1. Know Yourself

You need only claim the events of your life to make yourself yours. When you truly possess all you have been and done … you are fierce with reality. (Scott-Maxwell, 1983: 42)

Can you honestly say that you know yourself by the same way your students know you? This is such a challenging question, perhaps one that can never really be fully answered. It is however, a question worthy of our deep consideration, no matter how long that process may take. For it is in attempting to answer this question that we can close the gap between our own selfhood and that of our student learners. This chapter demands a great deal of you. I ask of you to suspend your search for fancy new tools and/or shiny new ideas from which to renew the contract you maintain with your students. Instead, I challenge you to stay open-minded, to become vulnerable to your greatest asset, that of being yourself.

I have been privileged to meet, and work with hundreds of entrepreneurship educators from all around the world. While their methods and contexts invariably differ, their curiosity to improve for the sake of their students is a commonality they uniquely share. When I initially wrote Teaching Entrepreneurship to Undergraduates and then later Teaching Entrepreneurship to Postgraduates, my intentions were honest, but perhaps a little naïve. My focus was on awakening an intimate awareness of context and also, bringing greater attention to the individuality of our students. While those concerns still remain, my interest in the heart and soul of the educator has intensified. This book addresses this itch, it seeks to awaken in you a passion for mastering a game, which despite being so complex and unpredictable, is so important in the lives of every individual student we serve.

The introductory chapter outlined the challenge of the game. This chapter aims to draw you deeper into your inner world, to levels at which your mastery of the game is possible. EE does not discriminate across specific levels of education, only against those unable to assist students to act upon their curiosities and aspirations. In short, mastery of the game equates to equipping our students with emancipatory abilities. However, be warned, the
road to such freedom for each individual student is strewn with the broken souls of entrepreneurship educators whose spirit was damaged by those students who remained disconnected, perhaps even resentful of the opportunities afforded to them. Just recently I was reminded of this challenge first-hand. Student evaluations received from a class of 300 or so students revealed as many appreciative students as aggrieved students. How we react to such outcomes depends on the skills we develop in mastering the game. This chapter aims to prepare you both offensively and defensively for the challenges that lie ahead.

VULNERABILITY AS CONNECTEDNESS

If you were to describe the special relationship you have held with certain students, how would you explain it to others? Perhaps they are students who are better suited to your chosen approaches? Maybe they are students who have more interest in the subject matter? I would argue, that they are students who have been (for whatever reason) more vulnerable to you in response to your willingness to be vulnerable to them. There are strong arguments that good teaching cannot be reduced to technique, that good teaching is based on your identity, that ultimately when at our best, we teach who we are.

**Figure 1.1** Transitioning towards connectedness
Figure 1.1 illustrates the pathway towards educator–student connectedness that all too often eludes us all. Sometimes as educators we sense a disconnect as our students remain silent, not expressing their dreams and aspirations. We can feel the uncomfortableness of their shyness. During these moments it is easy to fear being an educator. It is easy to lose faith in our ability to educate. It is as if you and any one of your students are like icebergs drifting in the same space, but disconnected in ways that render your association tepid. In figure 1.1, this state is indicated by the limited view the educator and student have of each other. Like icebergs literally, significantly more is hidden from view than can be seen from the surface. The cluster of dots in each triangle signifies the amount of information about the educator and student that is discernable to each other.

Given that we are paid to help others learn, it is important that we can overcome this uncomfortable and dissatisfactory situation of the icebergs. To do so, we must extend our hand, metaphorically speaking. I do this by telling stories of my personal life. These stories may relate to my entrepreneurial failures, rather than my entrepreneurial successes. They may also relate to the difficulties I have experienced as a learner, but rarely my successes in life. They do not constitute war stories in the sense of enabling some form of vicarious learning opportunity\(^3\). Quite the opposite, these stories of my difficulties and life experiences serve to open up myself to my students in the most human of ways, by seeking to make myself vulnerable to each and every student.

In moving myself towards my students I potentially reveal more information (or dots as illustrated in figure 1.1) about myself to the students. I have sought to transcend the subject matter and place a more human context for interaction between us all. This may include sharing a statement of my teaching philosophy with my students well in advance of our first face-to-face meeting. Inevitably, it will involve me yielding some degree of my assumed expertise in the learning environment. Doing so sends a powerful message to the students; while I am keen to help you, you’ll need to help yourself to make the most of the learning opportunity.

My experience is that when I successfully become vulnerable to my students in such a manner, a symbiotic form of connectedness is potentially achievable. Through this type of union, an honest and brave exploration of their passions and aspirations is possible. In figure 1.1 the movement of the student is shown as being equal to the educator’s, with both potentially benefiting from access to more meaningful information (or dots) about each other. In this situation the true identities of the educator and the student are in play and connectedness is possible. That said, it is always acknowledged that we confront much diversity in each cohort\(^4\). As much as we might like to hope that we can employ one overarching strategy to connect with our
students, that will not always be possible. Even in our finest moments of teaching we will notice a few icebergs floating around us, not connected or desirous of engaging with the learning environment. It is in such situations that your abilities as an educator are fully tested by the inherent tangles of teaching.

Rule 2: Be Vulnerable

Being genuinely vulnerable in a learning environment will aid the exploration of multiple ideas/assumptions and increase student engagement.

Our students need to develop and test multiple ideas/assumptions and subsequently sell their thinking to key stakeholders.

Therefore, we need to ensure we are sufficiently vulnerable to our students to ensure we support a process of transformative learning.

THE TANGLES OF TEACHING

I have previously contemplated the potential development of pedagogical content knowledge in the domain of EE. I did so seeking to encourage the reader to consider him or herself as a person first, a learner second, and ultimately as a teacher third. My motivation in doing so was quite simple, we teach who we are, and there can be no ignoring this truism. When we seek to improve our role as educators in our students’ lives, we must always appreciate the importance of our identity in this endeavour.

The idea of pedagogical content knowledge is quite simple, in distinct domains of education; educators differ in their orientation to life, which ultimately impacts upon the curriculum choices they make. In combination with the obvious diversity present in our student cohorts, we expect educational experiences from one student to the next to differ in ways that ultimately change the nature of learning outcomes. However, for those of us operating in the domain of EE, where the diversity of student needs vary greatly, it is especially difficult. Nevertheless, regardless of how tangled your world of teaching becomes, your ability to retain your sense of your identity, to communicate your identity and be the genuine article to your students is critically important.

Recently, I was giving an address to an EE conference. I asked of the educators in attendance: who felt comfortable failing in front of their students? Only a few hands went up. My follow-up question was along the
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lines of: well if you’re not prepared to fail in front of your students, why do you expect them to be prepared to fail in front of you? This line of questioning is central to our challenge of connecting to our students as learners, mentors and supporters. Students are more likely to operate in authentic ways when you also do so. If they sense your educator persona is different from your true identity, they are quite entitled to hold something back from you too.

Palmer identifies three important factors that produce the entanglements that ruin our teaching abilities. First, there is great complexity in the subject area of entrepreneurship. Second, there is great diversity, in terms of backgrounds, abilities, aspirations and learning styles, in the students we meet. Third, we teach who we are. Whether we wish to fully embrace such ideas makes them no less likely to be real. As educators, we bring into our students’ lives our own inner world, one that may be explained and understood, or one that may remain a mystery to all. From within our inner world we develop (subconsciously or consciously) the plot, scenes and characters of a play to which our students themselves perform the lead roles. How this play is reviewed, and how it lives on in the lives of our graduating cohorts should not be left to chance. Let us first consider the context of this play.

The Context of EE

In figure 1.2, the context of the EE educator is illustrated in terms of its total potential scope. The enterprise–entrepreneurship triangle was recently developed to highlight the interrelatedness of eE and Ee. Highlighting accepted differences associated with teaching entrepreneurship and enterprise (QAA, 2018) provides the means to contextualise different approaches to EE. However, consistent with this book’s introductory chapter, no attempt is made to elevate, in terms of importance, either the enterprise or entrepreneurship zones over the other. In terms of understanding the context, both zones are viewed as complementary to the other. As a result, we can celebrate equally the importance of new venture creation and transformative learning and everything that occurs in between. In the context illustrated above, eE aligns to the enterprise zone, whereas, Ee aligns to the entrepreneurship zone.
In reality, few programmes are expected to do both exceptionally well. A closer look at figure 1.2 reveals some of the reasons for why this may be so. First, the assumption that EE encourages an acceptance of failure is clearly problematic. It is not responsible of educators to facilitate authentic student learning related to genuine start-up activities that will most likely see individual students incur financial and/or psychological losses, for the purposes of learning. Alternatively, failing a task, and being consciously aware of failure in one’s life, can be a powerful learning experience in the domain of EE; which brings us to rule 3.

**Rule 3: The Opportunity to Fail**

We fail our students when we don’t provide opportunities for failure in their EE studies.

Our students fail themselves when they avoid failure at all costs.

*Therefore, we must design into our EE curriculums specific opportunities to fail, reflect and recover.*

Second, EE is fundamentally aimed at producing transformational education...
outcomes by supporting students to transcend concepts and ideas through personal experience. Therefore, a process of transformational learning is required to support individual students tackle their life’s dilemmas, transforming their meaning perspectives along the way. Conversely, Ee, viewed as business creation, is transactional in nature; it is about acquiring and efficiently using scarce resources to create a viable venture, using a series of processes (or steps) to achieve a specific outcome.

Central to the logic of the enterprise–entrepreneurship triangle is the importance of ensuring that students develop wisdom of their inner world, so as to enable future adjustments between their inner and outer worlds. Likewise, developing an acute awareness of one’s inner world, relative to the elements of one’s outer world, and how those elements combine in important causal ways, gives rise to the potential development of situation awareness, so important when seeking to conceive, create and capture new value in any eE or Ee context, when conceiving, creating and attempting to capture new value (Jones, 2011). Now we have briefly considered the broad context within which we all play a specific role, let us consider the nature of the students we typically encounter.

**Students of EE**

I have previously spent considerable time explaining the observable diversity that is present within our student cohorts. To any serious educator, it should be patently obvious that our students differ in their backgrounds, abilities, aspirations, and degrees of interest and effort. Such observable differences inspired the early works of Dewey and those who have championed freedom and individuality within the curriculum since. While we cannot guarantee that every student will cross the same finishing line, at, or in the same time, we can seek to guarantee all student of EE an equal opportunity to develop towards their full potential.

Any attempt to standardise (in any way) or to see our students’ development as collectively converging upon a specific point in time vis-à-vis their knowledge and/or skills works directly against the current of ever-present diversity. Not surprisingly, Palmer sees the ease with which educators become entangled in the honest pursuit of efficient ways to be all things to all students. From my perspective, it is possible, although not easy, that we can be many things to many different students; but there is a price to pay.
The Selfhood of the Educator

This section comes with a warning; be careful what you wish for, it just may end up costing you more than you could have imagined. Over the course of nearly two decades teaching EE, I have gained as many admirers as detractors. Sadly, most of the detractors, often very silent with their concerns, are closely connected to the processes governing aspects of my teaching. Alternatively, most of the admirers, often very vocal with their praise, are not connected to the processes governing aspects of my teaching. I tell you this, to ensure you are aware that to authentically explore the inner landscape of your life, to summon the courage to teach who you are, will most likely deliver both negative and positives outcomes.

It is not particularly normal for schools to encourage diversity to flourish; much easier to manage a herd heading in the same direction. Yet, this is the exact opposite dynamic required to support the individuation of the individual, be that an educator or student. Therefore, a challenge exists not only to discover your selfhood, and to be able to use it to the advantage of your students’ learning, but, to also communicate it in ways that are compatible with your surrounds. That is, to use your self-knowledge to the advantage of both yourself and your students.

I challenge you, whilst reading this book, to visit appendix 5 and write a short story of yourself, your approach to life and how it influences your finest teaching. I further challenge you to dwell on those aspects that may until now have been untouched and unexplained in terms of your scholarship of teaching and learning. Where is your heart in this process, your recognition of your values, and your sense of identity? Patricia Cranton, drawing on the work of Daryl Sharp, argues that the process of individuation requires ‘fidelity to the laws of one’s being’ in order to enable ‘the segregation of the individual from the undifferentiated and unconscious herd’. Herein lies your greatest challenge as an educator in the domain of EE. If you wish for your students a transformative learning experience, how can you assist this process at the level of the individual student if you have not had the courage to find yourself through the same process?

This is what I interpret Palmer’s courage to teach as; a never-ending journey to find, refine and employ one’s identity to the betterment of our students’ futures. To prepare for your EE students, ask yourself, who is the self that teaches them? Who is the self that transcends any amount of teaching techniques? Who is the self, who in other life contexts can communicate with and support others in complex and challenging environments? This self that you possess already exists, but perhaps not just in your educator life. The reality is, at your best, you have the power to create the conditions for individuals and groups of individuals to learn in ways that
advance their ability to know themselves and importantly, to see their outer world in new and exciting ways.

The Antecedents of Your Teaching Philosophy

I guess by now, you have been required to articulate your teaching philosophy. Perhaps you were seeking recognition of your teaching practice, or perhaps you were seeking promotion, or, a new job. Whether explicitly recognised or not, any authentic articulation of one’s teaching philosophy is an expression of one’s values, of one’s selfhood. I doubt too many teaching philosophies 1) make it explicitly clear who is the self that teaches, and/or 2) are shared equally with our students and colleagues in the complete form. Personally, I pride myself on doing this; I need to have an authentic starting position from which to establish sufficient connectedness with all my students. Does it always work? No, it doesn’t. Does it do any harm? No, it doesn’t. Does it set the tone for honest and respectful interaction? Yes, it does.

There is no shortage of books and other forms of guidance as to styles of teaching, techniques of teaching, or student learning styles and appropriate responses. All of these materials mistakenly demote the importance of your selfhood. These materials implicitly ignore the importance of your own orientation to life, and its contribution to your teaching philosophy and its enactment in the lives of your students. Following the lead of past work on pedagogical content knowledge, we could speculate as to the types of orientations to teaching EE. In the domain of science education, we might contemplate orientations to process, academic rigour, conceptual change, discovery, project-based learning and so on. But this would be the same as equating the orientation of EE educators as being concerned with understanding theory, personal development, competency development, societal growth or venture creation. Any such areas of focus or belief are merely the epiphenomena of the educator’s underlying orientation to life, or the self of the educator if you like.

You may develop a substantial array of techniques and approaches to aid your students’ learning, but ultimately, the choice of which to use and when, will always be maximised through choices occurring at the intersections of your and their selfhoods. It is through this connectedness that you can truly understand how each student’s needs vary, and how present you need to be at each stage of their learning. I feel the best description of this method is that of heuristic generalisation, used in the context of EE to imply a process of elevating observable student–educator interactions above popular single process approaches to ensure reactivity to emerging phenomena. In this way, we celebrate the vulnerability and curiosity of all in the learning
environment. Palmer\textsuperscript{22} believes we trust one’s self when we are able ‘to keep one’s heart open in those very moments when the heart is asked to hold more than it is able so that teacher and students and subject can be woven into the fabric of community that learning, and living, require’.

Clearly, the inherent complexity of value creating activities work against pre-determined approaches, providing an opportunity for your identity as an EE educator to flourish at the intersection of the inner and outer forces that constitute your students’ learning environments. None of this is easy; trial and error learning and an openness to learn \textit{in situ} are very important practices to role model. But just as the traffic police get used to, and skilled at directing the flow of traffic, so can we provide leadership by establishing a connectedness to the constant flow of ideas, actions and reactions occurring around us as our students explore their unknown outer worlds. Perhaps the biggest challenge for many educators is self-identifying their self in the context of their professional life.

\textbf{INTRODUCING YOURSELF AUTHENTICALLY}

So we have dealt with those factors most likely to create entanglements for you as an EE educator; the complex context, the diversity of your students, and your own emerging sense of self. An opportunity presents itself for you to explain your vocational choice and how this work fulfils your selfhood. From where has your inner voice grown, and to whom does it seek to reach? Daryl Sharp\textsuperscript{23}, drawing on Jung’s notion of vocation, aligns one’s true personality to a vocational calling. I relate to this, and see this disposition amongst many of my fellow EE educators. I suspect nearly every EE educator could teach in a simpler context, could just go through the motions for the same financial reward, but it would seem that we tend to be driven by an irrational factor to help others find the means to pursue their passions.

How does this sit with you? I hope you sense a calling to the domain of EE, and are not being pushed into this apace against your free will. Even for the committed, it is a tough space to survive in, let alone the uncommitted. Your role in the domain of EE is of the highest importance, regardless of what we may say privately about student-centred learning, self-determined learning and/or self-directed learning throughout the book, all of these desirable outcomes are greatly influenced by you. As Palmer\textsuperscript{24} famously stated, ‘I have no question that students who learn, not professors who perform, is what teaching is all about … [however] … teachers possess the power to create the conditions that can help students learn a great deal—or keep them from learning much at all’. Further, as a role model, you can set
the tone for what’s to come; you can demonstrate and encourage humility. Which brings us to rule 4.

Rule 4: The Importance of Humility

Our students will never be fully responsible for their successes.

Our students will never be fully responsible for their failures.

Therefore, we must help them to share success and move on from failure.

Whether you have been a serial entrepreneur, a full-time educator without business or value-creation experience, an opportunity exists for you to relate to the creation of new value. Developing your selfhood in this domain of education requires of you a philosophical disposition to find analogies and metaphors to build bridges between current reality and the unknown worlds you and others will imagine and seek to create. This is a common area where many educators feel less in comparison to others who by their own accounts have conquered great obstacles and have the scars to prove it.

As Dr. Seuss apparently noted, today you are you, that is truer than true. There is no one alive who is youer than you. What life experience around change and dealing with complexity do you have? Personally I have always found many parallels between the process of love and entrepreneurship, which brings us to rule 5.

Rule 5: Love is Everywhere

Entrepreneurship like love proceeds through a series of human emotions, curiosity, passion, vulnerability and trust.

Our students are all humans.

Therefore, we need to ensure our students have the opportunity to develop curiosity, passion, vulnerability and trust as it relates to their adventuring.

Such emotion is common in all our lives and our familiarity with it can be exploited to enable you to present yourself authentically. I always think of the pre-contact communications I send my students as metaphoric handshakes. I envisage myself extending a hand of friendship in such a way that my students will become curious about me. They will sense my passion. They might sense my willingness to be vulnerable to them, and hopefully they may find the courage to trust themselves, the learning environment, their
fellow students and myself. To the extent that I succeed, and there are no guarantees, I have laid the groundwork for further enabling my selfhood to be revealed and further developed in the lives of my students.

You are the most influential player in the EE game, the other players will come and go, but you will remain player one, always. Returning to the starting point of this chapter, are you ready to claim the events of your life, to possess all you have been and done, so that you can be fierce with reality? Doing so requires of you serious candour, it may mean rewriting your history a little to allow for the productive development of your inner autobiography. You can incorporate your revision notes by visiting appendix 5 where you can draft your story of self (your essential you-ness), as it is germane to the learning outcomes of your students. A good starting point is to think of the four words that best describe your character. Then, give some thought to the extent that these character traits are variable or constant across different contexts. What does that tell you about your true self being present in the different contexts aligned to your students’ learning? When you think about your development over time as an educator, to what extent are these four traits natural to you historically, or actively developed towards a strategic end?

In summary, you have it within yourself to become a master of yourself. To understand the drivers of your development, and to recognise those factors that stay unaltered through time and those that are open to change. You don’t have to become someone else to be a better educator, but you most likely will need to become a fuller version of yourself to become a great EE educator. It is now time to consider the nature of the playing fields within which your game will be played.

DEVELOPING YOUR APPROACH

There are no shortcuts here. A motivating factor for me in writing this book is to hopefully move educators away from what Lee Shulman terms an apprenticeship of observation (where the practice of others is copied) towards a journey of scholarly discovery. As you work through this book, I hope you will encounter many moments where you sense a need to reflect on issues that you have yet to really dive into, or other issues where you feel the need to revisit past thinking. Use the space provided in appendix 3 to record your thinking. Be warned, my thoughts and the ideas of other educators you will encounter throughout the book have matured over many years of trial and error, frustration and joy. Don’t expect to have all the answers fall into place,
we all have to develop a deep appreciation of self to move onwards and upwards in the domain of EE.

NOTES

1 Parker J Palmer (1998) discusses the idea of the educator’s selfhood, or, who is the self that teaches?
2 Parker J Palmer (1998) argues that good teaching comes from the self, not from technique.
3 See Neck, Greene and Brush (2014) for an insightful consideration of the use of war stories in EE.
4 See my earlier discussion of student diversity in Jones (2011).
5 My consideration of Shulman’s (1986) pedagogical content knowledge in Jones (2013) represents the first of its kind in the EE literature.
6 I wholeheartedly believe Palmer’s (1998) ideas have more significance in the domain of EE due to the greater variance in context our students learn within and the amazing variety of backgrounds our educators emerge from.
7 The enterprise-entrepreneurship triangle emerged through a series of scholarly conversations I enjoyed with Andy and Kath Penaluna. The fruits of our thinking have been shared in a couple of initial conference papers (Jones, Penaluna, Penaluna and Matlay (2017) & Jones, Penaluna and Penaluna (2018)), and also informed the development of the ‘gateway’ triangle in the recent QAA (2018) guide for enterprise and entrepreneurship education.
9 See the works of Hart (2001), Lindeman (1926) and Dewey (1913; 1916) regarding the importance of transcending ideas through personal experience.
10 See Mezirow (1978).
11 See Aulet (2013), Disciplined Entrepreneurship.
12 See Veblen (1922) on the importance of being able to continually adjust one’s inner world to one’s outer world, to ensure personal progress in the context of one’s life.
13 See Endsley (1995) regarding the importance and process of developing situational awareness to ensure comprehension of one’s outer world.
14 See Jones (2011) for a detailed discussion on the 4Cs process of value creation in EE.
15 Again, see Jones (2011) Teaching Entrepreneurship to Undergraduates for a detailed consideration of identifying and exploiting diversity in student cohorts.
16 See Dewey (1899) The School and Society.
17 Bray and McClaskey (2015) provide an excellent overview of the main educational theorists that have championed the importance of student individuality.
18 See Jung (1921) Psychological Types.
See Magnusson, Krajcik and Borko (1999) for an insightful consideration of the development of pedagogical content knowledge in the domain of science education.

The idea of heuristic generalisations was developed by Walter and Hengeveld (2014) in their work on autecology.


See Sharp’s (1995) discussion of vocation and the notion of the inner voice.


Baggini (2011) *The Ego Trick*, provides a fascinating account of what it is that constitutes our underlying self.

See Lee Shulman (2005) and his insightful work on signature pedagogies.