed, entrepreneurship practice is primarily drawn from strategy theory (Brush, Greene and Hart, 2001). This linguistic conflation enables practice and theory to appear to inform each other, whereas my research finds that they tend to exist in parallel, and so elements of practice seem almost to function as benign iconography within theoretically based teaching. The blocks to understanding the nature of what is being taught, that are imposed by entrepreneurship terminology, represent another barrier to practice in that its estrangement is embedded within the vernacular of entrepreneurship teaching. This is correspondingly assimilated into its rationale, which represents, but also feeds, entrepreneurship teachers’ understanding. Because these are more implicit than the blocks to practice that are discussed elsewhere in this section, they are likely to be more insidious and therefore less tractable.

9.2.5: Practice’s image problem

Another block to practice seems to be its characterisation, as observed previously, as disreputable and transgressive. Broadly, the strength of this perception seems to correlate negatively with the commercial experience of the participant. This, and the disciplinary heterodoxy also discussed previously, seem to contribute to academic insecurity about entrepreneurship as a legitimate field of study (Neck, Greene and Brush, 2014, p. 7), and this seems particularly so given its imbrication with the neoliberal agenda, arising from the latter’s focus on instrumental teaching as well as restrictions on academic autonomy and related reconstruction of the product, producers and consumers of higher education (Morley, 2003). My research observes that entrepreneurship education is viewed in the following way: while entrepreneurship education promotes universal opportunity, it is stripped of social context (Reay, David and Ball, 2005, p. 9), operates through the enforcement of normative values (Farny et al., 2016, p. 5) and is exclusionary on gender and socio-economic bases (Ahl and Marlow, 2012), the nature of which stands in opposition to liberal higher education values. Additionally, the issue of
being a “trade” rather than a profession arises from the UK’s lingering antipathy to the former, articulated in Shreeve’s (2019) paper entitled “Removing the tradesman’s entrance”, which relates to the divisions between academic and technical education, which is the precise location of entrepreneurship teaching. This discussion seems to represent a context that is prejudicial to acceptance of practice, in locating it outside the pale of the academy.

9.2.6: Resistance

Widespread resistance by participants to neoliberal characterisations of entrepreneurship teaching is evidenced in the prevalence of cognitive knowledge transmission teaching and the prevalence of socially oriented research and teaching, evidenced in Figure 8. The engagement in this, that was observed in all but two of the six research-active participants, suggests a pursuit of academic legitimacy (Neck, Green and Brush, 2014) that seeks to recast entrepreneurship as an authentic academic subject. Additionally, resistance emerges in the widespread rejection of the idea, within every group, that entrepreneurship teaching should produce entrepreneurs. These observations seem to express the degree to which participants desire to establish academic legitimacy within entrepreneurship teaching, in order to separate it from either instrumental education or the unpredictable, unreflective (Fotaki and Prasad, 2015, pp. 557–558) context of entrepreneurial practice. While the following characterisation does not directly relate to entrepreneurship education, Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd's (2012, p. 1) description seems to capture the position of practice: “priests of research purity”, in opposition to “soldiers of organisational performance” (ibid.), which seems to express the relative positions of academic researchers and teachers of cognitive information “about” entrepreneurship, and teaching oriented to practice, and to communicate the subordinate position of the latter. However, resisting this, the explicitly commercial rationale of the “commercial” group’s teaching seems to repudiate this observed subordination, notwithstanding that it potentially undermines their academic standing. This and other acts of resistance are discussed in Section 9.2.6.

In relation to curricular restrictions on time to co-work with students, my research observes a predominance of lecture hours that constrains teachers in working alongside students
on their start-up projects. However, this is resisted by teachers with markedly commercial experience, through repurposing their teaching time to include more time for “how to” teaching. Given neoliberalism’s promotion of economised measures of value (Brown, 2015) and instrumental teaching (Naidoo and Williams, 2015), the patterns of knowledge described in relation to Figures 6, 7 and 8 represent a repudiation of neoliberal values and an assertion of academic autonomy, by most of the participant group. However, the patterns of resistance to the functionalities of neoliberalism described above are not as clear cut as they may seem: owing to a shared focus on cognitive knowledge, resistance to neoliberal promotion of instrumental teaching (ibid.) is synonymous with career advancement, and there is consequently a neoliberally derived benefit, rather than a cost, in a research and teaching focus on cognitive knowledge. This type of research and teaching (and the concomitant estrangement from practice) are synonymous with behaviours that resist neoliberal pressure, so it is not necessarily possible to distinguish resistance to neoliberal values from the desire to succeed academically.

9.2.7: Neoliberalism: friend or foe to practice?

My research observes that neoliberal academic capitalism (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2000, p. 1) exerts pressure to research (Morley, 2003), focusing entrepreneurship scholars on information about entrepreneurship, rather than practice. However, the same neoliberal pressures impose a pressure to teach “efficiently” (Collini, 2010), and in this way reduce support for resource-hungry co-creative teaching of students, which represents a constraint on interpretive teaching “for” entrepreneurship. It seems therefore that within entrepreneurship higher education, the neoliberal agenda, while supporting instrumental teaching (Naidoo and Williams, 2015), has created conflicting incentives that reinforce teaching based on traditional, cognitively based education because of entrepreneurship research’s focus on information “about” the subject (Meyer et al., 2014), and its resultant non-applicability to practice. Entrepreneurship practice teaching therefore seems to exist in a state of neoliberally related jeopardy: ostracised because it is linked with neoliberal pressure to teach instrumentally, however, simultaneously deprived of the
resources necessary to teach it and marginalised because of neoliberaally derived competitive pressures to research.

9.3: DISCUSSION

The derogation of professional knowledge in entrepreneurship teaching has potentially serious implications for those students who want to learn entrepreneurship capability, and for governments who look to this teaching to stimulate economic activity. The implication of the observations discussed, about how ideological positions are defined in relation to commerciality, constitute a potent block to teaching “for” entrepreneurship, and particularly given the strength of alignment of individual academic interests with the success of the academic enterprise as a whole (Morley, 2003), this seems to impose a chilling effect on commerciality as a legitimate concern of entrepreneurship teaching, with a concomitant retardation of ways of thinking required to set up successful new businesses. The potential cost to this seems high, given Storey and Greene’s (2010) observation of a 50% death rate for new ventures over 3 years, and the correlation between this and a lack of competitive advantage: these figures are superficially unemotive, however, they represent a scale of personal loss, financially, emotionally and physically (Asgeirsdottir, Olafsdottir and Ragnardsottir, 2014), and represent clearly the cost of the distancing from competitive advantage, and correlatingly, interpretive teaching, from the majority of entrepreneurship teaching observed in my research.

It can be seen that there are considerable disincentives to teaching “for” entrepreneurship, an orientation of entrepreneurship theory towards studying the phenomenon rather than practice (Corbett and Katz, 2012), and a linked observation that teaching students entrepreneurial cognition and competitive advantage seems to oppose the dominant values of entrepreneurship teaching (Neck, Greene and Brush, 2014). This seems to represent a block impeding teachers from moving from traditional to emotionally engaged, contextually embedded teaching called for by Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton (2016, p. 8) that is required to teach “for” entrepreneurship. The
implication of these observations is that teaching “for” entrepreneurship is viewed as a subordinate activity, for the many reasons explored in my thesis. Because research “about” entrepreneurship informs policy, and sustains the academic enterprise (Delanty, 2003), it is therefore well positioned as the default characterisation for entrepreneurship within higher education. This is particularly since research, and therefore teaching, “for” entrepreneurship reaches into a different subject area (Meyer et al., 2014). The contextual element is difficult to pin down (Zahra and Welter, 2008), and lacks a vernacular that is unambiguously its own, which therefore imposes a penalty on pursuing this type of research and teaching. However, my research indicates that these apparently functional observations arise from a deeper discourse surrounding the moral dimensions of knowledge. In relation to this, an important insight is that the adherence to cognitive knowledge by the majority of participants constitutes an emphatic rebuttal of the consistent assertions noted throughout my thesis of a neoliberal character for entrepreneurship teaching, and in so doing, it rejects the assertions of moral deficit detailed in these. However, a corollary of this is a moral calibration of commerciality, which is hostile to the understandings for development of successful new businesses.

The issues discussed above relate to Greenwood and Levin’s (2001, p. 438) observation that:

society’s needs do not follow the compartmentalised structure of academic disciplines...no single form of knowledge is sufficient in professional activity...(teachers have to be able to) work with within both the disciplines of professional and propositional knowledge.

However, my research constitutes a reservation to Greenwood and Levin’s (ibid.) proposal, in the sense that professional knowledge imposes a requirement for interpretive rather than observational teaching, which encounters the cognitive barrier of understanding professional knowledge from a theoretical background: this therefore restricts the supply of entrepreneurship
teachers who are able to teach this way. Notwithstanding these cognitive blocks to practice, Greenwood and Levin's call prompts reflection on whether it is sustainable to continue to exclude understandings of competitive advantage and feasibility from the predominant knowledge transmission teaching approach observed in my research, given that being able to recognise and interpret patterns of competitive advantage plays a critical role (DeTienne and Chandler, 2004; Neck and Corbett, 2018) in understanding the dynamics of the environment in which entrepreneurial enterprises exist. However, not engaging with the development of ability in students to recognise and interpret competitive advantage through being able to “read” (Eraut, 2005) the entrepreneurial environment seems to exclude a key element in understanding the environment in which new ventures compete to survive, and to represent a missing key to unlocking meaning in the story “about” entrepreneurship, so its incorporation seems merited on these grounds. However, given the observations of my research, the prerequisite to this happening, of parity of professional knowledge, seems unlikely, certainly in the short term.

Are there grounds for optimism? It seems that if researchers were able to focus on the dynamics of professional knowledge in entrepreneurship, mirroring Eraut’s (ibid.) work on the nature of clinical understanding within medicine, it would open a valuable academic window into understanding practice, which potentially could start to build the legitimacy that it seems to lack currently. If the barriers to this type of cognition were surmountable, it would help to access the dynamics of entrepreneurial understanding, illuminating, for instance, within an entrepreneurial context, how patterns are recognised, the role of repetition and what “intuition” means, which would help to access the “black box” (Zahra, Wright and Abdelgawad, 2014, p. 482) of entrepreneurial behaviour, and render it theorisable, in a similar way to the theorisation of behaviour by psychology. The knowledge generated would be cognitively based theory, which is supportive of the academic enterprise (Delanty, 2003). This focus would be likely to begin to resolve the fluidity in terminology and understandings that are observed in my research, which in turn would help to establish a framework to understand the type of experience and knowledge necessary to teach different approaches to entrepreneurship, by illuminating the significance of
the divisions between observational and interpretive teaching observed by Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton (2016, p. 8). Developing entrepreneurship teaching that answers government policy (QAA, 2018), and concomitant student demand, seems contingent on engaging with this understanding.

9.4: CONCLUSIONS

9.4.1: Structure of entrepreneurship teaching

- The teaching of entrepreneurship seems to be divided into separate academic enterprises, with different objectives: the more dominant one engaged with socially oriented research, teaching cognitive knowledge via observational methods about the phenomenon of entrepreneurship, with the objective of developing entrepreneurship scholars, and the subsidiary one teaching to an explicitly commercial rationale, using professional knowledge and interpretive teaching approaches, with the objective of developing entrepreneurial capability. This observation seems to illuminate Fayolle and Gailly’s (2008, p. 570) observations of a lack of ontological or theoretical consensus in entrepreneurship education, and a corresponding lack of agreement over how to teach it.

- There seem to be potent cultural, ideological and organisational blocks to practice within entrepreneurship teaching, that seem decisive in determining the shape and extent of the teaching of entrepreneurial capability.

- These appear to enforce the dominance of cognitive knowledge, giving it an unchallengeable position, particularly as adherence to it represents personal and institutional competitive success (Morley, 2003).

9.4.2: Entrepreneurship teachers

- Participants’ route to current role seems closely related to their orientation to or away from commerciality, mirroring the research findings of Neck, Greene and Brush (2014, p. 5).
• Teachers from a less extensive commercial background seem likely to continue to migrate to a research-based identity, in response to the incentives of academic capitalism (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2000, p. 1).

• There seems to be a cognitive barrier that stands in the way of understanding professional knowledge from a background of theoretical knowledge, that means that teachers who do not have significant commercial experience are unlikely to have the experience-derived skills to “read” entrepreneurial contexts, to enable them to develop this type of capability in their students.

9.4.3: The fluid vernacular of entrepreneurship teaching

• A fluid vernacular within entrepreneurship teaching seems to obscure what capability is being taught, contributing to inhibition of understanding of what teacher qualities are required for the development of different types of knowledge.

• Entrepreneurship theory and practice appear to inform one another; however, my research observes they tend to exist in parallel, with limited crossover.

• Teaching “for” entrepreneurship has no axiomatic overlap with developing entrepreneurial capability.

9.4.4: Entrepreneurship knowledge and teaching

• The dependence of the academic enterprise on cognitive knowledge “about” entrepreneurship means that there seems to be limited academic mandate for the development of professional knowledge within entrepreneurship teaching.

• The operation of academic interests therefore seems likely to continue the marginalisation of the teaching of practice.

• The observed pursuit of academic legitimacy (Neck, Greene and Brush, 2014) seems synonymous with distancing from practice.

• Therefore, the observed turning away from commerciality, limited recognition of competitive advantage and under-recognised differences between observational and
interpretive teaching modes appear to arise not only from practice’s lack of relevance to the canon of cognitive knowledge, but as a reaction to the threat to academic legitimacy.

- Arising from this, teaching entrepreneurial capability has something of an “under the radar” character, with no agreed academic framework, illuminating Fayolle and Gailly’s (2008) observation of this.

- This seems particularly so given the strength of group norms associated with socially oriented research, their moral calibration of commerciality and the corresponding unease with commercially oriented teaching.

- It seems therefore that teaching entrepreneurial practice does not occupy a separate but neutral position, but that the activities of the academic enterprise (Delanty, 2003) create an environment that seems prejudicial to it.

9.4.5: **Insulation of cognitive knowledge “about” entrepreneurship from policy**

- The institutional privileging of cognitive knowledge and teaching “about” entrepreneurship, and the cultural, organisational and knowledge-based blocks to the teaching of entrepreneurial capability suggest that entrepreneurship teaching is insulated from the wider context of significant policy support for entrepreneurship teaching to stimulate economic activity (QAA, 2018), and the concomitant expectation of students that they will be taught entrepreneurship capability.
10.1: CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

Fayolle and Gailly (2008) observe divisions between teaching “about” and “for” entrepreneurship, which my research seeks to illuminate by understanding the nature of the knowledge used by these approaches, and also the neoliberally related pressures on entrepreneurship teachers. To do this, it combines understandings of the neoliberal restructuring of higher education (Brown, 2015), the oppositions between objectivist and constructivist philosophies of education (O’Connor, 2020), and of knowledge (Schon, 1984; Dreyfus and Dreyfus, 1986; Erat, 2005). My research observes that the academic focus of entrepreneurship is on researching and teaching cognitive knowledge “about” the subject, consistent with Meyer et al.’s (2014) findings that entrepreneurship research is dedicated to knowledge about the phenomenon of entrepreneurship, rather than informing new venture start-up. Morley (2003) observes the academic rewards and incentives that reinforce the predominance of this type of knowledge, and the concomitant marginalisation of practice as a scholarly activity seems to have resulted in a gap in the literature in relation to contextualising and illuminating the position of practice and theory within entrepreneurship teaching. For this reason, it seems that, irrespective of particular findings, my research contributes to an area that is not well understood. It has done this by significantly extending the scope of the research beyond the values and beliefs of entrepreneurship teachers, triangulating these through a detailed exploration of classroom practice, understood through engagement with theories of professional and cognitive knowledge.

Past research does not seem, as my research seeks to, theorise the connection between the nature of knowledge and entrepreneurship teaching practice, and to triangulate these with what educators understand and believe. In attempting to address this, my research provides explanatory context for Neck, Greene and Brush’s (2014, p. 5) observation of a correlation between entrepreneurship educator’s route to their current role and their location on the
My research seeks to contribute empirical and theoretical understanding by interpreting the relationship between experience and teaching by framing it against understandings of professional and cognitive knowledge. In triangulating this, my research has extended beyond its original scope, to additionally encompass a detailed exploration of classroom practice. In this way, my research seems to contribute insight in relation to Fayolle’s (2018) call for understanding of who entrepreneurship educators are and what they do.

10.2: THE ESTRANGEMENT OF PRACTICE

10.2.1: Fluidity of language and other more structural blocks to practice

My research seeks to contribute to empirical knowledge about cultural, vernacular and structural blocks to practice. It observes that cognitive knowledge seems to be regarded as the standard for entrepreneurship teaching, therefore marginalising consideration of other types of knowledge. However, my research also observes that fluidity of language of entrepreneurship teaching obstructs understanding of the nature of what is being taught, evidenced, for example by strategy theory, “skills”, and “how to” and interpretive teaching being conceptualised under a single identity, although my research finds that there is no axiomatic overlap of these categories. The presence of fluid terminology links with my research’s observation of other, more structural, blocks to practice, arising from the incentives, rewards and structure of the neoliberal refashioning of higher education (Morley, 2003), practice’s positioning as anti-intellectual (Fotaki and Prasad, 2015), its disciplinary heterodoxy (Brush, Greene and Hart, 2001, p. 7), position as trade rather than profession (Shreeve, 2019) and the espousal of neoliberal values by its teaching. The observation of fluid terminology within entrepreneurship teaching seems to provide empirical evidence for Fayolle and Gailly’s, (2008, p. 571) observation of the presence of perspectives that are not explicitly stated, or are implicit and/or hidden, but which fundamentally affect the content and meaning of what is taught, and observation of other blocks to practice seem to provide empirical evidence for their observation of divisions between teaching “for” and “about” entrepreneurship discussed above.
10.2.2: Conflict within entrepreneurship teaching arising from neoliberal pressure to research and teach instrumentally

My research observes that there are conflicting objectives imposed on the teaching of entrepreneurship by neoliberalism’s simultaneous pressure to research (Morley, 2003), but also to teach instrumentally (Naidoo and Williams, 2015). Because of the disciplinary heterodoxy specific to entrepreneurship, neoliberalism’s pressure to research (Morley, 2003) seems to ensure the failure of its imperative to teach instrumentally, by creating a research impetus based around knowledge about entrepreneurship rather than its practice, therefore systematically disadvantaging teaching entrepreneurship capability. Additionally, my research observes that neoliberalism’s focus on teaching “efficiently” (Naidoo and Williams, 2015) withdraws from practice teaching the resource to enable the teacher to work alongside students to interpret entrepreneurial context and develop entrepreneurial capability.

An implication of this is that the personal and institutional rewards arising from researching and teaching cognitive knowledge about entrepreneurship are synonymous with resistance to neoliberal values, a conjoining of advancement and principled action that seems to represent a potent deterrent to teaching entrepreneurship capability.

10.2.3: Orientation in relation to commerciality and implications for teaching

My research seeks to contribute theoretically and empirically to understanding participants’ views in relation to entrepreneurship, and how these define groupings in relation to commerciality, by viewing them through understandings of the neoliberal restructuring of higher education (Brown, 2015), the oppositions between objectivist and constructivist philosophies of education (O’Connor, 2020) and understandings of knowledge. My research observes that teaching behaviours mediated around the functionalities of neoliberal pressures described above are not simply pragmatic, but seem to reflect participants’ deeply held beliefs, aligning participants into groupings that are differentiated by their relationship with commerciality.
Correspondingly, teaching “about” or “for” seems to operate as a manifesto that signals participants’ beliefs about what entrepreneurship teaching is for and demarcates the enclosure of groups from each other. Groupings seem to correspond to the following pattern: the “commercial” group comprises significantly experienced participants, who incorporate commerciality as a foundational understanding in their teaching. The largest group, of less extensively and non-commercially experienced participants, evidence a strong focus on socially oriented research, a distancing from commerciality, and privileging of cognitive knowledge and teaching about the phenomenon of entrepreneurship. The third group, participants with a teaching route to their current role, who seem, as a result of not being inscribed by the values of either having significant commercial experience or engagement with socially oriented research, to simultaneously privilege cognitive knowledge while also teaching “for” entrepreneurship. This discussion provides insight in relation to Fayolle’s (2018) call for insight into what entrepreneurship education means: my research evidences that this depends on the perspective of the respondent and what that person considers it is for, a view that is likely to be shaped by their route to their current role (Neck, Greene and Brush, 2014), and particularly by their position in relation to commerciality, the type of research they are engaged in, and the extent to which they support teaching to develop entrepreneurial capability, or focus on cognitive knowledge. The implication of this is that an exclusion of commerciality seems not to be incidental, but rather that it is part of a narrative that defines “tribes” based on the values of participants, which mirrors the observations of Neck, Greene and Brush (ibid.) of the link between experience and location on the theory/practice spectrum, and evidences the role of professional experience in entrepreneurship teaching, an issue that Fayolle (2018) observes that research has been silent on.

10.2.4: Resistance to neoliberal values, and academic legitimacy

My research seeks to provide empirical and theoretical insight into Neck, Greene and Brush’s (2014, p. 7) observation of a pursuit of academic legitimacy by entrepreneurship scholars, by framing this against the neoliberal activity described above, and by understanding the role that knowledge plays in resistance to neoliberal values. My research observes that engagement with
socially oriented research seems to express a pursuit of academic legitimacy, observed by Neck, Greene and Brush (ibid.) in recasting entrepreneurship as an authentic academic subject. This seems positioned to counter entrepreneurship’s “image problem” and disciplinary heterodoxy, along with its imbrication with a neoliberal agenda which restricts academic autonomy and reconstructs the product, producers and consumers of higher education (Morley, 2003). In particular, engagement with socially oriented research seems to counter neoliberalism’s stripping of social context (Reay, David and Ball, 2005, p. 9) and gender-based exclusion (Ahl and Marlow, 2012). This serves to distance entrepreneurship teaching from either instrumental education, located outside the pale of the academy (Shreeve, 2019) or the unpredictable, unreflective (Fotaki and Prasad, 2015, pp. 557–558) context of entrepreneurial practice. The observations above represent a desire for academic legitimacy that is expressed through research that distances itself from commerciality, therefore repudiating the principles of practice, particularly in relation to its imbrication with neoliberal values.

The findings in Section 10.2 seek to contribute empirically and theoretically to the recognition of considerable and tenacious blocks to the teaching of practice, by framing them against understandings of neoliberalism and of knowledge. Correspondingly, my research observes the dominance of cognitively based teaching “about” entrepreneurship, and the variety and salience of blocks to practice-based teaching, embedded within cultural understandings and language of participants, as well as in more tangible obstacles. These findings illuminate the systematic disadvantage of practice, its corresponding subordinate status, and illustrate how participants’ choices about what they research and teach seem shaped by pressures that arise from the neoliberal restructuring of higher education (Brown, 2015).

10.3: IMPLICATIONS OF THE ESTRANGEMENT PRACTICE

10.3.1: The nature of knowledge in entrepreneurship teaching

My research seeks to contribute theoretically to the understanding of the types of knowledge that relate to teaching “for” entrepreneurship, through recognition of parallels
between this and Eraut’s (2005) differentiation between cognition developed for clinical diagnostic ability and for biomedical science. My research observes the same pattern of differentiation within entrepreneurship teaching, distinguishing teaching that develops students’ ability to “read” (ibid.) the competitive landscape, from that which enables students to understand patterns of causation: the former teaches students how to negotiate the entrepreneurial environment, and the latter how it is done, and my research observes that, while these cognitions are contiguous, they are not the same. This contiguity appears to be the issue that obscures boundaries between these types of knowledge, and which predicates the presence of, for example, widespread use of teaching and assessment instruments drawn from practice, but which function as expositions of cognitive knowledge, modules “for” entrepreneurship that are taught via cognitively based strategy theory with limited or no “how to” teaching, and the conflation under a single identity of different ways of teaching “for” entrepreneurship.

10.3.2: The relationship between professional experience, knowledge and teaching

My research seeks to contribute to empirical knowledge in observing that engagement with different types of knowledge seems to correspond to each participant’s route to their current role. My research finds that professional knowledge seems to correlate with participants with significant commercial experience, providing the linkage between professional experience and the ability to teach interpretively observed by Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton (2016, p. 8). Illuminating this, the “commercial” group has been intensively exposed “live” to recognising and instantaneously interpreting commercial contexts in order to make effective commercial decisions, therefore understanding the connection between knowing “that” and knowing “how”, and its significance to commercial capability. It seems that it is this understanding of the salience of commercial judgement that drives the commercially oriented teaching of this group, in contravention of the prevailing academic incentives discussed above. My research observes a correlation between “research” and “teaching” group participants and teaching and assessment instruments drawn from practice, but which are used as expositions of cognitive knowledge, and also cognitively based strategy theory teaching with limited “how to” teaching. My research
observes, however, that it is difficult to know the extent to which these are mediated by significant neoliberal pressures to research and teach “about” entrepreneurship, as they are predicated on obscured definitional boundaries of knowledge that obstruct understanding, discussed above. Nevertheless, these teaching approaches seem consistent with the observed predominant resistance in the “research” group, and to a lesser degree in the “teaching” group to the idea of developing skills-based knowledge. The observations above suggest that what is meant by “learning by doing”, as called for by Fayolle (2018, p. 695), depends on the type of knowledge deployed in the teaching, and that this in turn relates to teachers’ experience.

10.3.3: Contribution to knowledge made by merging understandings from education and entrepreneurship

(ibid) notes a need for merging educational and entrepreneurship understandings to gain insight into the function of objectivist, subjectivist and constructivist philosophical paradigms in entrepreneurship teaching, which my research has sought to achieve. My theoretically merged perspective has enabled insight into how philosophies of knowledge are articulated within teaching “for” and “about” entrepreneurship, and correspondingly within the nature of, and oppositions between, cognitive and professional knowledge. Referencing the theory of both disciplines has enabled my research to gain perspective on entrepreneurship as an element in the neoliberal restructuring of higher education (Brown, 2015), and to recognise its lack of social orientation (Fotaki and Prasad, 2015). If my research had been restricted purely to entrepreneurship knowledge, it would have been difficult to penetrate the significance of neoliberal pressures that form the context in which my research participants work, and which shape the choices they make about their teaching. These reflections would not have been possible without a perspective arising from both disciplines, corroborating the value of Fayolles’ (2018) call for this.
10.4: SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

10.4.1: Recognition of the blocks to practice

- Understanding the variety and salience of blocks to practice, and that they are embedded within cultural understandings and language of participants, as well as in more tangible obstacles.
- Observation of fluid terminology within entrepreneurship teaching, that obscures the nature of the knowledge that is being taught.
- Observation of the significance, in terms of blocks to the teaching of practice, of the alignment between neoliberal pressure to research cognitive knowledge “about” entrepreneurship and academic advancement.

10.4.2: Understanding of the role of knowledge in entrepreneurship teaching

- Identification of the relevance of Eraut’s (2005) research into professional knowledge to entrepreneurship teaching, and a resultant ability to define the difference in cognition achieved through using professional and cognitive knowledge.
- Recognition of the dominance of cognitive knowledge, the segregation of professional knowledge from the main body of theory-led teaching, and the concomitant systemic disadvantage of teaching of practice.
- The development of explanatory links between teaching focused on professional knowledge and participants with significant commercial experience, and cognitive knowledge with participants with less extensive or no commercial experience.

10.4.3: Understanding of the links between participant experiences, beliefs and knowledge, and how these shape entrepreneurship teaching

- Understanding of the links between professional knowledge and significant commercial experience, representing an explanatory linkage between Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton’s (2016, p. 8) observation of a connection between teaching interpretively, and professional experience.
• Development of understanding of the significance of the strength of orientation away from commerciality, its correlation with socially oriented research, and its relationship with deeply held beliefs about what entrepreneurship education is for.

• Clarification of the purpose of different teaching approaches and instruments, development of understanding of what cognition is developed by them, and arising from this, some clarification of the fluid terminology surrounding them.

10.4.4: Merging understandings from education and entrepreneurship

• The above insights have been achieved by the theoretical merging of understandings from education and entrepreneurship, called for by Fayolle (2018).

To summarise, my research has sought to contribute to knowledge by combining understandings from education and entrepreneurship, to explore the beliefs and understandings of entrepreneurship educators and how these relate to their routes to their current roles, providing theoretical and empirical evidence for the observations of Neck, Greene and Brush (2014). My research recognises the role of professional knowledge within entrepreneurship teaching, and its correspondence with Eraut’s (2005) research into the teaching of clinical medicine. This understanding provides a theoretical explanation for the connection noted by Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton (2016, p. 8) between professional experience and the ability to teach interpretively, and illumination for my research’s observation of a correlation between significant commercial experience and the ability to teach entrepreneurial capability through the use of professional knowledge. My research observes that the predominant focus within the participant group on cognitive knowledge, knowledge-transmission and observational teaching methods correlates with less extensively and non-commercially experienced participants, again mirroring the research of Neck, Greene and Brush (2014). My research observes that these teaching approaches are intended to develop entrepreneurship scholars rather than answering policy calls for teaching that stimulates start-up activity (QAA, 2018). However, my research observes that this focus on cognitive knowledge seems strongly shaped by academic pressure to research (Morley, 2003), one of a number of systematic blocks that obstruct the teaching of practice.
10.5: PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

I hope that my research, in unpicking the relationship between teaching “for” and “about” entrepreneurship, may help to clarify the difference between cognitive and professional knowledge, and consequently, the type of experience that is needed for developing both. The understanding built by my research of the potential and limitations of theory that is used to inform teaching “for” and “about”, and its insight into these characteristics of teaching approaches and instruments from practice may help to disambiguate the blurred roles of these in entrepreneurship teaching. I hope that the understanding developed by my research, of the influence of the nature of research undertaken on teacher orientation towards teaching “about” and “for”, might enable teachers to reflexively be aware of their location on the ideological spectrum between teaching “for” and “about”. Specifically, my research contributes the following insights that relate to pedagogical understandings, and the cognitive and organisational infrastructure of entrepreneurship pedagogy.

10.5.1: Pedagogical understandings

- It makes explicit the roles of objectivist and constructivist teaching philosophies within entrepreneurship teaching.
- It illuminates the correlation between the nature of knowledge and approaches to entrepreneurship teaching.
- In particular, it makes explicit the difference in cognition achieved through professional and cognitive knowledge.
- Through this, it defines the areas of conflation within the use of teaching instruments from practice in the teaching of cognitive knowledge.
- It makes explicit the nature of the difference between teaching students to “read” entrepreneurial situations, and that which enables students to understand patterns of causation.
• It disambiguates the single identity of strategy theory, skills development and “how to” teaching.

10.5.2: Teaching infrastructure: cognitive

• It makes explicit the structural and cultural pressures to teach “about” entrepreneurship.

10.5.3: Teaching infrastructure: organisational

• It offers a theorised connection between route to current role and cognitive or interpretive approaches to entrepreneurship teaching.

These contributions to pedagogy inform my own teaching, most particularly the importance of teaching students to interpret commercial situations in “how to” teaching, the awareness of which arises from my research’s theorisation of professional knowledge in this type of teaching, which gives a cognitive framework to my practice experience of working with “how to” knowledge. My teaching practice has also accommodated the exclusionary nature of entrepreneurship opportunity, in terms of making this clear to students, and in using case studies where students can see the differential opportunities open to different types of entrepreneurs (for instance, demonstrated in NatWest’s backing of female entrepreneurs).

Less positively, the subordinate position of practice provides context for the widespread failure to date within the universities that have hosted my research, of progressing practice-based teaching faculty to professorial grade. This seems to have pedagogical implications in terms of incentivising and retaining this category of entrepreneurship teachers.

10.6: LIMITATIONS OF THIS RESEARCH

The following discussion restricts itself to the limitations of my research in terms of a comparator set of qualitative, interpretive research into subjective issues. It does not seek to measure itself against quantitative research, given that this type of approach is not well structured to gain insight into the type of subjective perspective engaged with by my research. A limitation arises from the nature of my research being interpretive, arising from the subjective character of
the reflections of participants. This may be seen not only as a structural limitation, but also an ideological one, given that my research finds that the context for teaching “for” or “about” is shaped by ideological issues. The relevance of this is that, evidenced by previous comments about the impossibility of being a “fly on the wall” (see Section 4.3 within qualitative research, it is reasonable to assume that the way I perceive and interpret these issues has contributed to the outcome. Consistent with this reflection, it is also relevant to recognise that a researcher with a different ideological lens is likely to obtain different insights from this type of research, and this researcher positionality should therefore be seen as a limitation.

The structure of the research is another limitation: its small respondent base, consistent with the research’s narrow and deep view into respondents’ understanding and beliefs, implicitly encompasses the probability that a wider respondent base would reflect different patterns of engagement with the issues embedded within the context of entrepreneurship and its teaching. The fact that my research is based on participants within English institutions means that these patterns of contextual engagement reflect the domestic policy framework and other social and financial contexts, and that changes in these that correlate with geographical location are likely to alter the nature of participant beliefs and understandings.

There is also a temporal limitation to the research, in the sense that, even though the data collection process spanned 2 years and triangulated participants’ temporally distanced views about issues, this is still only a “snapshot”, reflecting a particular set of contexts and views embedded within that context, that are likely to change if observed at a different time, or over a longer time span, as these policy, social and financial contexts evolve.

10.7: FURTHER RESEARCH

Given these limitations, it would be interesting to carry out this type of research contextualised within different policy, social and financial frameworks that arise from different geographical locations. In particular, it would be interesting to research these issues in the USA,
given that, although entrepreneurship teaching tends to be discussed as a homogeneous entity, my research suggests that practice has a different status in entrepreneurship teaching in the USA. It may be valuable to establish the differences between entrepreneurship teaching in Europe, the UK and the USA, in defining the links between context and beliefs and understandings in the same way as this research has done, in order to understand more widely the nature of the pressures that shape how entrepreneurship, and its teaching, is understood and operationalised in the classroom in these locations. Continuing the approach of widening the geographical reach of this type of research, it would be helpful to understand how types of contextual frameworks shape entrepreneurship teaching in markedly different types of economy, for instance, in sub-Saharan Africa and poorer parts of Asia, where there is greater economic pressure on entrepreneurship to stimulate economic activity.

It would also be interesting to carry out repeated iterations of this research over time, which would be an insightful way of gauging the interaction between the contexts for entrepreneurship teaching and the way it is conceptualised and taught. The same type of insight into the changes in relationship between context, understandings beliefs, and teaching would also be gained by researching different sample sets of types of educational institution.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONS AND TOPIC SCHEDULE

These apply to the initial discussion and the Skype discussion subsequent to the teaching observation. The topics that also relate to the teaching observation are in bold.

What was your path to teaching now?

What’s the academic and commercial background of your colleagues?

Where relevant, does your business background have value for your students?

**Where do you think your teaching sits in the “for”, “in” and “about” spectrum?**

What makes entrepreneurship teaching different from, say, strategy or economics?

**What skills do you want to foster in your students?**

**What practical skills do you think are valuable to students?**

What is valuable teaching to you?

What relevance do you think entrepreneurship theory has to starting up a business?

What relevance do you think entrepreneurship theory has to teaching?

**Does your own research shape your teaching?**

Who is entrepreneurship research for?

What are the challenges of teaching entrepreneurship?

Do you think the hierarchy above you understands the teaching of entrepreneurship?

What areas of entrepreneurship do you feel colleagues are less able to teach?

**In what important ways have your ideas shaped your teaching?**

**Do you teach how to spot competitive advantage?**

How?

Why have you chosen this format of assessment?
APPENDIX B: SAMPLE PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW, SKYPE DISCUSSION AND TEACHING OBSERVATION

Locations, institutions, people, and other things that may identify participants are anonymised.

Sample interview (respondent is represented as “R”, interviewer as “L”)

L: You talked to me before about the path through to teaching entrepreneurship now, so do you think you could just recap that for me?

R: I had done some sort of (voice goes) I think this is sinuses and stuff. I had done some sort of teaching and stuff at University X and then I was working in industry. And then I moved back and did a Law degree, came out and then was working in a management/economic development consultancy. I suppose what turned me towards entrepreneurship was a lot of the work because it was economic development was devising and delivering training to SME owner managers, and then you had, there was a lot of EU funded programmes throughout Country A. So, you were evaluating those and saying you know, there were all sort of SME stimulation programmes, development capacity programmes, and evaluating those. Then actually delivering programmes, and some of those would have had a mentoring aspect to them. So, I suppose it was when I was doing that, I saw in the newspaper that the department for the economic development or whatever, was looking for someone to undertake a piece of research and develop a strategy to promote entrepreneurship within the region, and I thought, oh that would be really interesting. I suppose given the projects I’d been working on and the background of the company, so I did up a tender, submitted it, got it, and then I was as part of that I’d got in touch with Professor name, I got him on board as part of the team. He’s at institution name, I think. So, this time, you know, I was working at this economic development agency in Country A, and did that and really enjoyed it, and as part of the mentoring, I noticed that there was a difference in confidence levels which influenced things like pricing strategy, and stuff like that, between men and women and their businesses. So, I thought I would like to
do a PhD in this area. So, what happened then was I saw this job advertised which was a centre for entrepreneurship research in Country A which had a specialism looking at women’s entrepreneurship. And I thought, God, perfect! I can go in, work in that, sort of, you know, and because there’s that will help me with my reading round, and my research question, and would also be an interesting day job. So went there, and worked there, and ended up running that centre, did that for a few years, and then I left there and went to do my PhD full time at the Royal Veterinary College. It was OK for the first year, but then the prospect of a woman vet who specialised in zoonotic disease transfer between sheep and pregnant women was the only gender aspect to it, or you know, it was all racehorses and pigs’ hearts and dog breeds and you know, very sort of scientific, medical, vet-type research that was going on and then there was me, so I left there, and came here to finish, and I was changing the focus of it, and finished it with name who is still here.

L: What was your first degree?

R: So, my first degree was Information management, which is really a management degree with some sort of an IT and you know, preparing people for the information society, this sort of carry on. So, a bit of programming, a bit of managing IT systems, that sort of thing. And then I started a PhD at University A.

L: So, you went straight from an undergraduate degree to a PhD?

R: Yeah. And then sort of life happened, and I came out of that. And it was at the point sort of 18 months later, where it was like, after 2 years, if I go back, you know, I had a grant originally and would have to pay to finish the PhD. And I thought, you know what, if I’m going to pay, I’d rather pay to do something that I really want to do. And so, I went back and did a Law degree in 2 years rather than 4. And (sighing), as I say, I came out following that and I was working then I did a Postgrad in Management practice in the south of Country A and then I did my PhD, I think, and then I did the teaching qualifications and stuff like that.

L: hat’s very interesting. Relating to a slightly different subject, what sort of background
do your colleagues have?

R: Probably, I suppose, probably I’m the only one who had their own business, for a while, in the middle of all of that. It was a consultancy company, so when I was in that research centre and left it, I left it to go to a government department in Country A, in a research policy development role. So, they had wanted me to continue doing some work, and so that was really as a way of doing stuff that was other than the day job that was still of interest, because I suppose at that stage I had two competing interests, management and law. And to reconcile that, I was a lay Magistrate for 5 years in my spare time.

L: You obviously have a lot of energy! To go back to what you were saying before, your colleagues’ background.

R: I think name a number of years back, I think her and her husband had some sort of venture abroad, they lived and worked abroad for a while. And while I think about it, the new recruit there, name, she has been working as a management consultant for a number of years while she’s been doing her PhD as well. But I think most of the department will have come in from the research department.

L: Interesting. Do you feel your business background has shaped your teaching, and if you do, in what way?

R: I’d say certainly with perhaps the Masters level, much less so with undergraduates. I think it’s that background working with SME owner managers, and stuff like that, if you’re looking at MBA or some of your Masters groups, it’s a bit different. With undergrads, there would be times, it depends on the subject when you can bring in relevant examples and there are times where you can do that.

L: Do you think it’s shaped the WAY you communicate stuff?

R: Certainly at the postgrad level, it’s much more relaxed. It’s much more difficult when you’ve 250 people in a tiered lecture theatre, you know? I enjoy the seminar sessions better because you’re able to be a bit more relaxed with them, be more informal with them and
engage them a bit and see their faces. It’s nice to see their eyes.

L: Do you think they appreciate you having your business experience?

R: I don’t know. I think when you’re using an example from a company you’ve worked with or mentored or something, it introduces that reality. In smaller groups, they’d be more likely to ask questions about this. In that large lecture theatre, nobody wants to really wants to say anything.

But you do notice when you translate theory into practice, they go “Oh! Alright, OK, that’s how it works”. You know, the worst thing is, they think, especially when in their first or second year, they’re wanting to know what the “right” answer it, give me a model that works. And if this model’s in a book it must be right! And it’s trying to get them to engage their brain, and not just accept received wisdom but actually, use your common sense. And so, giving them examples, I use a Twitter feed on the module, and there’s lots of current examples there that then I can say, look at this one, and if you’ve read that one on the Twitter feed, this paper says, but if you look at that, it doesn’t fit, why not? This other paper suggests that this might make more sense.

L: That’s very interesting. So, is the idea that you bring that in a very real time way of getting them to be critical?

R: I suppose in the context of “International Entrepreneurship” (the participant’s module) there’s the argument about the Uppsala model, or born global, so it’s getting them to say, there’s an example of a Ukranian IT software company, but then we have this example of this craft beer company, what does that say? Would that lend support to this? So, it’s just trying to give them real world. Also, if they’re reading something, they might go, how does that fit? Because they expect to find it all I think in a textbook or a journal article. And they expect it to fit. You go, so it’s a bit messy and you have to think. So, in one of the seminars at the end when I said, “So how are things going with the assignment?” One girl said “this is the hardest assignment I’ve ever had. And I said “really, but that’s amazing! You’ve written essays before”.
“Because you want us to think, you want us to read it all, to read this stuff, and to come up like with our own opinion, our own view!” . And I said “yeah, that is a challenging task, but I think you’ll find that if you start doing that and evaluating what you’re reading, and being critical about what you’re reading, that it’ll improve your marks going forward, not just for this module, but throughout, you know”.

L: Very interesting. To move the conversation slightly, what other modules do you teach, apart from the module that I sat in on?

R: I teach Masters “Launching New Ventures”, so I was teaching it this morning, and it’s 72 Masters students in the class, and it’s very much, you know (sighing) trying to use a SIM venture to give them that same environment, to learn through doing. So, that’s part of that as well as general theory. We use SIM venture because this Masters module I’m co convening this year, with name who’s run it for the past few years, so she’s used, and I’ve inherited it. So, we’re a sort of tag team on this module this year, but I’m taking over next year. And we’re meeting next Wednesday morning with a guy from Edumondo or something.

L: I was curious about, with your depth of commercial experience, what you benefitted from in using a simulated software package?

R: I think that the fact that, OK, so (sigh). This semester, this year, I’ve no choice in the module because it’s name’s to lead. I think where there’s a benefit is that there’s a large number of foreign students in the cohort, and we’re typically at the Masters level, use the case study approach, but that’s much more challenging for the foreign students, because of the language skills and perhaps in terms of getting the nuance and the sophistication of an argument within the language, sometimes it’s missed because they’re struggling with…getting a surface level rather than a depth. And so, I think in a way, it comes back to what I said before, you know, with entrepreneurship education, you can teach for, about, through, and it I suppose ticks in a way some of the “through” elements, you know, that experiential learning in a safe environment. The tendency with case study teaching is you’re expecting them to apply, it’s perhaps much
more embedded in theory? Because this module is part of a Masters course. That’s much more about equipping them for entrepreneurship, so in terms of giving them that “through” and “for”, that would be much more the focus of this particular Masters.

L: How does that differ from the undergraduate module, in terms of the “for”, “in” and “about” trichotomy? What do you feel the undergraduate teaching is for?

R: I think at undergraduate, you’re trying to give them a bit of everything? Because at undergraduate, you might have someone who thinks, actually, if you’re thinking about, actually this is very interesting, I might like to do a Masters, I might like to do a PhD, I might like to go into academia, I might like to go into Policy Development. So, you know, it’s important to have that element of “about”, and then if you’re teaching them “for” and “through”, you know, “through” you’re helping them develop transferable skills that will benefit them as an employee, so entrepreneurship education and confidence development, you’re looking at things like creative thinking, creative problem-solving, self-confidence, all those other things.

L: Interesting. Related to this, what do you think it is that makes the teaching of entrepreneurship different from, for instance, economics or strategy?

R: Right. I would like to think that it’s a marriage of both theory and practice. That it is something that’s practical, there is that theoretical basis to it, but it makes a difference to the individual, to their skill level, and their confidence. If you can get them to take responsibility for their own learning, they’re much more likely to take responsibility in other areas. I had a student write on his feedback, “this module has blown my mind, now I know that I need to manage things like paying my rent, and Oh My God, basic life skills”. But you know, if they take responsibility for their own learning, and you’re trying to say to them “look, my role here is as a facilitator, you’re supposed to be independent, do this yourself”. They’re going to be more likely to engage in lifelong learning and take responsibility for their career development and other things. So certainly, I think there’s a lot to be gained from it.

L: So, just to make sure I’ve understood, you’re saying that what makes
entrepreneurship, specifically entrepreneurship, is the marriage of the practical and the theoretical?

R: Yes, because I think that delivers real benefits for the students, generally, in terms of life skills. I think if you look at economics, or whatever, you're looking at models and it's very hypothetical, much more abstract, whereas if people are doing something and then you're catering for different types of learners, but you're more likely to get greater engagement, they're more likely to actually turn up to class, you know, the research shows this. They're much more likely to find it interesting, and they're much more likely, as Tigh would say, to come away with some sort of depth learning. But I'm a sucker, I'm a sucker for the research! And it shows that there are benefits for students and then when they're going into a job, or be entrepreneurs, learning it's not for you is a pretty important lesson, and that's just as important if not more so for some rather than others.

L: What are the skills that you want students to pick up, and what is valuable teaching to you?

R: I don't know! They'd be the ones to say (laughing). I suppose I have a genuine interest and belief and passion for it. I genuinely find it so interesting, they may not. For them it may be a Wednesday morning, 9 o'clock, you know, and it's miserable and it's raining, whatever, but I do find it genuinely really, really interesting, and I think it's like, I don't know if you're familiar with the work of the poet W.B.Yeats, so he says "education is not the filling of the pail, but the lighting of the fire". And I think that just sums it up, so you know, if there's an example that you use, or there's something that just catches their interest, it may be not about the entire module, but it could be about some aspect of it, that they think "I've got that, and I actually have those skills". Or if they can recognise that they have a skills or ability, and that's transferable, that's wonderful. If we can have them try, I do try to take that approach, have them build some skills in terms of their referencing, their writing style.

L: What practical skills do you think are valuable to build in students?
R: I think a major weakness is their writing style, and so I think that’s a valuable thing to build, because they would go out into industry, and write a management report the way they would hand up their first assignment to me, this tends to be something that English people use much more as a colloquialism, to say “off”, you know O F F, this of something instead of from, whatever. It really irks me, and it’s like, let’s use English grammar, let’s use punctuation, you know? Let’s not use contractions like “doesn’t”, let’s have a formal typewriting style, and teaching them that you don’t actually write as you speak, or you shouldn’t, at least. And that it needs to be more formal, to convey quality and professionalism, and you do that through your writing.

L: So, the lens that you’re looking at this through is a practical lens? What other skills do you think it’s important for them to build up as you teach them?

R: In relation to entrepreneurial skills, we start off in the undergraduate degree, we take them in, and we take them through the “innovation” process, which is about creative problems solving and developing an idea, and this was done in conjunction with location council this year, in terms of coming up with ideas, in terms of homelessness. So, the working groups, you know, what is the problem of homelessness, and what are the issues, and someone might focus particularly on say, homeless women, or whatever it’s going to be, the key issues, how you get a job, how you get shelter. And then they go through this problem identification, problem-solving, and come up with suggestions, and a couple of those were taken on by the council. So, they had to go and pitch the idea and present that.

L: So, problem identification, problem-solving, presentation, persuasion.

R: Yeah, that’s Year 1. And then Year 2 you should be trying to build on that. While you’re doing that as well, you’re trying to give them you know, Schumpeter, the definition of entrepreneurship, that sort of thing. Because that’s a second-year module, trying to look back, do you remember, trying to let them see that they’re building their skills.

L: That’s interesting. But it’s not an entrepreneurship degree?
R: No, it's business, but entrepreneurship would be, there's some core of entrepreneurship modules there.

L: So, it seems to have been constructed explicitly as an iterative process?

R: Yes. I think that's worked, because otherwise they say, and what I do try to do in tomorrow's session is looking at people. What I try to do then is look to other modules, so those of you who are doing politics might be familiar with this argument, so things like an inclusive space, even if you've never done a business module before. We have a wide variety of students, for example pharmacists, they're surprisingly on to it. But sort of saying for those, you might remember doing this, for those of you who haven't done it before, this is what it is. And just try to make sure that everybody feels included and taken along. And I've forgotten what your question was, sorry! (laughs).

L: That's very interesting and you answered the question! On a slightly different issue, what do you think the role of theory is in entrepreneurship teaching?

R: I think the inclusion of theory, explicitly, because I suppose before when I was training SME owner managers, they would have had theory, but it wouldn't perhaps have been so explicit. But doing that explicit, you have to do that in an academic sense. It gives you that framework, because as I keep saying to them, a model is just a simplification of something that's much more complex in reality. And a particular model or theory is like a spotlight on the stage, but shown on one bit, everything else goes into black. It just illuminates something in particular that's worth knowing, or useful, but then that's the reality and that's the limitations on this area.

L: I wondered what types of theory you are thinking about when you're teaching entrepreneurship?

R: You sort of say to them "this is entrepreneurship, and especially for those who have, you know, come back after the holidays and they're come back and sitting down, and then you have the pharmacists and the geographers and the industrial relations and the politics people
and whatever, sitting there, and haven’t done business before, I sort of say “entrepreneurship really pulls on different aspects”, so there’s an element of strategic management, there’s the element of an economics input into it, there’s social psychology, and this all happens in a particular context. So, you have sociology, you have politics, so you sort of talk to them about neoliberalism and how that influences this transcendence of entrepreneurialism, so that’s the context. So, you’re asking them to do the basic things like a PEST analysis, so you have to be aware of that, so part of the second assignment for me is a SWOT analysis as part of analysing what they see to be the options. And then basing their recommendations for this social enterprise. So, they have to be aware of those things. So, you’re pulling on all those different disciplines really.

L: I wondered about the extent to which you feel that entrepreneurship theory itself informs undergraduate teaching rather than strategy theory or economic theory?

R: That’s the thing about entrepreneurship, it pulls on all of those. Entrepreneurship research informs undergraduate quite a bit. This module, if you look at the reading list, the International Entrepreneurship module, the reading list comprises much more journal articles much more than taking a textbook and trying to follow it, and I think that’s important. And last year, one of the guest lecturers was one of the women on the reading list, several of her articles were on the reading list. So, it was nice to talk about her research, and the trends in research, stuff like that, so they can see where this was going, and talk to the woman who wrote it, and clarify their understanding. I think it’s a module of two halves, and I think that’s reflected in the coursework. The first piece of coursework is very much engaging with the literature, engaging with the theory, and the second piece of coursework, I suppose you missed that seminar, much more practically focused. They’re taking this particular, it’s actually a genuine social enterprise that’s based on Bhutan, and it was really like a “born global” social enterprise. And I suppose really through the network of contacts of this particular woman, and so, what they have to do is to analyse that, and to come up with recommendations for the internationalisation plan for the development of this social enterprise. So, one half is getting the theory, the other half is being
able to recognise theory, and being able to apply that and general commercial acumen. It’s trying to get that marriage really of sort of theory and practice and seeing that it’s useful to know some of the theory, because it might help you to make a better decision in practice. And also, when you look at something in practice, and you’ve got the sense of the…if it’s reverse engineering you might go and find someone said something about that somewhere. And isn’t that a wonderful thing to know, that you have an innate instinct, and just happens that some academic has said that before!

L: How much entrepreneurship research would someone need to start a new business?

R: None, let’s be honest (laughs). Working with people who were starting their businesses, they were trying to do market research, it was much more general? And (sighs) this is when I come back to influences on higher education approach. If you look at EU research and policy recommendations over the last 20 plus years, it’s been very much trying to promote entrepreneurship education and the embedding of that, and interestingly we now have the Witty Scholarships, because we received an endowment from Witty to help the students who, perhaps from less privileged backgrounds, who had some sort of entrepreneurial spark or idea and were able to help them and perhaps follow them through internships and things. It’s a neoliberal thing, and while I would be quite critical of the impact of that, particularly on women. The neoliberal rationale is that we live in what could be called a post-feminist moment, we have had this equality legislation for 30 years and we have women who are prime ministers, we have women who are doing this, we have women in science, and it’s all wonderful. And then what’s been nice recently is we’ve had the “Me Too” sort of backlash campaigns, raising issues. But if you look at the past 5 to 10 years, young women were saying we “don’t need feminism now because everything’s fine”. Because the whole gender equality discourse has been mainstreamed. So, they were thinking “those days are gone”, I can go out and do whatever I want. And that’s fine but then if you look, and you deconstruct that neoliberal thing, and you look about what actually happens to women in the workplace over some of the profession, especially within STEM, traditional masculine areas, they don’t want to be regarded as a
troublemaker, and anyone who’s remotely attached to feminism, there are social sanctions there, so we can’t be saying that. But it makes them individualise their experiences of disadvantage or discrimination, as “well, I was unfortunate” but the next time, I will avoid that or I will laugh when the older man says something, and they determine individual pathways to negotiate that, and they don’t see it as being... and it also, you Sheryl Sandberg’s Lean in, the neoliberal woman’s bible really, and if you actually read it, it says things like “how to change yourself”, and it’s the advancement of one woman at a time climbing the corporate ladder, one woman at a time. But what things can you change about yourself to help you progress! And it’s just like, well actually, no matter what you do, there are going to be some structural issues there. So, neoliberalism obfuscates really a lot of stuff and removes any focus from collective action, and any focus from structural action, and individualises everything. Because success is all about your individual effort, entrepreneurship is all about your individual effort, and you have Richard Branson and you have Alan Sugar and these are all self-made entrepreneurs because they’ve worked hard, so it’s all about your individual effort. So, then you have these women, and if they’re putting in the effort and they have got the qualifications and they’re working really hard, and they’re not actually progressing and getting to the next stage, and that’s because perhaps the men in senior positions automatically discount them because they’re women and they might go off and have babies and work part time. So, what does that mean? They have to explain their differential outcomes is that they weren’t good enough, or they didn’t try hard enough. So, it’s really like re-victimising someone, and I don’t think that we have a responsibility to be setting up businesses, but what I do think is that you should have an awareness of your context and what influences your choice and be aware that you have some sort of bounded rationality. And these students don’t. And when it comes to entrepreneurship, it’s not that I want to teach them to go out and set up businesses so that they’re living in poverty, because that’s the side that isn’t talked about. Well, I do highlight that to them I think, but it’s not that I’m trying to create the next generation of fat cats, and I’m not trying to see about economic development, but I do think that there is something in the approach that’s
taken and in what we do that helps them develop their skills, and perhaps leaves them a wee bit more switched on and more likely to fulfil whatever their potential is, and that’s all you can hope for in a role as an educator.

L: That is extremely interesting. On a slightly different but linked subject, do you think that entrepreneurship education has changed over the last while, and if you do, how do you think it’s changed?

R: I think if you were looking at entrepreneurship education, and if it was called that, 20 years ago, you’re probably looking at a module where people used a textbook, and people followed through, and they did strategy in Week 1, and they did marketing and they did HR and they did finance so that they were able to produce a business plan at the end of it. Or the business plan was the focus of the teaching.

L: Just to clarify that I’ve understood, 20 years ago it was “for”, rather than “about”?

R: I think that the business plan was the focus of it, that’s not to say that they weren’t “and in marketing, we have” you know, and sort of doing generic spots and then I think the business plan was the focus, and probably the assessed output of most courses. I think that if you look at some of the things now, what we would tend to have assessed pieces that are reflective learning, because I really think you need to try to develop people to engage in reflective practice. We should be doing it as educators, hopefully we all do. But if you’re out there as a manager, you do engage in reflective practice, you think “OK, how did that conversation go this morning with that person this morning, could I have handled that disciplinary issue better?” And you learn from it next time round. So, I think it’s important to do that. But it also means that then, they’re recognising value in the learning. So, I think there’s probably much more of that as well. I think there’s also probably a recognition of the influence of role models, and again, that’s probably influenced by the research. And so, we will have more guest lecturers coming in, people who they can identify with, who have done it, so it’s nice when you have somebody rocking up in a pair of Converse and ripped jeans talking about their
businesses. So, I think there's probably been a recognition of the value of that as well. Because even if you have walked the walk, I think there's an element, it's like whenever my daughter was younger and I would tell her something...but whenever Rebecca, her best friend's mother would tell her the exact same thing she'd go OH! Rebecca's mum said to me, Rebecca's said “oh, blah blah blah”, and I'd be there going “I've been telling you that” but she's like “alright, OK”, but it's like a fresh voice, different perspective, and it's recognised. And I think, even if you've walked the walk, the students just see you as the lecturer at the top of the room. So, when they see someone coming in who's currently doing it, or has done it for 20 years, in 5 different companies, and made £20 million, they're going to perk up. So, I think there's a bit more of that. And I think there's also recognition of (sighs), one of the Masters it's like having pop up shops or whatever, they're actually going to do it. What I want to bring in for the first years is that they do something and raise money for charity, that we can then donate. So, I did that at the last place, at last place it was wonderful, we raised over £10 grand from the first years for local charities. And it was because they were doing things in their groups like fashion shows, where they were developing a particular product or service inside the module. It's coming back to the theory of teaching and learning, and again, it's constructive alignment, your assessment should match your learning objectives. So, if we're wanting to teach them “for” and “through”, then we have to teach them “for” and “through”. And as well as that, we complement that then with the “about”. So, I suppose across different modules, this would perhaps be different emphases, but overall, across a programme there should be a nice blend, and a nice complement, and have them develop those other skills like presentation skills, report writing, that's going to benefit them going forward as well.

L: It's interesting you say that, because of the few other people I've talked to, they've said it used to be more "about" and now it's more applied?

R: It was the business plan, it might have been generic stuff, it wouldn't have perhaps been very applied, it was theoretical like business strategy. I think it's much more applied now, because we have the guest speakers, people coming in, telling us about their experience, what
they did, how they did it, how they found it. Then be it through software or module activities, actually engaging in and simulating and learning from practice.

L: What you just said touches on quite a key thing, which is if you haven't got business experience, how do you recognise and teach competitive advantage?

R: Well, it’s the theory. I suppose if you teach home economics you have to have some awareness of the chemistry that goes on when you stick bread in the oven and put different ingredients. You don't have to be a chemist; you don't need to have worked in a bakery. I think in a lot of things, if you’re talking about competitive advantage, you’re sort of saying this is what it is, these are what approaches where you can get it or you can try to pursue it, strategies for that.

There is a mentoring element within that, because they’d be sitting in their groups, coming up with ideas, and isn’t enthusiasm a wonderful thing? And it’s asking questions, “do you think there’d be much of a market for that product?”. You would hope that someone in the groups would recognise if there might not be a market for that. And then comes the bit where you go “for these reasons I think that this idea that you’ve had is probably better than that one, because...“.

L: What do you think about the idea that you as the teacher need to know what those reasons are? Can you know without experience?

R: It’s a good question. I don’t have an answer for you! Well, I’m just thinking, even people who, see I would say some people don’t think that they’re creative, but they are. Just because they’re not musicians or they’re not doing art, doesn’t mean that they’re not creative. I think that some of my colleagues who have come through an academic pathway are quite entrepreneurial in their thinking. They have the ability to recognise a runner from a non-runner. It’s a wise person who recognises that something might not be for them, for whatever reason, being their family circumstances or the fact that they might be a worrier, thinking I like the security of a regular pay cheque, or whatever it is, but there are creative thinkers, they’re quite
innovative, quite entrepreneurial and they would have been really good at evaluating. So, I suppose I can only think in that way, and I can see what they're doing, but I don't know what that sums up, if that's innate or honed, or they've had developed through their life and education, I don't know, I can only say.

L: Interesting, so what value do you feel that your business background has to your teaching?

R: Having said that, I'm not sure it's much (laughing). No, I think probably having worked with so many small companies, having done so many feasibility studies, having run my own company, and that challenge of working on the business, working in the business, doing the thing, delivering, and then prospecting, I'd like to think if nothing else, it probably gives me some sort of legitimacy, I sort of know what I'm talking about!

L: Do you feel your experience delivers value to your students?

R: I'd like to think so. And I suppose there is the, while I would like to think that we've moved away from chalk and talk, there has to be some depth...chalk and talk is the old school way, transmit all that knowledge and their wisdom, now it's much more, it isn't that sort of hierarchical, much more working together. So, you'd like to think you're there as a facilitator of learning, rather than someone who thinks "I know all this", but there has to be that depth of subject knowledge, and it has to be informed by teaching theory. So, I think it does require a marriage of different types of knowledge and experience, so the business stuff is grand, and if you were going into the classroom, you would probably find that you might do things and take an approach intuitively.

Then if you were actually to look into the teaching theory and pedagogy, you would say "OK, the students go back and say, oh the academics say this". There is that relationship. So, I couldn't just say it's because I have business experience, I've read an awful lot of bloody books (laughs), I've done an awful lot of studying, staying abreast of things, and I think it's an enquiring mind. It's a bit of everything, isn't it?
L: Who is entrepreneurship research for?

R: Entrepreneurship theory no, but entrepreneurship theory might have a lot of value for practitioners. We do a lot of stuff through our “innovation” lab, and colleague name runs our business network. So, we have breakfast club meets, so name next door, he'll go and do a session on building your social media brand, and the considerations of things of that sort, or might have one on, I suppose we have a team that comprises both practitioners, business mentors, venture capitalists, as well as academics.

L: So, is it half and half, or are there more academic colleagues?

R: It's about 50:50 but we would do slightly more of the taking charge of the academic modules. So, I'll be the module convenor, and colleague name will come in and do the finance. When we were looking at marketing and positioning, and SME for internalisation, the woman from location SME that's internationalising comes in to do it.

L: Are there areas of skill where colleagues might feel they're not strong enough, and bring someone in? You mentioned marketing and finance?

R: Certainly, the finance thing. I think it's good for colleague name to come in as a venture capitalist (VC). If you're looking at internationalising particularly for some real born global enterprises, then VC funding is important. So, him coming in and saying, “as a VC, what we look for in presentations blah blah”, so they're getting it from the horse's mouth. So that again, it's that other voice, they go, listen to that. Name does a session on making the numbers work, there are accounting and finance modules.

L: Do you think that's a normal area to bring people in? And do you also think marketing is a normal area to bring people in?

R: It was more the fact, again it's that role model thing. So, this is a woman coming in from a location-based SME that's sort of internationalising and that's gone into a couple of markets.

And I suppose like a live case study, and then where she would be going, this is what we would
be doing, then I’m there going “that would echo off that theory”, if you remember this example, and that links to. And so, this is like a live case study type thing. This is a woman who’s from location, who’s a location-based small firm that’s internationalised. And so, you’ve got that identification, this is possible! And also local, and female, and possibly something slightly different from what you might expect. And then it’s the links to theory and what might this mean in your assignment. So that’s why she’s running because she’s that different voice, and it’s that real work example as well, they’re going “ah”, so I can chime in at the back. So, it’s more so for that, and yeah, I suppose really it would depend, for some things it’s expertise and for some it’s role models.

L: Interesting. Sorry, could I just ask you to remind me what you said about entrepreneurship theory?

R: In terms of entrepreneurship theory, nobody really cares. No one’s going to lift a textbook down off the shelf and say, “how does Schumpeter define entrepreneurship, and am I engaging in creative destruction?” No. They’re not going to. Is this Shane’s model or is it Sarasvathy, “am I an effectual or causative?”, they’re not going to give a damn. But if it comes to things like research on, perhaps, some of the challenges or what they’ve found makes funders more likely to give finance. There are areas of research where they’re going to like “alright, OK”, and there are going to be some of it that would probably be quite offputting, in terms of survival rates, they would probably not seek out. Because at that stage, they’re so enthusiastic, if they’ve made the decision, sometimes it just, and I suppose that’s the role, if they’re going to a business advice agency or something like that for help with the business plan, or going for funding, you’d like to think that there might be some of that assistance with evaluating the options re the strategic positioning of their business. I remember I ran a course about (surprised look) 10 years ago, and it was for women owned businesses across a variety of sectors, and it was a growth programme. And some of them, you would do the follow up, and this one said, “it was after I’d been on the programme, I realised there was no growth potential in that business, and it wasn’t really a business”. So, she said, “I have scraped that”, and she
says "actually, this is my new product, I think there is real growth potential in it, this is my scalability plan". And I thought, "oh my God". You know, sometimes people just need a bit of help to position what they’re doing, you’re not really going to find that from theory, but you might find it in some of the research, some of it. You know, and then there’s case studies that might be useful examples.

L: That’s very interesting. On a slightly different subject, what do you think entrepreneurship is?

R: To me, it’s an everyday activity, if you look at the media, and there’s research into this which is very interesting. And I think the word itself is quite offputting, there’s research into this which is very interesting. Gorillas beating their chests, “I am the entrepreneurial myth hero, and I’m aggressive and I’m go getting.” And so, if you said to most small business owners, are you an entrepreneur, it’s a negative. And that was certainly the case in the 90s, you might have more people, because it’s become more common parlance, and certainly put forward as a much more acceptable. It had that sort of Arthur Daley, Del Boy sort of connotation, where I think now the image of the entrepreneur is Mark Zuckerberg, sort of. So, I think most small business people wouldn’t often, certainly wouldn’t have identified as an entrepreneur because the word is often offputting.

L: So, what do you think it is?

R: I think it’s an everyday practice that people engage in. Starting and running a business. I don’t think it has to be this creative destruction thing I think it’s not even something that’s confined to the business context, you have a lot of social enterprises, you have a lot of entrepreneurial activity, where people are being innovative within their employment, you have a lot of academic entrepreneurship, not just in terms of spinning companies, but in terms of people being entrepreneurial about what they’re doing. I think it’s (entrepreneurship’s) opportunity recognition and exploitation. For me, it’s seeing an opportunity, and thinking, well there might be an opportunity here, and pursuing that, and I think that everyone has to do that
in their work, otherwise I think it would be really bloody boring. So, to me, I wouldn’t think what is entrepreneurship, I’d think what is entrepreneurial activity.

L: So, what do you think are the challenges in teaching entrepreneurship?

R: I think the challenges are, I suppose, number one is, do you know when you go and see a play, and there’s that suspension of reality, certainly if you watch something like Armageddon, you really have to suspend anything that’s plausible. And I think there’s an element of that in the classroom, because you’re going to have people sitting there who think entrepreneurship can’t be taught, so you’re asking them to subscribe to the idea that it can. So, I think that’s a challenge, and I think it’s perhaps bigger than we realise that sometimes in the process of learning about something, that you can learn a lot of other things that will benefit you as a person and in terms of your personal development, should you never choose to do that thing in particular. I think what’s also a challenge is we have so many students coming in who are taking this course because they want to start a business, and to my mind, there’s a responsibility with that, because you’re trying to imbue these sorts of evaluative skills and self-recognition, reflection and all these things are really important. Because as I said, it’s just as important if not more so that some people recognise that perhaps it’s not actually for them, so there’s a challenge and a responsibility there. Just with those who are like “I’m taking this module, I don’t believe you can teach it” to those are like “I’m doing this because this is my future”. So, it’s two different mind sets but equally a challenge and responsibility for both of them.

L: Do the people above you in the hierarchy understand what the demands are of teaching entrepreneurship?

R: I think we’re in quite a privileged position here, we’re probably quite unique, because we are an endowed institute for Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Everyone here, because of our successes and the development of the institute and the growth of the institute, and things that have been happening, if there were people higher up who perhaps weren’t as signed on, I
think that certainly the institute would get a lot of support, so I do think within this organisation, there is some sort of recognition. I think it is quite an entrepreneurial university, to be fair, whereas I remember in a previous organisation that I worked in, I was teaching one of the modules to first years, “Creativity and Social Media” or something, and one of the Profs said to me, in the name of God, I never heard such nonsense! How can you teach someone to be creative, what’s that all about? And he just sort of laughed, and I said, “you not being a creative, you wouldn’t get it”. And he went “Ha ha ha…I know she’s sort of joking, I just don’t get it” (laughing). There was like the old timers close to retirement, and they were going “I just don’t understand why this was put in. I mean surely to God; it would be better with management accounting. And they were like I don’t understand how this was put into the programme revalidation, we had to have an emergency meeting and take this out! So, it’s a joy to be here.

L: Thank you, I think that’s pretty much everything, that’s been very interesting.

R: Check through! I probably haven’t answered your questions, or I’ve answered them five different ways (laughs). Maybe it’s because I haven’t actually sat and consciously thought about some of those things, to articulate them well.

L: I’ll have a quick look at my list, but I don’t think it will help me.

R: I think it’s a comfort thing. I used to do exactly the same thing. The worst thing in the world is to go away and go “Oh!”.

L: But it’s not the end of the world, for me it’s much more interesting to let people talk. Nothing’s worse than asking someone a question, as in “this is a question”. I don’t think that’s a way to get what people genuinely think.

R: And I think, my daughter’s started doing her fieldwork, and I said to her you will know if your semi-structured interview schedule is alright, because as they’re answering one question, it should lead into something else. But not necessarily in the same sequence, no, you can be quite mercurial, particularly if you’ve had a lot of coffee in the day, so it’s a challenge.

L: Thank you so much, that has all been very interesting.
Sample skype discussion (respondent is represented as “R”, interviewer as “L”)

L: In what important ways have your ideas shaped the module? How much of the research you have done is brought into the teaching?

R: The context is important, making it clear that entrepreneurship looks different in different contexts, perhaps necessity entrepreneurship. There are more female entrepreneurs now, not the old idea of white male entrepreneurs. The idea of critical thinking is important, getting them to be able to think critically.

L: What is the background to the module being taught mostly by the knowledge-transmission method rather than by participation?

R: I inherited this lecture pattern, it’s not what I’m used to, which was 1 lecture hour and 1 seminar hour per week. I fought for and got 1.5 hours lecture per week rather than the 1 hour per week that there was when I got the module. You won’t have seen this, because you only saw one lecture, but they don’t necessarily follow a lecture pattern. For instance, there is a lecture from a location SME that’s internationalising, and students can ask questions in that session. There are 16.5 hours of lectures and 4 hours of seminars.

L: Asked about the apparent disjoint between the forms of assessment and structure of the teaching. Why have you chosen this format of assessment?

R: I chose this format because I think it’s important to put in some form of peer learning, particularly as the students come from different disciplines and they can learn from each other.

L: In the paper you sent me, the EU paper on entrepreneurship teaching, it promotes practitioners doing the teaching, but they don’t contribute to the ref list? How does the business school deal with that? what about the people in the innovation centre, are they on the ref list?

R: We’re very luck at the Innovation Centre, we have three professors of practice and they come in to mentor the students when they are having to do very practical stuff like, for instance, the financial side of a business plan. There is no contradiction re the research, because
only research staff are now focused on the ref list. It used to be that you could, for instance, choose 6 out of 10 who did the best research out of the research staff, but now you have to include all of them. There are two career paths, the teaching path and the research path and the people on the teaching path are not counted, however, all the research staff are.

L: In terms of evaluating the competitive advantage of a new idea, how important do you think the financial analysis is?

R: It’s important in the very practical forms of entrepreneurship learning, the “through” approach, but in the “about” and “for”, not so much. It’s equally important as learning about marketing and strategy. In terms of “International Entrepreneurship”, it’s more “about” teaching.
Sample seminar teaching (respondent is represented as “R”, interviewer as “S”)

R: We’ll be doing group work on this, so you may want to sit around a couple of tables. You’re actually typing it up, to be honest (laughs). OK, so a couple of things, hopefully you’ve all been to at least one lecture by now, so you should know that I’m name, and I’m the module convenor. Today this is our first seminar, and we have a guest, sitting at the back of the room, Lisa Blatch from the University of Sussex. So, Lisa’s here today, not to monitor you, or to observe, or to evaluate anything you’re doing, but she’s actually here to evaluate me. Just looking at the approach to teaching “International Entrepreneurship”, both here and at other universities as part of her PhD. So, I said the best group I’m going to have is this one, so come along and see the star pupils. So, I think we may have another latecomer, so that’s the story so far, I’m going to pass this out, so please sign your name in the sign in sheet, if you’re attending the seminar that isn’t your allocated seminar, put your details, your name, your student number and sign, please, at the bottom of the form.

Right, so, your first assignment is your individual essay, it’s worth 50%, it’s to be 1500 words at the limits, before penalisation, plus or minus 10%. People usually worry about being over length, but it’s also an issue if your essay is too short. You have to in the 1350- to 1650-word bracket. You should include a minimum of six relevant academic sources, and the submission date is the Thursday 22nd, is that right? Using source materials, you’ve been asked to assess the relevance of the Uppsala model to international entrepreneurship today. Why have I said, “using source materials?”, sorry, would you come over and join this group, thank you. Because you’d be surprised at how many assignments are handed in, and people are referencing Wikipedia which isn’t really a great academic source, and when you’re doing an academic submission, it really should be academic materials that you’re referencing.

Similarly, TutortYou, Business Balls, Essaysforfree, some students rely entirely on online resources, and it’s much better if you read the materials that are suggested and do some research yourselves looking at more recent articles, in online journals, like the Journal of International Business Studies, or Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, really good journals. I
think that the *International Small Business Journal* also might have a special issue within the past 18 months. So that means you’re getting up to date with more current thinking. So, using course materials, I’m trying to get you to engage with the reading that’s on the reading list. I set the relevance of the Uppsala model to international entrepreneurship today. If you’ve been asked to assess the relevance of something, what is the question asking you to do? How would you go about doing that?

S: What was the name of the journal you just mentioned?


R: So how do you approach this question, knowing nothing about the Uppsala model? I’m not asking for the detail, but just general principles, how would you go about assessing the relevance of some sort of theory or model in an essay?

S: Could we look at theories that support it and also...

R: Critique it, yeah, yeah. So, you’ve been asked really to evaluate it, to critically analyse the model and evaluate whether or not it applies in the real world today. If it’s still relevant, does it still explain the phenomenon that it’s supposed to describe. So, what I want to cover in this seminar is basically to make sure you get some sort of understanding about critically reviewing literature. Because every question, or almost every question you’ll get is critically analyse or critically evaluate. And then, whenever I ask students “do you know what critical analysis, or how to critically evaluate something”, they often say “well, I’m not really sure”. So, I thought it would be a good idea to cover what the question is actually asking of you. And hopefully by the end of it, you’ll be better able to identify key concepts, themes and limitations within the two journal articles you were to read for today’s seminar. Now, you are at a slight disadvantage, because your seminar is before the relevant lecture, which isn’t ideal, but people in timetabling, with the number, the size of the group, there was just no way round that. But you will appreciate the difference in the revised Uppsala at the end of it. So, what does critical analysis mean? It’s that
careful evaluation of the propositions, arguments, evidence, whatever has been put forward.

Sometimes, people think that if you’ve been asked to critically evaluate something, you just try to criticise it, or knock it down, or try to find faults or failings with it. But it’s not that, you’ve been asked to do that balancing act, to look and see what are the strengths and weaknesses of it. And in any academic submission, it’s really useful to have theorists and other academic pieces of writing that you can cite, to say, well this is a strength, I can confidently say this is a strength because a, b and c have said this as well. And all you need to do to convey that in your writing is put in in brackets, those citations. So, your aim is to determine which of the concepts or issues are valuable, so as well as looking at the strengths and weaknesses, you have to look at the limitations of it. In what contexts might this not apply? When is it generally relevant, but not always relevant, and in what situations may it not be relevant? So, you’d look at the research, you’d look at the methodology, is there anything there that seems a bit odd? Has everybody read the Uppsala model? The original paper?

…OK thank you. It’s better to murmur no, than to try to avoid eye contact, because as we continue with the conversation, it will become apparent perhaps. So, can I assume that the majority of the people haven’t done the reading? So, we’ll talk generally then, there’s no point in talking about the Uppsala model. So, if you’re looking at a piece of research that says it’s going to talk, has findings relevant to women’s entrepreneurship in Bangladesh, and you look at the methodology, and they’ve only spoken to men in Bangladesh. Then you might wonder, based on that methodology, how can this paper make conclusions about women’s entrepreneurship, the challenges women face, women’s experiences and motivations for engaging in entrepreneurship, because they haven’t actually talked to women! That methodology would seem a bit odd, so there would be limitations, that would lead you to question the validity and reliability of the findings of that study, yeah?

That’s what you’ll have to do with this, and there will be some quirks in the methodology of the Uppsala model that we’re going to talk about, that you might want to highlight. And what you want to do, is you want to look, so every academic paper, and some of
them are easier to read than others, I confess even I need matchsticks, they can be extremely inaccessible and dense and boring. And read as exceptionally long, and others are quite interesting and easy enough to read, and are much more accessible in their language, and how they convey the concepts. Well, they’ll all follow a particular format, and in the introduction they’ll tell you, “this is what’s currently known in this area” or about this topic. And then they’ll say, “there’s a few areas that are up for debate or discussion, some things that we’re not so sure of, and these are a, b and c. And what this particular paper’s going to look at is “voila”, whatever it is, right, and it’ll tell you “this is the focus of this paper, and we’re going to plug a gap in the literature that we’ve just set out”. Then they’ll tell you how they’re going to set about doing that, so they’ll say, “this is the method that we’ve used, this is how we’ve gone about doing this, and we’re doing this in order to be able to find the answer to the questions”. So, you read the methodology, and you think “well, can they actually answer the question that they’re asking by doing what they’re doing?” So, if someone says that they’re going to get the opinions of striking university lecturers about the pensions dispute, but they’re asking the students, you know, again there’s that disparity, they can’t answer the question about that group and their opinions and their experiences by looking at a different group. So similarly, if you were trying to find out about how people felt about Brexit, attitudes about Brexit, you might say OK, if there were a second Brexit referendum, how would people vote? And you might do some sort of survey that would capture a sizeable enough proportion of the population to give some sort of representative idea. So, we do know that the pollsters got it wrong, so it’s obviously not that easy, but you know, you couldn’t just ask 10 of your mates, and just say “on the basis of my 10 friends, if there was a second Brexit referendum, this is the way the result would be”.

So, you have to make sure that it fits, that the approach they take enables them to answer the question they’re trying to answer. And they’ll tell you what’s known, what’s in dispute, what are the key debates, and what remains to be known, and that’s when they set out the gap they’re going to fill, the methodology, how they’re going to fill it, then their
findings: this is what we found, and in the conclusions they’ll say “this is the implication, this
what it means for policy or practice, and what it is”. In this area, this is what it means about
international entrepreneurship, or international marketing, or companies trying to retrench
and come back out of international markets. And then they’ll say, “the limitations of this
research are”, and they’ll tell you that as well, and then they’ll tell you future research that
should be undertaken in order to advance it, right, so you’re asked to read 2 papers and to
answer four questions, based on that.

But in your assignment, this is what you need to do. You need to give a succinct
overview of what’s known in relation to the topic. The topic is the Uppsala model, right, so you
need to say “this is what is known or agreed, this is what the Uppsala model says, does, what
it’s for. And that changes over time in terms of argument development. So, the original
Uppsala model, the first paper was published in 1977, right, and what it actually tries to do, it
tries to explain the process underpinning the internationalisation of small firms. So, it looked at
empirical data, and it said right, so this is a pattern that has been noticed, but why does that
pattern exist, and it tries to give an explanation. So that was fine, then we had the internet,
globalisation, we had lots of changes, and the authors came back and revisited their model, in
2002, in their subsequent paper. And they said, look, 30 years later, a lot has changed, so the
outline why the model needs revisiting. So, they in the second paper tells you what has changed
over time. And what was going on in the other literature, in the other topics that were relevant,
that meant they had to revise their model. So, they do all that work for you in the revised
paper. You have to provide an overview of key concepts, identify major relationships or
patterns discussed in the literature, and identify strengths and weaknesses of the Uppsala
model, conflicted opinions and evidence, so what are people saying about the Uppsala model.
There’s load of stuff because it was the key theory, it was used, and it’s still the basis for a lot of
government policy interventions. So, it was the key theory in terms of international
entrepreneurship and international business.

So that’s your task in your assignment. We’ll come back to that at the end with perhaps
a few hints and tips. What I’ll do is, I’ll give you a summary of the first paper, and then it might be useful for you to, shall we say, recap, and flick through the second paper for 10 minutes or so, and then we can continue on. So, the first one, the original Uppsala model, it’s called Uppsala because that was university that the researchers were based at, and it’s based in Sweden. So, according to the literature at that time, it was all very much based on economic theory, and they said, as if businesses sat down and said, “let’s work out a detailed cost benefit analysis and weigh up the risks”, and you know, textbooks are wonderful, but they’re not often found on the shelves of business owners or leaders. So very much it’s done on a more informal basis. And we know they can do strategic and systematic market research, but it was very much focused on the costs and risks involved. But what the Uppsala model said was “if you actually…”, they looked at research that was undertaken by their team, and they said, “if you actually look at what happens to these small firms as they grow, is it quite like that, or how does it happen”. And they found that, they did case studies, some of the Uppsala team did case studies using Volvo, Sandvik, Facet and Kopco, and these were really large firms, even then, Volvo was still a multinational in 1977, so they looked at these firms and did a case study and analysed how they internationalised and became that big.

And they found that they actually didn’t sit down and strategically think “let’s enter a new market, let’s enter THIS market”. Often what happened was there was informal order fulfilment, that ad hoc exporting that we discussed in the lectures. And then, whenever they were getting a few sales in foreign markets that perhaps had a sales agent who acted on their behalf. And then as sales developed, the importance of that market in terms of revenue generation increased to the firm.

They replaced the sales agent, and they had a sales office. And then eventually perhaps had a production facility or whatever. But they didn’t just go and think “OK, let’s build a manufacturing plant in Britain”. It wasn’t striking, big, bold FDI investments that they were making, it was small, incremental steps. And that was how those really big multinationals became big, they took those small incremental decisions and steps. So, whenever they looked at the data, the empirical data as
to how this actually happened, they were going “well this doesn’t actually tally with what the current theory is telling us”, so they tried to develop their own explanation or model to explain that. So, they came up with some key concepts, I’ve mentioned this before in the lecture, psychic distance and basically this is anything that disrupts the flow of information and increases the complexity and difficulty in understanding as to what’s going on in a different market. But over time, perhaps you’re fulfilling the internet orders or what have you, as the knowledge and experience increases in that given market, then the firm becomes more comfortable, it has more knowledge about that market, it has more general knowledge about the institutions, the culture, the market structure in those different countries, so it might decide to increase its investment. And that’s what the Uppsala model explains. That as the firm gains knowledge and experience, it learns, and learning helps it to overcome the challenges associated with psychic distance. And as they learn in one market, it means they might be more familiar with what they need to know in other markets. And so, they might then begin to enter other markets that are more psychically distant. They also said “look, these firms need to overcome the liability of foreignness”, so what it said was a foreign investor in a market is an outsider. No one knows them, they maybe don’t trust them, they’re maybe not aware of them, so they need to have a really good advantage to offset that liability of foreignness, right? And the greater the psychic distance, the greater the liability of foreignness. So, when Lidl came to Northern Ireland, Northern Ireland is very conservative, with a very strong agricultural background, and Lidl came and they had all these non-brand name goods, and people are really fussy about their food, you need to have trust, you know, as we saw with the horsemeat scandal and the fish scandal, Tesco was badly damaged for a time. So, people were like “what do you know about that new place? It’s all brands I’ve never heard of, you don’t know if it’s good meat you’ll be getting”, there’s a bit of wariness. And what Lidl did to overcome that liability of foreignness, what they started putting ads round everywhere, in beef from Northern Ireland, they started using local suppliers, because that had built trust in the local market. They started advertising their returns to the local community in terms of charities, and they had your sort of Heinz
ketchup besides other alternatives, and then people were trying some of the lesser-known brands, and saying “that’s really nice, that’s really quite good, and it’s much cheaper than the alternatives”, you had more and more people trying it. So, it had a bit of a liability of foreignness when they first entered that food market in a new area. So, the underlying assumptions of the model are uncertainty and bounded rationality. And I sort of introduced the concept of bounded rationality the lecture one week before. When I said, “when we grow up, and depending on our family and how we’re brought up, and our education and the type of school we go to, and who our friends are and what they’re doing”, it sort of shapes, or puts an invisible boundary round what you think are possible options for you. So as I said, growing up in an area that didn’t have any water round it, not able to swim, being a marine biologist was never something that came across my mind at all, and in later years I was watching a documentary, Blue Planet or something, and I was thinking “why would you ever grow up and sort of thinking, and thought, well obviously, these people are living in a different place with different interests”.

So, bounded rationality, these business leaders, what is psychically distant to one may not be to another, and this explains the differences between some firms that will enter a market and internationalise, and others that won’t. And uncertainty, now that’s taking you back to entrepreneurship, that’s taking you back to Kirzner and taking you back to Schumpeter, and the discussion around uncertainty and opportunity, opportunity identification. So, what they’re saying is, psychic distance is a form of uncertainty, and we know that there is risk and uncertainty have a relationship, where there is great uncertainty, there’s an element of risk, perceived or actual.

(coughs) Sorry. So, the model put forward two change mechanisms, saying first firms change through learning through their operations or current activities in the market. So, it’s experiential learning. And the second is that they change through the commitment decisions they make to strengthen their position in the foreign market. We talked about commitment last week, in terms of the size of the investment, how that impacted on flexibility. So that was the
original model. Hold on one second *(taps the laptop)* there's nothing quite like a diagram, apologies, that buzzing is my dad who's obviously ringing for some sort of IT issue, I get it all the time "I can't print this out!". So, they have knowledge, and here is the market position, haven't got the right one, and this is the outcome. So, the change process is the learning that we discussed, and the commitment decision, yeah, so as they learn more about the market, they feel more confident, psychic distance is reduced. They've built a bit of a presence in the network in that foreign market. So, they feel more comfortable and are better placed in that foreign market, and within the networks there. So, as they gain knowledge, they recognise more opportunities and are more comfortable in increasing their commitment in that foreign market. So, it's something, that knowledge, that learning builds over time, so that's why it's a slow, incremental process, because it takes time to learn and then to process that knowledge and see opportunities in that new space.

So, you were asked to look at four questions, so what we'll do quickly is, if you take 10 minutes to flick through the first few sections of the revisited paper, which you can either download from Moodle if you don't have a hard copy, it’s in the other reading folder.

**STUDENTS TALK BRIEFLY AMONG THEMSELVES**

R: Has everybody signed in? Where’s the sign in sheet? Did you get to sign in?

S: Yes, signed in.

**LONG SILENCE WHILE GROUPS READ THE READINGS, R RESPONDS TO QUESTIONS QUIETLY, AS THEY ARISE IN THE GROUPS. THESE ARE NOT MANY.**

R: OK, at this stage, you should have read enough to answer the first question, so perhaps you want to draw up a few points in your groups.

**FROM MINUTE 40 STUDENT TEAMS TALK AMONG THEMSELVES, R TALKS WITH THEM TO ANSWER QUESTIONS.**

R: That’s a very positive note of encouragement, you are ready then?
S: No, we're not.

R: (laughs).

S: Do you want to hear what we've got? I think this is good! We said that... *(the rest is not audible).*

R: Only thing I would say is, there when you were reading that, and saying "our model", it's not your model!

S: Did we say that? We copied and pasted from...

R: Which is fine, but it just reminds me of something, for when you're actually doing your assignments, be sure not so stick too closely to the wording because we don't want any issues. OK! Anything here?

S: An increase in technology and communication, those new methods of entry have come to light, that there are networks and everything...

R: Yup, exactly, all of that. And basically, the advent of network theory, there was a massive body of literature on that, between '77 and 2002, and essentially a different perspective where markets are actually regarded as networks, and so they felt it was important perhaps. So, how do they incorporate the network perspective into their model, and why do they feel it's necessary, I've sort of answered that for you, because it's been such a body of work. And it was one of the, I suppose, key criticisms. But how do you think they incorporate it, did you get that far in the paper, anyone? How do they incorporate the network perspective into their original model, to come up with the revised model?

S: Well, they were looking at knowledge, what was the words exactly for that. In the first one, it was market knowledge, so instead of putting it as market knowledge, they put it as networks, because they realised that the knowledge of the market came through being involved in that network, so they kind of switched around the wording.

R: Yeah. Yes, yes. Which was quite clever *(laughs).* I think in terms of learning, and
learning was one of the key things they talked about, they said that, it was a really clever critique and defence of their paper, their original paper at the same time, so they said “OK, so lots of people have been critiquing our original model”, saying it doesn’t really take into account behaviour and networks and all of this, but actually, they said networks are really important, and networks really evolve as trust builds and reciprocity builds between different actors in a network. And they said “well, essentially, our model did say that, it just said it implicitly”. So now we’re going to say it outright, and make it very clear, so they said that trust was an outcome of learning in your relationship building, so they really spelled that out in the new model. So, the core argument: markets are networks of relationships, and so insidership is relevant. Insidership in relevant networks is important in internationalisation. So, what they’ve done is, they’ve said OK, their focus in the original model is on the liability of foreignness, but now that we’re thinking of a market as a network of relationships, it’s not so much the liability of foreignness that’s important, that these firms need to overcome, because the market is a network, it’s much more important that they overcome the liability of outsidership. So, they changed the focus, the concept, from liability of foreignness to liability of outsidership. So, they said “if you’re a member of a network, then you’re an insider; you’re inside that network”. And depending on your position, how many contacts you have, how many of you are on LinkedIn? Just, right, so in LinkedIn you can have primary or secondary contacts, so, what this does is, if you have a lot of primary contacts and a lot of secondary contacts, you’ve got quite a large network. And you’re sort of quite central in that network, there’s lots of connections to you. Then you have, obviously, a more prominent position, you’re more central in that network, so you have quite a strong network position, yeah? So, what we’re saying is it’s one thing to be inside the market, inside the network, but if you want to enter into a foreign market, that market in France is a whole array of other relationships and connections, networks, that you may not have a connection in, and so it’s really important to establish some sort of connection in that market, and networking is very important. So, they also said that market relationships offer the potential for learning, but that as you learn, you build trust and commitment, so what
they’ve done is, they’ve said “this was here all along, it just sort of wasn’t spelled out explicitly”.

Anybody come up with anything as to how their thinking might have changed on psychic distance, or do you need to read, I think there might be a subheading called “Psychic distance” in that second paper.

SOME INAUDIBLE CHAT WITH STUDENTS.

R: Right, they talk a lot about opportunity development.

S: (question that is not audible).

R: Well, I’ve sort of answered that. So, because they said that liability of foreignness was less relevant, right, that it was all about this concept of insidership, or the liability of outsidership. Psychic distance was really closely connected with the liability of foreignness, because it was because you were outside of that country, that market, that perhaps there was uncertainty around those institutional structures, regulations, the customs, the language. That you had high levels of psychic distance, and that you would have to overcome that liability of foreignness in the market. So, with this concept of liability of outsidership, that means that things are slightly different. So, what they’ve said is, their change mechanisms are the same, firms will change through the learning process, and where they say that the original operations would, their current activities in the original model would influence the experiential knowledge and foster greater commitment and learning. They said that they change through commitment decisions, but they do that to strengthen their position in the network. So, they’re linking that back to network theory as well.

And they add in the two concepts trust building and knowledge creation. Erm (taps at laptop)

S: (question that is not audible).

R: We’ll cover this in the lecture tomorrow. But did you get as far as reading about the establishment chain? OK, I want you to read then, it’s introduced at the start of the paper, and then have the declining validity of the establishment chain towards the end of the paper. So, I just want you to be clear before we leave as to what the establishment chain is and isn't, and
what the Uppsala model is and isn’t. And then we can link back to the assignment.

QUITE A LOT OF SOFT CHAT FROM ONE STUDENT, NOT AUDIBLE. STUDENTS ASK QUESTIONS.

S: You can’t say everyone who is a small firm is going to do it that way. What do they say to that?

R: That’s very true, and that’s valid, right. So that’s what I’m saying, small firms don’t sit with a textbook and think, “well, we want to expand, we want to increase our profit, our product sales are declining in this country, so maybe it’s time we took our products somewhere else”.

So, what actually happens in a business is, you’ll be sitting looking and you’ll be thinking, “you can recognise opportunities and try to pursue those”, do you actively try to engage in different networks, and there’s loads and loads of different business networks, and that’s part of the reason, it’s because, I used to work as an economic development consultant, and I would have run programmes that would have brought businesses in different areas of the country to come together around a particular topic, like e-commerce, or sustainability, environmental improvements, things like that. But as different businesses are talking, over dinner or during the coffee breaks or whatever, then they’ll sort of go “so what’s your line of business, Oh, right right right, where do you get your chain from?” So, one thing this guy said, “I’ve a contact in France, I get chain from him, and it’s so much per yard or metre or whatever”, and the other guy says, “that’s a third of the price I’m currently paying”. So even just simple things like that, it’s really beneficial to be able to pick other brains and benefit from their experience and contact networks. So, I suppose part of the reason that these things are researched is because academics have to do research, and usually people become academics because they enjoy research...and teaching. And so, sometimes I think, like management was always happening before academics came along to look at what was happening and develop theories. So, what academics have done is, they’ve come along and said, they’ve gone and done the Hawthorne studies and things like that and thought, why is this style of management working, or how could that be improved, and how could we improve the productivity of the workers, so start of
changing how much light is in the area, different things like that, and found out what worked and didn’t work. So oftentimes management theory is developed as a way of describing what’s happening in reality. There’s often a timeline with it, because you’ll see something happening, and then you can go and sort of describe part of it. But your work’s never done because reality is so complex, right, that you can never come up with some sort of theory or model that’s going to describe that complex reality. All you can do is try to pick out the key components of it and try to explain the basic operation of a given thing. And there’s a bit of doubt, I suppose, there’s a management theorist called Morgan, and he talks about, if you think of a spotlight shining on the stage, right, so if you’re shining at the actor doing his whatever, then everything in the background goes black, you don’t see everything else. And that’s the way it is for the lab management theories as well. So, they focus on one particular aspect, or one particular thing. But there’s lots of other things going on there that are all connected and related as well. You know, it’s just the spotlight in network theory is being shone on the networks. So, you know, you’ll have other theories that talk about the importance of knowledge and education and characteristics, so if you think entrepreneurship research, the characteristics of the entrepreneur, the traits of the entrepreneur, the behaviours, then looking perhaps at the resource-based view, that’s actually the resources that they have that determine things.

S: It’s a funny one though, the traits associated with becoming an entrepreneur, you don’t just start with these traits, know what I mean?

R: Yeah, and you don’t need to have them all, do you know, no entrepreneur really has them all (students laugh), as I said, when they started doing research on entrepreneurs, started up in a really wacky things, is it to do with their age, to do with their height, I mean, I don’t know what they were thinking of when they were looking at height, does it depend whether you’re the first child of the family or the second, or the last, so they were looking at birth order, and at all these different things. But you know you look at a lot of things, and a lot of them won’t (inaudible) but some things will, and this adds to knowledge, and as you build this stuff up, the reason I suppose that this is a key area of research, is because if you think of governments,
they’re trying to develop economic policies to try to encourage small business to grow bigger, because then they’ll create employment in their communities, they generate wealth, and the turnover they generate they need to pay tax on. It all helps the national economy, and you know, all your countries are trying to build productivity and innovation. So, governments have been using this Uppsala model for decades now, so a lot of government interventions will be funding to help small firms export, or networking events through regional things, or they’ll take a group of entrepreneurs to trade shows abroad and have the showcase their products and meet people in different markets. So, it’s all pretty much based around this Uppsala model, and if that’s what current policy is still pretty much hinged around interventions, then we need to think every so often, “well, how relevant is that?”.

Specially if we have these born global firms.

S: How is it hinged around it?

R: Because the policy that they develop is to try to get small businesses to grow bigger and bigger and to start a drive for small businesses to export. And so, all the policy interventions will be things like the trade shows and networks and funding to help them to export, trading programmes, start your own business, grow your own business, export development, training programmes, would be offered by local enterprise partnerships. So, the government really tries to push export, really tries to push people along these different sorts of steps in the establishment chain. OK, so the establishment chain is the four steps we mentioned earlier, right, so the establishment chain is based on the research of Johanson and Wiedersheim-Paul, this is in your lecture slides tomorrow. So, whenever they looked at Sandvik and Volvo, they saw this pattern, that there was small ad hoc export, then they had the sales agent in the foreign country, then when sales had reached a solid level and when they were established and had a solid presence in that market, then they increased their commitment in that market, by setting up their own sales office which obviously is a much greater expense, and less flexible. And then at the very end, they would have perhaps a production facility, so they noticed that these were the four main steps. And that pattern of market entry and increase of market
commitment is what’s known as the establishment chain. Yeah? So, the establishment chain is not the Uppsala model, sometimes people get it confused. And in their paper, in the revised second paper, they said “look, people have been critiquing this establishment chain, and saying it’s not really valid” because we can see now that there are in this sort of new era of the internet, online business, online orders, we can see that it isn’t really relevant. People start off by small scale ad hoc export, and just fulfilling an order they got online, but sometimes they actually skip some steps, and they might actually use other modes of entry, that we talked about last week, like licensing or franchising or something like that, or it might be something completely different. Or they might skip the ad hoc export, and have a sales agent in that country, or a sales office. And then we have these international new ventures, or born globals, that really internationalise quite quickly, and they don’t seem to follow these four step-by-step things, according to the establishment chain, so it was getting really heavily critiqued, and people were saying because the establishment chain isn’t as valid now, the Uppsala model isn’t as well. So, in the second paper, these guys come back and say “hold on! Hold on a minute! When it comes to international new ventures and this born global phenomenon, you’ve really been critiquing us heavily here”. And when you look at these, the majority of them aren’t really born global. They’re born regional, they’re not starting up and trading in 20 countries, at the outset, or within the first few years. What they’re doing is maybe starting up, and maybe trading in one, two, three countries sort of, it’s more a regional business, a regional block, as opposed to truly global. So, and we think our model does apply to that, does explain that, in terms of insidership, psychic distance, whatever concept you’re looking at, it does cover that.

And all these people were saying the model was deterministic. What does that mean?

It means that once you started on one step, it means that you had no choice except to go through the other steps. That you could only go up, you couldn’t stop, you couldn’t go back, that when you started ad hoc exporting, you were as much as saying that they were all going to follow this four-step process, which is nonsense, because we know from previous weeks that the majority of small businesses stay small, the majority of UK businesses what they call mice,
and it’s the same in other countries in Europe and the world. So, they said:

no, we don’t think it ever really was deterministic, we just don’t think that people applied
their common sense. But now, to make it easier for people to get, we said we only ever
presumed that people would take the next step and the step after that if market conditions
were right, if there were valuable opportunities there that they could exploit.

So, it’s always been dynamic, but we’ll state that. And they said, “a one-way view of learning
and dependent relationships, that’s how the model was critiqued”. And they said “right, we
recognise that, that was a limitation. We only looked at how learning was done from that firm.
They called it the focal firm in the paper, the firm in focus in the paper that you’re looking at.
And they said:

we only looked to see how that firm learned stuff, but now that we’re thinking of it in terms
of networks, we realise from network theory that if we are in a relationship, if we have some
sort of trade relationship, that I might learn from you, and you might also learn from me. And
then over time, if we keep trading as supplier-user producer-customer, there’s learning to be
done with that interface, yeah? There’s learning, it’s a two-way process.

So, they said we recognise that, so we’ve incorporated trust and commitment. And they said,
“international expansion requires sufficient time for the company to learn and to build that trust
in those relationships”. And perhaps this is person specific, as opposed to firm specific, which
the model at the start really assumed, and was quite firm specific. So, what this means is, if you
have a firm that I start, and you have a firm that my mother starts, right, one of them might be
much more likely to internationalise than the other. Because my mother’s afraid of flying and
doesn’t travel. Whereas I have travelled and worked in different places, people with different
cultures and backgrounds, so whether you call it psychic distance, or look at networks and
connections, mine might be greater than my mother’s. So this is saying “it’s person specific”, so
with some of these born global firms, you might have managers who have worked 10 years in
Canada or Hong Kong, or somewhere like that, they’ve gone back home to America, or Ireland
or England or wherever it is, and so they don’t have that psychic distance, they don’t have that
outsidership because they have contacts in that relevant network. Yeah?

And they also said the establishment chain isn’t actually part of our model, right, our model is really the state and change diagram. This is our model (indicating a diagram) the validity of the establishment chain doesn’t really touch our model. So, it was a nice little bit of fancy footwork there, and putting a wee bit of distance between their concepts and that, and when you think that this paper was written by Johanson and Vahlne, and who came up with the establishment chain? Johanson and Wiedersheim-Paul, so it’s the same guy was involved in both papers, and he’s going “ah yes, that was my earlier work, nothing to do with this”. So, they have changed it, right, so this one now we have knowledge and recognition of opportunities, and realistically, that is a subset of knowledge. Because as you’re familiar with things, you’re more likely to see opportunities, because we know that opportunities are embedded, going back to context. They’ve included relationship aspects, because they’ve said that sometimes, and we’ll talk about this tomorrow, sometimes you’ll have client followership. So, if you have two companies that work together for a long period of time, and one of them internationalises, sometimes they’ll want that key supplier to internationalise as well and have a presence in that foreign market. Because it saves them costs and whatever. And the reason the supplier firm might do that is because it’s a sign of increased commitment to that perhaps very valuable relationship. So, we know about sort of commitment decisions, learning as we’ve said, still the same, but they’ve put in this creating and trust building, because if they want to demonstrate this network focus and the behaviour or effect of aspects to it, and that this is strengthening network position in that market. So, skip that, that’s the summary between the old model, right, in the old model you had current activities, learning, higher level of abstraction, more than experiential learning, and they talk about the emotional, the affect, the emotional dimension of trust building. They’ve made it much more explicit, and they’ve said trust is really, really important. But it takes time to build. So, if you think about friendships you’ve made, if you’re perhaps friends with people you went to school with, and certainly in 10 or 20 years, you’ll still have friends that you met at university. It’s sharing experiences together, it
takes a lot of time to build a trusting and valuable relationship, and I suppose this part of the weakness of this, because the research shows that it can take 5 or 6 years to actually build a relationship and to build your networks. Which is a lot of time, and opportunity cost associated with that.

OK, so knowledge, trust, commitment, was also much more efficient creative process, and what they've tried to do in this paper as well is point to other areas of literature and say "so, in this literature, this was referring to social and intellectual capital". So, social capital is that relationship bit, and the other bit, the intellectual capital, is the knowledge of institutions, the market, the regulations. I'll just give you the heads-up, today I know this is very much like a mini lecture.

That should not have been formal today, it would have been much more you reading and feeding back, but given that only two people had read the papers, that wasn't possible. Next time round it will be you doing the work and talking back.

But OK, in the old model the commitment decisions, the value of the relationship, as I explained, really to imply that the focal firm, the firm you’re looking at, decides to increase or decrease the level of commitment to one or several relationships in its network. Because it isn't just within perhaps one other firm, it could be several firms in that network. Any questions so far, or is this just like (makes a whooshing sound).

S: Asks an inaudible question about the difference between the Uppsala model and the establishment chain.

R: I suppose it’s because the Uppsala model came about because what they were trying to do was, the establishment chain was like, the empirical findings, so they looked at the four case studies, and they said:

right, what's happening in reality, let's describe it. These are our findings that took these four steps, which they put down as their establishment chain. Along these two come, and think we'd better embed this in some sort of theory, how do we explain why is that four steps?
So, what they did was, they put the axes of commitment and knowledge, and they said, it’s all about learning and experiential learning influences commitment, and so they take the next step and the next step. So, they actually incorporated the establishment, and did a bit of fancy footwork, and went “actually, you know, it’s not actually part of our model, this is what our model is”. So, when you read the paper, some bits of it are really quite defensive, and other bits are really like a hit list of people who have criticised their work! “All these people had criticisms about this, and they were wrong!”, you know, it was there all the time. So, they were the ones that linked it in, because they said, “this model that we’re giving you explains why those were the four steps that they found in this paper”.

S: Thank you.

R: No problem. OK, so what are the implications. Basically, the revised Uppsala model says that internationalisation, whether or not it happens, and how it happens, is going to depend on a firm’s relationships and network. That’s pretty much common sense, is it not? Yeah. That’s the other thing that I did try to warn you in Week 1, when it comes to management and entrepreneurship, you know, academics come along and describe reality, and you go “how’s this a theory? This is just common sense!” that’s the nature of it, and the more common sense it is, the better, because if it seems intuitive, you look at it and go “oh yeah”, and you’ll remember that. So, your relationship partner who’s going abroad, or is already abroad, wants that focal firm to follow, to demonstrate commitment to the relationship, and that’s when you get that client followership thing that we were talking about. So, is it applicable? How applicable is it? Or instead of applicability, you might have relevance. How relevant is the Uppsala model? The revised one? Well, the first paper was really relevant to small firms, yeah, because the argument was that the access to information was more relevant as opposed to large companies. Large firms had that centrality in those networks, they had many more primary and secondary connections, so they were able to access information from their network and through their network to other connecting networks, yeah? (to a student).

S: Wasn’t the research that they did for the first paper, wasn’t it based on large firms?
R: Yes.

S: So, wouldn't that...?

R: So, what they're saying now is, that might be more applicable to smaller firms, explaining how they followed those steps to becoming large firms. Because what they did, they did the case studies getting them to trace their steps, so it's like reflection or hindsight. Now they're saying this model would be equally applicable to large or small firms. Because it's really dependent on knowledge and learning, and that's really context specific. So what they're saying is, if you take the four steps out of it, if you're just thinking about those change and state variables, that's sort of pretty common sense process, you learn by doing, entrepreneurs learn by doing, they go into a market, experiential knowledge of that market as they're trading in the market, they gather more knowledge, recognise more opportunities, they think “OK, this could be really valuable, so we'll invest here”. And so, they increase the commitment in that market, and the cycle continues. Providing that market and opportunities are really suitable. So large firms are better informed when they acquire a firm in a market where they're already active. We talked about Walmart coming into the UK through Asda. Experience matters more than size, and acquisitions are not that unusual, so what they're saying is that experience is basically knowledge and learning, it's not to do with if the firm's big or small. This model applies to everyone. Then they have a section which talks about future research, and what I would caution you about is, sometimes students read a paper and think “Oh, happy days, this tells me ideas for future research”. But this paper was written in 2002, so in 2018, if you're writing ideas for future research, dating back to 2002, there's someone has tried some of that already. So don't get caught out by that. Just remember and have the timeline in your head. So...

S: (inaudible question).

R: You don't have to highlight areas of future research, but you could. But if you were going to do that, if you're going to do an all-singing, all-dancing, first-class submission, go to something more recent and look at what they're suggesting would be useful. So, your
question, and how you’re going to excel in it, using course materials we know we’re talking about academic journals, academic articles. Assess the relevance of the Uppsala model to international entrepreneurship today. In order to do that, and what we’ve done today, we’ve done the first half really of your checklist. We’ve looked at what current thinking was, we know what current thinking is, we know about the importance of networks. Tomorrow, we’re going to talk about the three different theories of small firm internationalisation. So, what you’ll say is, just the way that the Uppsala model incorporated network theory into it, to give a revised, all-singing, all-dancing model, yeah, if you look at the born global phenomenon, there’s an article by Coviello in the reading list, and she talks about how the born globals are international new ventures, she frequently calls them, how that and network theory go hand in hand as well. So, network theory isn’t a standalone approach, it complements each of the other two. So, in order for you to really assess the relevance of the Uppsala model today, you’re going to have to look at to some extent the relevance of the born global phenomenon, so perhaps not immediately evident, but when you think about it, when you’re asked to comment how relevant is this model, you have to critique it in terms of the real alternative, yeah, because that’s why that model has been critiqued, people have been going “well we have these international born globals, how does this still work?” So, on the Moodle site, under additional materials for Coursework 1, there is a template that you can use to critically review journal articles as you read them. There’s also a sheet “preparation for seminar”, which most people obviously didn’t see, but what it tells you to do is to look across those different articles to see what are the similarities, what are the differences? We’ve done that today with these two papers. But there are other articles there that critique this stuff. So, you need to do that as well. Hopefully you came in not knowing what the Uppsala model was, hopefully you’ve some idea, hopefully if you go to tomorrow’s lecture it will make more sense because of the set out across the two, and it’s like anything, when you get some familiarity with the terms, the second time you hear them it makes much more sense.

So, any questions? Any questions about the assignment? I will probably add a couple
of slides to this and will put them up by the end of the week. I’ll put them up on Friday evening, and I’ll put a couple of slides about referencing, because that’s really something that is a major issue, and I don’t want it to be a major issue for any of you, yeah? So, you need to use the Harvard referencing system, and you have to make sure that when you’re referencing somebody’s idea, right, it’s not a quote directly from something or someone. When you’re referencing somebody’s idea, you have to, if you talk about someone’s idea, you have to reference it. If you directly reproduce wording from a paper or website or book it needs to be in quotation marks, and you have to have to have the relevant citation. Otherwise, your Turnitin scores won’t be terribly high and there’s going to be issues with plagiarism. And before anybody asks, there is no magic number. I don’t do, "Oh, 10% and above, I’m going to look at it" (laughs). I’ve actually had a submission that was a 99% score on Turnitin, and the 1% of originality was the question that I actually set. I’ve also had a student who handed me my undergraduate coursework (laughs), what a mistake to make. I had to hand it back and say, "I really couldn’t have said it any better myself!". So, you know (laughs), we don’t want any issues. But sometimes people genuinely get the technicalities wrong, so if you put the full stop before you put in the brackets before you cite Johanson and Vahlne, the software doesn’t recognise that Johansen and Vahlne for the stuff before the full stop. And it thinks that quote isn’t referenced yet. So, I actually go through all of the Turnitin reports, and so sometimes someone might have an issue with plagiarism at 9%, just copied a chunk of something and haven’t referenced, and someone can be 20% and it might be just that they haven’t put the full stop in the right place, and they have been trying to reference, but just don’t know how to do it properly. So just spend some time, you don’t want to be losing marks, you don’t want to get into trouble because of plagiarism, you don’t want a mark of zero, and it’s only going to improve your marks across the other modules. Yes (to student).

S: (inaudible question about referencing).

R: If you’re paraphrasing someone else’s work, you still reference it. You just start a paragraph saying, “as Johanson and Vahlne discussed” blah blah blah. And then you can
paraphrase that no problem. So just be really cautious, if you want to ask questions, I'll be happy
to take them, or email me and I'll pin them on at the end of the lecture. Thank you for coming,
I'll see you tomorrow.

S: (inaudible question about working in groups).

R: Well, you are in groups now, it's up to you how you organise it. I would suggest that
you should at least meet up and know who the other people are.
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