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In the current global socio-economic development corporate success emphasizes social benefits in addition to financial profit gains brought by entrepreneurial actions (Wilenius & Kurki, 2015; Tracey & Phillips, 2007; Driver, 2012). Social entrepreneurship education is both a new territory in higher education and a rapidly growing field for research (Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010; Higgins, Smith, & Mirza, 2013). With more than 148 institutions worldwide teaching about social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship education (SEE) is moving from a wave of growth into a wave of innovation (Brock & Kim, 2011). Educators are expected to take responsibility for SEE by cultivating innovative ways of thinking and modes of pedagogy (Higgins, Smith, & Mirza, 2013).

In this thesis I theorize educator professionalization based on a self-study of my practice in SEE curriculum development. This project accounts for the start one of the first post-graduate programmes in social entrepreneurship in Brazil. I participated in this project in 2015 as an undergraduate student of educational sciences in the University of Oulu, Finland. Integrating the grounded theory methodology (GTM) and self-study of practice (SSP), I examined data generated during the ten months of social entrepreneurship curriculum development. As a self-study I share my understanding of how SEE curriculum development may contribute to educator professionalization. From a GTM perspective this study contributes to the knowledge basis in SEE by theorizing educator professionalization.

Studies on professionalism and professionalization acknowledge work quality as directly influenced by the professional (Jóhannesson, 1996) Meanwhile the context for professional practice strongly influences professional development (Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015a). Such reciprocity is confirmed by my theorizing in this study. Furthermore, reflection is examined as a practice in professional development (Schön, 1983; Kalet et al., 2007; Rué, Font, & Cebrián, 2013), and particularly in educator professionalization (Cautreels, 2003; Gillentine, 2006). Extant literature on cosmopolitanism (Josephides, 2000; Mikhaylov & Fierro, 2015; Smith & Jenkins, 2011), reflexivity (Sandywell, 1996; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002), and compassion (Miller, Wesley, & Williams, 2012; Neff & Vonk, 2009) are utilized to increase the scope of the theory I generate via this study.

This study contributes to SEE in two ways. First, the self-study of practice illustrates how challenges for SEE (Miller et al., 2012; Sinha et al., 2014; Tracey & Phillips, 2007) are encountered in curriculum development. Secondly, the grounded theory in this study offers directions for future research in educator professionalization in the field of social entrepreneurship education.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Social entrepreneurship education (SEE) is moving from an era of growth with regard to number of courses and programmes, to an era of innovation (Brock & Kim, 2011). Regardless of the abundance of scholarly attention, there has been a lack of clear and consistent theorizing on the topic (Naia et al., 2014; Pache & Chowdhury, 2012). In this thesis I theorize empirical data generated through a project in social entrepreneurship curriculum development. The curriculum developed in relation to this study gave rise to the beginning of a postgraduate programme. With management and leadership as key components alongside social impact and networking, this is one of the first programmes in Brazilian higher education which is dedicated to social entrepreneurship. In the first section of this chapter I give more details on the creation process of this postgraduate programme.

This is a self-study of practice (SSP) as well as a grounded theory study. The collaboration in curriculum development not only offered an authentic experience in learning about SEE. Meanwhile it allowed me to create a systematic understanding of my professionalism as an educator. My reflection upon the interaction with my teammates not only informed my practice in curriculum development, but it also generated data for the following theorization. The first phase of theory construction contributed to an understanding of my educator professionalism in SEE. The second phase in theory constructed up-scaled the emergent theory by bridging it with a broader spectrum of literature in professionalization. At the end of this chapter I provide an overview of the components of this thesis.

1.1 The Teamwork and the Team

This study had been inspired not by theoretical literature, but by an initiative in creating one of the first social entrepreneurship postgraduate programme in Brazil. In July 2014, a social enterprise in a southern state of Brazil published a research study. The study engaged more than 150 persons from 36 organizations. Participants in the study included experts in the social field, influential persons in foundations, and social entrepreneurs. Interviews revealed areas participants found most important for social entrepreneurship development: strategic thinking, sustainable management, network formation and collaboration, and knowledge dissemination. The social enterprise which funded this research is a social business Legacy (henceforth referred to as Legacy) which provides training and
networking opportunities for local entrepreneurs. Based on the results of this pilot research, the chairpersons of Legacy proposed partnership to a higher education institution (henceforth referred to as HEI) in the same region to develop an education programme. Cooperation between Legacy and HEI began at the end of 2014. Their common aim was to create the first postgraduate programme in Brazil dedicated to social entrepreneurship education. The Teamwork I address throughout this thesis refers to curriculum development for this programme.

Legacy was represented by Nastássia in the Teamwork. Nastássia maintained contact with participants of the pilot research to gather feedback for the social entrepreneurship programme curriculum. She also established and further developed partnerships with individuals and organizations which would offer mentorship, training, and placement opportunities to students in the postgraduate programme.

HEI was represented in the Teamwork by Paulo. The institution’s responsibilities covered provision of physical space as well as facilities for teaching, procedures for student admission and certification, and programme finance. Paulo’s main responsibilities included the design of a course catalogue, as well as pedagogical arrangements. It is noteworthy that many of the tasks in the Team involved all three of us. For example, partnerships established by Nastássia contributed to pedagogy, course material, and admission criteria.

I joined the Teamwork at the beginning of 2015. By the time of our meeting with Nastássia, where I heard about the Teamwork I had been living in Brazil for half a year. During that time I fostered strong appreciation for the people, and the cultural and historical heritage of the southern state I stayed in. In addition to this emotional bond, my everyday observations, conversations with locals, and the mainstream Brazilian media each played a part in my aspiration of fueling positive social change through the Teamwork. My participation in the Teamwork was voluntary and not-for-profit.

I returned to Finland after meeting Nastássia. The collaboration with Nastássia and Paulo for developing the postgraduate programme lasted for over ten months in 2015. During this period I maintained regular contact with my teammates through emails, online conferences, and social media applications. Topics we discussed with regard to the curriculum included tuition and scholarship, admission criteria, evaluation of learning of the postgraduate programme’s social impact, as well as specific course contents and learning formats.
I consider Nastássia and Paulo as collaborators in this research. Without the Teamwork, it would not have been possible to reflect upon and theorize my practices. Paulo and Nastássia have contributed to this research also by allowing me to archive and analyze records of our communication. The use of their names in this thesis is based on Nastássia’s and Paulo’s consent.

1.2 Why Theorize Educator Professionalization In and For SEE?

This study has been designed to answer the following questions:

1. What, and how, does the Teamwork reveal about my professional practice as an educator, and
2. How does this study contribute to SEE from a perspective of educator professionalism and professionalization?

My first reason for conducting this study roots in my intrinsic motivation to gain a clear and concise understanding of my professionalism based on practical experience. Intercultural competence (Jokikokko, 2010), experiential learning (see Chang, Benamraoui, & Rieple, 2014), and the habit of reflection existed among ideologies embedded in my study programme (see University of Oulu, n.d.). In addition I had internalized a set of values in relation to educator ethics which are reminiscent to those of my mentor in the programme (see Järvelä, 2000). Considering myself as a professionalizing educator, I was curious to challenge and modify what I had learned what would be mirrored in my practice in the Teamwork. Moreover, by participating in the Teamwork I had aspired to contribute to the well-being of people in the region in Brazil where I had stayed for half a year, and where the postgraduate programme would be launched.

The find out what elements of the knowledge, skills, and values would be relevant for social entrepreneurship curriculum development was the other motivation for conducting this study. This research purpose required me to study the Teamwork from two perspectives. As a participant in social entrepreneurship curriculum development I focused on the content of the Teamwork. Interaction with my teammates Paulo and Nastássia, as well as independent learning were reflected upon as my educator practice in SEE. This content and the theorization of it addresses the relevance of my practice in the Teamwork as a particular example of SEE. The other aspect in finding relevance between educator professionali-
zation and SEE lies in the interrogation of reflection as a method to develop professionalism. In this respect it is necessary to review literature associating this study with the field of SEE research.

On a global level, social entrepreneurship education has seen a rapid growth in the number of courses, projects, as well as programmes (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012). According to Brock and Kim (2011) this trend has been permeating multiple disciplines in higher education for the past two decades. The presence of social entrepreneurship in high education may be considered a double-edged sword. On the one hand, the integration of an entrepreneurial spirit in the academy has been held responsible for the commercialization of higher education which prioritizes economic prosperity over the social good (Lambert, Parker, & Neary, 2007). On the other hand, social entrepreneurship education carries potential in transforming capitalist societies through the redefinition of profit and value creation (Driver, 2012).

Like entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship involves both theory and practice (see Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010; Huq & Gilbert, 2013; Zahra et al., 2009). However, social entrepreneurs have been considered to operate in a different context in comparison to traditional entrepreneurs (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012; Tracey & Phillips, 2007). There is controversy and overlapping in the conceptualization of entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship. In academic research social entrepreneurship exists as a stand-alone focus for scholars (see finSERN, n.d.; Dacin, Dacin, & Matear, 2010). In entrepreneurship education social entrepreneurship is occasionally treated as a topic area (see Nielsen et al., 2012), even though social entrepreneurs face distinct challenges in comparison to entrepreneurs (Tracey & Phillips, 2007). Business school curricula constitute a potential site for creating legitimacy for social entrepreneurship. While entrepreneurship does not readily provide solutions to all social problems, characteristics formerly considered unique to social entrepreneurship are gaining legitimacy across different forms of business. (Driver, 2012)

In some learning environment in SEE teachers are expected to take on the role of entrepreneurship educators (see Hytinkoski, Kiilavuori & Seikkula-Leino, 2012). Although educators play a crucial role in SEE by engaging learners in the formation of a social entrepreneur identity, there has been a lack of coherent knowledge which would inform educator practice in SEE (Driver, 2012; Naia et al., 2014; Smith & Woodworth, 2012). This study and my theorization of educator professionalization responds to this gap in SEE research.
1.3 Thesis Overview

The working order in this study moves from a description of practice to theorization. The Teamwork experience not only drew my attention toward features of my professional practice, but it also allowed me to conceptualize them via this study. Before taking a closer look at examples of the data retrieved from the Teamwork in social entrepreneurship curriculum development, I present in chapter 2 the methodologies utilized for data collection and analysis. I also briefly explain technical and interpretive procedures involved in theory construction and for increasing the scope of abstraction of the theory.

I present extracts of data from the Teamwork in chapter 3, in connection to three theoretical subcategories developed for the theory of my professional practice. By elaborating on the relations among these subcategories I construct a substantive theory (see Littlejohn & Foss, 2011). In chapter 4 I bridge this emergent theory with extant theoretical literature on educator professionalism. The theorizing of educator professionalization in and for social entrepreneurship takes place in chapter 4, where I relate aspects of the Teamwork-based theory to academic writings on cosmopolitanism, reflexivity, and compassion. A theoretically dialogical version of the theory is presented at the end of this chapter.

I evaluate the methodology soundness of this study in chapter 5, by discussing how well the integrated use of self-study of practice and grounded theory methodology has served the research purposes. In the same chapter I also consider ethical issues related to my participation in the Teamwork as well as to the effects of this study. Chapter 6 includes a discussion on theoretical resonance between this study and extant knowledge in SEE.

This thesis has been an exercise of finding balance. One challenge lies in communicating with parsimony while capturing the authentic complexity inherent to the research trajectory. I faced a choice of presenting the research in a chronological order, where data analysis and theorization would be constantly enriched by new information I come upon. On the one hand, this style of presentation would have been coherent with my understanding of the grounded theory methodology: there is ever more to be explored, integrated, and used for challenging the researcher’s own interpretations and constructions. On the other hand I had aimed to meet standards of academic writing where clear and concise language often adds to a text’s comprehensibility - if not its convincingness. The structural arrangement of contents in this thesis is a result of negotiating and experimenting between alternatives.
2 GROUNDING THEORY IN A SELF-STUDY

Methodologically this study relies on SSP (see Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009), constructivist grounded theory (see Charmaz, 2006; 2009; 2013), as well as multi-grounded theory (Thornberg, 2012), and applied grounded theory methodology (GTM) (Urquhart, 2013). In the previous chapter I clarified two purposes of this research. First, to gain an understanding of my professionalism through collaborating with Paulo and Nastássia in the Teamwork. Second, to contribute to the extant body of knowledge in the field of social entrepreneurship education. To respond to respective research questions I integrated two methodologies throughout different phases of this study. The data collection phase involved participating in the Teamwork as a member of curriculum development and a researcher of her own practice. I provide more detail on the procedure in the first section of this chapter. Consecutive phases in this study include reviewing and analyzing data generated from the Teamwork. In the latter section of this chapter I explain how I have done so by applying strategies in the grounded theory research tradition.

2.1 What Make This a Self-Study of Practice?

Within the field of education self-study corresponds to an inquiry on the implications of being a scholar of one’s own practice (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009; Hamilton et al., 1998, viii). The Teamwork offered an environment in which I could study my practice in relation to curriculum development. Professional curiosity motivates the researcher-practitioner to explicate as well as to improve their actions (LaBoskey, 2005; Vanasse & Kelchtermans, 2015b). Considering my research interest in understanding about my professionalism, the motivation for this study corresponds to what is common among self-study researchers.

One feature of self-study of practices (henceforth referred to as SSP) is that it employs multiple, and often qualitative, methods. These methods include dialogue as a foundation for knowing. (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009; Lunenberg & Samaras, 2012) My collaboration with Paulo and Nastássia consisted of online communication facilitated by emails and online conference media. My participation in this dialogue during the ten months is a major part of my curriculum development practice. With respect to the research questions this dialogue enabled me to acquire and construct knowledge about my professional practice as well as about social entrepreneurship education. Keeping a journal on the Teamwork was
the other qualitative method applied in data collection. Reflection becomes self-study of practice when the process and outcome of are made transparent to public (LaBoskey, 2005). I elaborate on these methods for data collection in section 2.1.2.

Besides motivation and data collection methods, what makes this a self-study of practice is the knowledge work the researcher-practitioner has been engaged in. Three types of knowledge are involved in SSP: knowledge-in-practice, knowledge-of-practice, and knowledge-for-practice (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). This study involves all these three forms of knowledge. Knowledge-in-practice refers to an inquiry which would reveal or develop one’s knowledge in a particular practice (ibid.). The subject of practice in this study is social entrepreneurship curriculum development, which I expected to reveal and develop my professionalism as an educator.

Knowledge-of-practice refers to an understanding of professional learning (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). The Teamwork was equivalent to a ten-month learning process. With an aim to develop a postgraduate programme in social entrepreneurship which would be relevant to its geo-political context, I had to learn about various topics related to the curriculum development. I also learned about, and from, working with my teammates. Continuous learning is a central component of self-study research (Lunenberg & Samaras, 2012) as well as for my participation in curriculum development.

Knowledge-for-practice in self-study research corresponds to assertions for action and understanding (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009; Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015a, 2015b). As knowledge claims based on practical experience this form of knowledge resonates with what LittleJohn and Foss (2011) describe as practical theory. Practical theory comprises of concepts, patterns, explanations, and principles synthesized based on these theoretical relations. In this study the knowledge-for-practice and practical theory I construct are grounded in data generated during the Teamwork. By illustrating an understanding of how my educator professionalism evolved, I offer assertions for future actions in social entrepreneurship curriculum development.

Critical reflection of one’s practice becomes a self-study of practice only when it becomes accessible by a critical audience (LaBoskey, 2005). By making personal practical knowledge available to an audience I publicly assert ownership and responsibility for my practices in the Teamwork and the research on them (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p.13).
2.1.1 What count as data in this research

In this section I explain how data in this study contribute to the three forms of knowledge mentioned for self-study research. Knowledge-in-practice is manifested as both primary and secondary data originating from the interaction between Paulo, Nastássia and me. Emails exchanged between us - including notes from our online conferences - recorded our decision-making processes. In addition we utilized external information sources in the discussions about the postgraduate programme. Primary data are emotions, opinions, and narratives of experiences expressed in the Teamwork interaction. Secondary data involved academic and non-academic publications, news and company websites, statistics databases, as well as references to events. Primary data were archived as electronically written text. Secondary data was not archived for this study.

Knowledge-of-practice was constructed and archived as my personal reflective journal (henceforth referred to as RJ). In the RJ I reflected on knowledge-in-practice by paraphrasing my teammates and recollecting incidents in our collaboration. I evaluated the communication with my teammates, why I considered certain objectives worthy of pursuing in curriculum development, and how my teammates and I reacted to one another’s suggestions. This set of primary data was also archived as electronically written text. The chart below summarizes the types of data and their sources in this study.

Table 1. Summary of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotions, opinions, narratives of factual information and personal experiences</td>
<td>Meeting notes taken from online conferences</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(same as above)</td>
<td>Written emails</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(same as above)</td>
<td>My reflective journal (RJ)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles, publications, news, statistics, company websites, events</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three objectives guided my practices in the Teamwork: facilitating equal access to resources, enhancing programme financial sustainability, and creating immediate impact. During the collaboration with Nastássia and Paulo I employed different communication
strategies to pursue these objectives. Toward the end of the Teamwork decisions were made for the postgraduate programme in social entrepreneurship, inter alia student admission criteria, tuition, as well as evaluation of learning in, and the social impact of, the postgraduate programme. Table 2 on the next page presents excerpts from these topic areas to illustrate the primary data involved in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Examples of primary data archived from the Teamwork.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emails</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The 10% idea is interesting, but something we can discuss after having the first months of experience with the budget. No, the entire program costs R$10,729.50 that can be paid in 20 installments. But it is the same "solidarity" price for all. | Pricing & Tuition  
-Qiqi had looked up an article on the accessibility and affordability of tertiary education in Brazil (World Bank, 2008), where affordability is considered in the light of education costs (e.g. registration fee), living costs, grants (e.g. scholarships), loans and tax breaks. | Remembering what Paulo has said earlier to be the average tuition of [HEI’s] post-graduate programmes, the tuition of the [programme] is around 76.6% of that price. Although I cannot verify direct causal relationship between the pricing...and our discussions about student-friendly tuition, scholarships and various models for pricing, the tuition appearing lower than average is good news! |
| Paulo, here are the studies I referred to yesterday:  
...The "learning--by--doing" (e.g. fund-raising projects) can enhance both knowledge about entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial skills:  
...Learning--by--doing as an approach to teaching social entrepreneurship... | Programme evaluation  
-Qiqi shared a word document so we define and make accountable, for the program evaluation: what are our expectations? Why? What bases them? - ...four criterias: 1. Psychological safety: how to have a good atmosphere that students feel fine and trust to share their ideas, ask questions, avoiding discrimination and bullying 2. Reflective thinking: gender / social class / age / ethnicity / educational level 3. Community practise - sense of belonging 4. Techniques - for social entrepreneurship learning > Nas thinks to have psychological safety we could explore the best in each student somehow, so the class understands what they can learn from the other, as well as being more opened and avoid prejudice and pre-judgements. | Paulo asked me to forward him the reference to another article where different types of [entrepreneurship education programmes] are mentioned... We discussed about how to measure impact in the light of evaluation of the [postgraduate programme], and Paulo mentioned that [HEI] "has great concern about evaluation". I can see this need for the prestigious institution to maintain its popularity with accountability and credibility in its educational endeavours, and I decided that evaluation of the [postgraduate programme]'s quality and impact is also a topic we'll come back to many times. |
2.1.2 Data collection

One research question for this study tackles the relationship between my professionalism and my practices in the Teamwork. Considering that I participated in the development of a social entrepreneurship curriculum, I did not collect data as if I were an outsider gathering materials that were ready and available. Instead, my practice contributed to the generation of primary data (see Table 2). In addition, all data were automatically saved in a digital format because the Teamwork interaction and my writing in the RJ happened in cyberspace. Hence data collection for this study can more accurately be understood as data being generated as a side-product of the interaction between Nastássia, Paulo, and me.

Dialogue is a central method for data generation in this study as well as for self-studies in general (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). During the period of approximately ten months, over forty emails were exchanged in the Teamwork. Seven online meetings were held where Paulo, Nastássia and I were present. Two additional meetings took place where one social entrepreneurship educator was present.

Writing reflectively is the other major method applied in data collection. Keeping regular entries in the reflective journal (RJ) enabled me to reflect on the Teamwork and how I was influencing the curriculum development through my practice. As one form of practitioner research (Schön, 1983) self-study of practice has been used to demonstrate how professional development can be facilitated through reflection (see Froehlich, 2012; LaBoskey, 2005; Hamilton et al., 1998). Self-study scholars view a journal to be “free flowing about feelings, interpretations, and judgments” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2010, p.123) where writing contributes to both data gathering and data analysis. In this study reflective writing is both a method for data collection, and a practice in professionalization that is subjected to critical interrogation. I engage in a critical examination of reflection in chapter 4.

What makes self-study unique among genres of qualitative research methodologies is its ontological stance: an individual can simultaneously become and act as the researcher and the researched (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). When working with the secondary data (see Table 2) and interacting with my teammates I acted as the researched because my practice constitute to the primary data in this study. I acted as a researcher when I wrote in the RJ, because analyzed primary data what was originating from the Teamwork interaction. My becoming as a researcher and the researched bridges data collection with the theory construction in this study. According to Schön (1983) reflection-in-action corresponds to a
description of intuitive understanding which allows one to construct a new theory of practicing in a certain professional context. Theorizing my practice in the Teamwork in order to understand my professionalism is essentially an inquiry on becoming an educator in the context of social entrepreneurship curriculum development. In the next section I elaborate on the trajectory of this inquiry.

2.2 How is Theory Developed from Practice?

Social entrepreneurship suffers from a lack of clear theorizing (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012). Besides formulating an understanding about my professionalism, this research has another purpose of contributing to the knowledge basis in social entrepreneurship education. Generating theory from data is a research orientation which distinguishes grounded theory methodology from other approaches to study qualitative data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Charmaz, 2006; Morse et al., 2009; Urquhart, 2013). I utilize this methodology because its openness towards theory development serves my research purpose. In this study grounded theory methodology (henceforth referred to as GTM) supports theory generation by two means. It provides coding strategies for data analysis (Charmaz, 2006; 2009; 2011), which allowed me to construct theory about my professionalization. Second, by broadening the scope of the emergent theory (Urquhart, 2013) I formulate a response to the research question of how the theory of my practice could inform social entrepreneurship education from a perspective of educator professionalization. In the remainder of this section I shed light on these processes.

2.2.1 Data analysis and theory construction

The grounded theory methodology (GTM) has been applied in diverse manners across disciplines (Nogård, 2013; Schwartz, 2011; Schwartz & Holloway, 2012). In the first phase of data analysis I performed initial coding, focused coding and theoretical coding (Charmaz, 2006) of primary data. Open coding involved revision and classification of data units, such as phrases and sentences, using descriptive and analytical codes. The result of open coding is a map of initial codes. In focused coding I reviewed this map of initial codes so that patterns could be recognized from recurrent themes in the data. Using the qualitative analysis software NVivo, I conceptualized these patterns to synthesize sets of theoretical relations. Charmaz (2006) describes coding as “more than a way of sifting, sorting, and synthesizing
data” (p.71). Instead of applying extant coding families (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) I followed Charmaz’s (2006) example, and embraced open-mindedness toward complexity when generating theoretical subcategories.

In the final phase of data analysis – theoretical coding – I clarify relationships between the subcategories to construct a theory about my practice in the Teamwork. Abductive inference, or a creative way to combine theoretical knowledge with newly observed empirical facts (Kelle, 2005; Charmaz, 2013) has influenced the process of relating the theoretical subcategories. The results of focused and theoretical coding will be presented in chapter 3, where I apply examples from the data to explain theoretical subcategories and their relations.

As coding proceeded, patterns based on concepts became enriched and more complex. I elaborated the relations among the theoretical subcategories to increase the degree of abstraction in theorizing (see Urquhart, 2013). The outcome of data analysis and theory construction is knowledge-for-practice, a form of practical knowledge expressed as assertions for action and understanding (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). In this thesis it is presented in chapter 4 as knowledge claims based on a theory of my practice in the Teamwork.

2.2.2 Scaling up theory

In the grounded theory methodology (GTM) the gap between an identified research topic and extant literature can be identified during and after data analysis (Charmaz, 2011). While I did not intentionally apply any specific theoretical lens in coding the data, I take theoretical literature into account more extensively in the phase of theory up-scaling. Utilization of extent theoretical constructs to inform data analysis has been legitimized in the writings of GTM researchers (see Dunne, 2011; Kelle, 2005; Thornberg, 2012; Goldkuhl & Cronholm, 2010). Theory up-scaling refers to developing an emergent theory by bringing its components into a dialogue with extant literature (Urquhart, 2013).

In multi-grounded theory the search for relevant theoretical literature is known as theoretical grounding (Goldkuhl & Cronholm, 2010). The theory about my Teamwork-practice is scaled-up via theoretical grounding in three directions. All these directions bridges the emergent theory with educator professionalization and social entrepreneurship education. Details of theory up-scaling are presented in chapter 4.
2.3 Philosophical assumptions

I maintain an open mind to scholarly critique of the research design of this study. The research questions encompass assumptions. First, I assume that the Teamwork was shaping my professionalism as an educator. I also assume that reflecting on my participation in the Team impacts my professionalism. The approach is inductive because I expect to understand and theorize educator professionalization based on the Teamwork in social entrepreneurship curriculum development and my personal experience of it. The theorists’ philosophical assumptions are one major component of practical theory (Littlejohn & Foss, 2011). Since one aim of this study is to theorize educator professionalization, I dedicate the rest of this chapter to the ontological and epistemological paradigms informing my theorization.

I summarize my philosophical assumptions into five statements:

1. Knowledge and experience reinforce the one another’s formation;
2. The act of theorizing engages socially constructed knowledge;
3. The analysis of my practice in social entrepreneurship curriculum development is determined by my relation to the Teamwork, and my theorization is one of many possible ways in which the same data could be examined and presented;
4. I refuse to refer to qualities of knowledge using binary positions;
5. I present knowledge claims as diffractions from a crystallization of my practice in the Teamwork, and not claims of constancy or certainty.

These philosophical standpoints are reflected by my methodological choices of the grounded theory methodology (GTM) and self-study or practice (SSP). Littlejohn and Foss (2011, p.21) pose the question of “to what extent can knowledge exist before experience” (editors’ italics). As explained in connection to data (see section 2.1.1) the Teamwork was a site for knowledge construction involving various sources and authors. On the one hand, some of the information sources had existed prior to the Teamwork. For example, prior to the Teamwork I had developed knowledge as an undergraduate student in educational sciences. As I explain in section 4.2.2, this body of knowledge influenced the curriculum development process in various ways. On the other hand, individual knowledge contributed to collective knowledge construction only through the shared experience of developing a social entrepreneurship curriculum. Reciprocally, new forms of practice and knowledge
enriched individual understandings through the Teamwork experience. Hence I consider collectively constructed knowledge and experience as existentially reinforcing one another.

With regard to the epistemological component of theory Littlejohn and Foss (2011) questions the process from which knowledge arises. Constructivist grounded theorists assume that the content of data and analyses are social constructions reflecting the ways of their construction (see Charmaz, 2006; 2009; 2013). In self-study of practice knowing happens through dialogue (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). A practitioner’s integrity and the quality of practice are validated through the feedback and responses of those in interaction (ibid.). Coding data and theorizing in this study would have been impossible without the conversations between Nastássia, Paulo and me. As presented in section 2.1.2, channels for social interaction activated the procedures described for data collection. In addition, theorizing my Teamwork-practice engaged socially constructed knowledge I recorded in the reflective journal (RJ). Based on the dialogue with my teammates I was able to reflect upon my practice in curriculum development. Hence theorizing in this study engages both the Teamwork-dialogue as a site for knowledge construction, and my reflection as part of the socially constructed knowledge.

The knower-known relation may be examined to reveal systems of thought (Nisbett et al., 2001). With the third statement I emphasize on how my subjectivity makes the theorizing in this thesis relational to the Teamwork. Having spent my childhood in China, and continued secondary, and higher education in Finland, I embrace both Asian and Western epistemological traditions. Nisbett and co-researchers (2001) contrast Asian and Western ontologies and epistemologies by juxtapositioning 1) continuity and discreteness, 2) the field and object being studied, 3) relationships and similarities as alternatives to categories and rules, 4) dialectics versus foundational principles and logic, and 5) experience-based knowledge versus abstract analysis.

Continuity is inherent for self-study of practice (SSP) because it involves change in the self (Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015b) influenced by the organization of practices. The Teamwork informed my practice as a participant in social entrepreneurship curriculum development, and as a person studying that practice. Continuity of knowledge construction in the Teamwork can also be understood as the Teamwork affecting learning processes of students of the postgraduate programme in social entrepreneurship.
The dialectics aspect of my hybrid epistemological-ontological framework is manifested as reconciling the seemingly contradictory features of Western and Asian cognitive orientations. GTM strategies such as coding and theoretical sampling complement the continuous, interactive, and experienced-based characteristics of SSP by channeling in abstract thinking to data analysis, via discrete categories and rules formulated by logical reasoning.

To evaluate knowledge in terms of its unit (see Littlejohn & Foss, 2011) would contribute to dualistic epistemology. Pragmatism links both SSP and GTM with a qualified relativist approach to epistemology and ontology (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2010; Charmaz, 2006; Thayer-Bacon, 2003). My third philosophical statement roots in a qualified relativist, pragmatic ontology. In presenting a qualified relativist view of pragmatism Thayer-Bacon (2003) refers experience as both “subjective and objective...private and public...internal and external...thought and thing” (p.423). My decision to ally with Kathy Charmaz’s (2006; 2009; 2011) constructivist grounded theory roots in correspondence between our pragmatist ontological stances. Her stance toward the GTM is characterized by indeterminacy, fluidity, and openness to multiple interpretations. Facts and values are regarded as interrelated, and the philosophical concept of truth is seen as relativistic. (Charmaz, 2006) I see resonance between the pragmatic orientation toward knowing in constructivist grounded theory (ibid.) and self-study scholars’ ontological stance toward practical knowledge. (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009).

Systems of thought may also be examined for their certainty (Nisbett et al., 2001). Taken into account a qualified relativist position to view reality, for which I join camp with scholars in SSP and CGT, I treat reality as plural and dependent on the subjectivity of the viewer, and hence also diverse and transient. Following this ontological stance theorizing which involves human realities is uncertain. Keeping in mind my research aim, my primary concern is not to guarantee certainty or constancy of theoretical postulations. Instead, I embrace practical theory as partial and contextualized (Littlejohn & Foss, 2011).
3 DATA ANALYSIS & THEORY CONSTRUCTION

One purpose of this research is to generate theory about my professionalization as an educator based on my practice in the Teamwork in social entrepreneurship curriculum development. I have integrated methods in self-study of practices (SSP) and grounded theory methodology (GTM) for data collection and analysis. As a result of data analysis I reached three theoretical subcategories (Charmaz, 2006; 2011). In this chapter I first present these subcategories with examples from the data. Then I theorize my practices by explaining relations among the theoretical subcategories. In the final section I propose an emergent theory of my practices in social entrepreneurship curriculum development.

3.1 Theoretical Subcategories

Data collected during the ten-month collaboration with Nastássia and Paulo revealed topics and processes crucial for social entrepreneurship curriculum development. Analyzing my reflective journal (RJ) and records of communication – including meeting notes and emails – also enabled me to contrast individual behavioural patterns amidst the collaboration. In theory construction I use theoretical subcategories to organize relations in the Teamwork data. The first subcategory, complex difference illustrates context-dependent relations between my practices and emotions experienced in the Teamwork. My practices in the Teamwork were influenced by both teammate relations and working content. On the other hand, my personal input had an impact on these two areas of the Teamwork. In theorization I conceptualized this reciprocal relation in the data as actor-action reciprocity. The third theoretical subcategory negotiatory adaptivity refers to my ability to adapt in discouraging circumstances while actively negotiated for certain objectives. This subcategory frames my practice in the Teamwork as a simultaneous relation negotiating and adapting.

3.1.1 Complex difference

Emotions were a thread that led to my theorization of these practices as composing ‘cohesive difference’ or ‘dispersive difference’. In data analysis I treated positive emotions as factors strengthening cohesion in the Teamwork. Negative emotions recorded in the data were treated as hampering cohesion, thus being dispersive factors in the Teamwork. By considering what had triggered positive or negative emotions I detected practices that ei-
ther strengthened, or weakened cohesion among team members. It is worth noting that the same practice could be cohesive or dispersive depending on the work content in curriculum development.

In the Teamwork appreciation was most often expressed toward collective practices that enhanced clarity and consensus, such as having more than one person sharing meeting notes. Appreciation and gratitude were shown toward individual gestures, such as flexibility with re-scheduling. My suggestions for optimizing the quality of learning and the postgraduate programme’s social impact received encouragement from Paulo and Nastássia. Negative emotions involved collective as well as individual practices. Dissatisfaction and a sense of urgency were often linked to different pace in achieving tasks agreed during online meetings. I regard achievement pace as a dispersive difference because it hampered team cohesion, both through dissatisfaction verbalized in conversations and urgency in meeting due dates, and as negative emotions I personally experienced. The negative emotion most heavily affected my practices in the Teamwork is self-doubt. Figure 1 demonstrates how I have organized and analyzed components in the Teamwork data to conceptualize the complex difference -theoretical subcategory.

![Diagram of conceptualized data](image)

**Figure 1.** Patterns in data conceptualized as complex difference.

In analytical coding I applied the concepts orientation in knowledge use, and strategic communication to classify my practice in curriculum development. These three kinds of practice created tension in teammate relations in some situations, but promoted team cohesion under other circumstances. Features of my orientation in knowledge use, and my
communication strategies did not always resonate with those of my teammates’ as we worked across a range of different topics. The conceptualization of achievement pace contributed to the theorization of complex difference by drawing my attention toward individual practice and emotional outcomes. However, difference among Teamwork-members in completing agreed tasks unexceptionally led to negative emotions. Hence I do not take those incidents into account when conceptualizing the context-dependent subcategory of complex difference. In the following paragraphs I use examples from the data only to illustrate orientation in knowledge use and strategic communication as two kinds of practice where complex difference was involved.

_Critical thinking as one feature of my orientation in knowledge use_

My tasks in the curriculum development consisted mainly of sharing information. This practice was informed by discussion topics in the Teamwork complemented by my former university studies in the field of education. In addition to searching and sharing, knowledge use involved my evaluation of information. The way I evaluated information constitutes to one difference among individual behavioural patterns in the Teamwork.

Nastassia thinks that since we are creating a course based on the research to identify which profile of social entrepreneur is needed to address the challenges of [the] region… [The postgraduate programme] would give a broader and deeper understanding to better deal with social challenges.

- Nastássia’s meeting notes

Through data analysis and theory construction I recognized critical thinking (Fischman & McLaren, 2005; Hooks, 1994) as a key component of my orientation in knowledge use. At the beginning of the curriculum development Nastássia regarded the pilot research conducted by Legacy as the major factor determining the nature of the social entrepreneurship curriculum. The field knowledge of participants in the pilot research was applied in the Teamwork as one way to monitor the quality of the curriculum. Despite my appreciation for such resource I was reluctant to rely on it as the only indicator for evaluating the curriculum’s quality and social impact. According to the founder of critical pedagogy Paulo Freire, critical thinkers not only teach and publish to raise awareness toward unfair treatments, but also reflect on how their own professional practices challenge imbalanced power relations (Hooks, 1994).

If the [postgraduate programme's] impact on society is to be evaluated not only by looking at quality of instructions, but also [by evaluating its] impact on social welfare and equality,
then it should aspire to address the challenge of educating those who have less socio-economic capital (knowledge, time, money, powerful network) and not aggregate the rich and poor gap

- My RJ

Nastássia’s and I had different orientations towards how the pilot research participants’ knowledge should be used for curriculum development. While Nastássia made sure that the curriculum would take into account the pilot research informants’ needs and recommendations, I considered thinking beyond the pilot research as necessary for increasing fairness in society via the postgraduate programme. For instance, some of the pilot research informants argued that the postgraduate programme should target management-level employees and leaders of social enterprises. I pledged for eligibility for applicants who were interested in becoming social entrepreneurs, who did not have previous work experience in social enterprises.

Student admission is one other topic in curriculum development where this difference in knowledge use orientations occasionally led to competing viewpoints and my experience of weakened team cohesion. In contrast, pedagogical arrangements and immediate societal impact of the postgraduate programme are topics where such difference was recognized as a strength of the team. The phenomenon indicates how team cohesion was affected by difference in knowledge use orientation, and how the effect varied depending on the Teamwork topic. In the data there are more incidents based on which I have theorized my orientation in knowledge use as complex difference. I include more excerpts later in this chapter when explaining how the theoretical subcategories relate.

**Questioning as a communication strategy**

During the ten months of collaboration I deliberately employed several strategies to communicate about objectives I regarded important for the curriculum development. Questioning is one of these strategies.

**Excerpt 1.** My at-the-moment perception of how I can contribute to the process of curriculum planning...[s] asking my partners and myself meaningful questions. The questions can concern the purpose/objectives of decisions and actions, what kind of impact/consequences might follow, and how we could optimize benefits and avoid/minimize harmful effects (e.g. aggregating inequality in social and economic capital).

—My RJ
In addition to orientation of knowledge use, strategic communication is one other concept I used in data analysis to capture patterns of my practices. As the classification of orientation in knowledge use, strategic communication inspired my theoretical construction of complex differences because my practice in negotiating affected team cohesion via emotions.

Excerpt 2. Looking at Paulo's notes...I felt that my questions were taken in better than my recommendations! …my questions about how to adapt teaching to student' different needs, and how to clarify participant motivation both received response in the form of discussion.

–My RJ

As the former excerpt suggests, my intention in questioning had been clear since the beginning of the Teamwork. Nevertheless I was uncertain where this strategy would be relevant regarding topics in the curriculum development. As the Teamwork continued I began to identify topic areas where questioning was effective for engaging team members in a discussion. In the latter excerpt I reported with excitement and delight about Paulo’s attention concerning pedagogical arrangements.

Depending on the topic in curriculum development, the same strategy I practiced either enhanced or hampered team cohesion. For example when tailoring a tuition model for the postgraduate programme questioning as a strategy generated replies from my teammates. However, the broader topic of programme financial sustainability involved decision-makers outside the Teamwork, and the effects of questioning was not apparent. Excerpt 3 illustrates the complexity of this topic:

What is the financing model for the programme? Is [HEI] the only one paying salaries of professors and also visitor-lecturers and workshop-runners? Is [HEI] the only institution receiving tuition? ...Is it possible to save 10% of the income to build a pool for future scholarships? * This fund should be managed by a student union. Paulo, is tuition going to be tailored according to individual[s’] financial ability?

- My email

HEI did not provide higher education free of charge. My personal objectives regarding the postgraduate programme included promoting a progressive tuition model where a fee would be charged based on the income and funding resources of admitted students. I also proposed the idea of a fund pool from which scholarships would be granted to future applicants. Despite questioning and other strategies I applied in the Teamwork, neither of these suggestions was operationalized. This example illustrates how complex difference involves context-dependent relations between practices and emotions. In the context of designing a
tuition model as one task in curriculum development, my practice of questioning did not strengthen cohesion by creating consensus.

Strategic communication is one kind of complex difference manifested by Teamwork members’ behavioural patterns. Questioning as a practice in strategic communication in the case of programme financial sustainability indirectly caused dispersion in teammate relations. While my teammates expressed intention in supporting social justice by developing the curriculum in social entrepreneurship, there were constraints set by the institutions they represented. The discrepancy between my suggestions and interests of external stakeholders in Legacy and HEI might have explained why the practice of questioning caused dispersion in the team via negative emotions. Questioning is one strategy I employed in the Teamwork to negotiate for ideologies embedded in my institutional background. The relation between complex difference and my institutional background will be discussed in chapter 4.

3.1.2 Actor-action reciprocity

Qiqi: reflection question can we relate to social entrepreneurship on the process of creating this program? Are there inequalities we would solve?

-Nastássia’s meeting notes

One personal goal I had for the Teamwork was to embed characteristics of social entrepreneurship into the curriculum we were developing. I also intended to approach this goal in an entrepreneurial manner. These personal objectives inspired me to treat the Teamwork as an environment to practice cognitive and interactive skills which would be needed by social entrepreneurs. The following chart visualizes core components of the theoretical subcategory actor-action reciprocity.

Table 3. Core elements of the theoretical subcategory actor-action reciprocity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premise</th>
<th>Key question</th>
<th>Key objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Action’</td>
<td>Developing a postgraduate programme in social entrepreneurship</td>
<td>‘How can we integrate social entrepreneurship characteristics in curriculum development?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Teamwork I reviewed and suggested modifications for the course catalogue by bringing in academic knowledge for decision making. The research data record my action in summarizing and sharing information for discussions on tuition fee model, admission criteria, and pedagogical arrangements. In addition, I attended meetings in which staff recruitment and marketing of the postgraduate programme were discussed. I evaluated these practices in the reflective journal (RJ) by contrasting these actions with those of my teammates’, and with concrete operations that took place after decision-making processes. After noticing how I had begun to adopt an entrepreneurial mentality in my actions, I began to self-identify as an actor who engaged in curriculum development based on her understanding of entrepreneurship.

...our Team[work] is at the same time the research study...we create and are influenced by this experience, and the same goes for my creating and being influenced by the intention of studying this experience..."

-My RJ

My input in curriculum development had an impact on how I understood about working in social entrepreneurship curriculum development as an educator. My key question as a member of the Teamwork was ‘how can we integrate social entrepreneurship characteristics in the programme and in curriculum development’. Three objectives guided my practices with regard to this question. The objectives are facilitating equal access to resources, enhancing financial sustainability of the postgraduate programme, and bringing positive impact to local communities via the curriculum. My key question as an educator-becoming was how I could professionalize via the Teamwork in a social entrepreneur-like manner. Two objectives guided my practices with respect to such professionalization: confronting failure, and field awareness - staying tuned to entrepreneurship research and practices.

Actor-action reciprocity refers to the dynamics between my practices in the Teamwork and my becoming an educator through social entrepreneurship curriculum development. Toward the end of this chapter I shall elaborate the reciprocity between my practice in the Teamwork and my self-identification as an educator.
3.1.3 Negotiatory adaptivity

There are two dimensions of the theoretical subcategory negotiatory adaptivity. On the one dimension it compasses my practices in negotiating with my teammates. What guided the negotiation are the two key questions stated in the previous section: how to integrate social entrepreneurship characteristics in the programme and in curriculum development, and how to practice curriculum development in a social entrepreneur-like manner. On the other dimension, negotiatory adaptivity emphasizes my ability to adapt to my teammates’ expectations as well as unexpected situations in the Teamwork. The name of the theoretical subcategory finds its root in the data:

Qiqi: we should be looking for researches or social entrepreneurship education programs...and use the data for negotiating the scholarships/value

-Nastássia’s meeting notes

An adjustment…can be made to how I position in this cooperation…[so that] I can learn/be inspired to accommodate my partners in this team work.”

-My RJ

Nastássia, Paulo and I shared common values with regard to how the postgraduate programme in social entrepreneurship could create and support positive social impact. We all appreciate diversity in pedagogy, including experiential learning facilitated by visits to local social enterprises, and diversity in assessment formats, such as peer-teaching and mentor feedback. We also reached consensus on the inclusion of practical work as one part of the curriculum. However, there were occasions where our views diverged. These were sites where I practiced to negotiate using research knowledge and communication strategies. Moreover, practicing an entrepreneurial mindset enabled me to adapt in situations what I found as demotivating, and cope with negative emotions I experienced in the Teamwork.

So far I have introduced how the theoretical subcategories have emerged from data, and what relations in the data they represent. Next, I bring theory construction a step further by relating these subcategories with one another. Grounded theory has been criticized for manifesting a relatively low degree of conceptualization which yields descriptive theories instead of substantive or formal ones (Urquhart, 2013). By clarifying subcategory relations I relate actor-action reciprocity and complex difference with negotiatory adaptivity, and take one step toward a substantive theory (ibid.) of my practices in the Teamwork.
3.2 Subcategory Relations

My reflective journal (RJ) provides a record of objectives I intended to promote through developing a social entrepreneurship curriculum. Contrasted in data analysis with emails and meeting notes, I recognized from the RJ how my practice in promoting these objectives were responded to by my teammates. I also classified communication strategies employed in the Teamwork, and how they reveal my belief about what values and skills contribute to educator professionalization. This section is structured according to the core components of the theoretical subcategory actor-action reciprocity (see Figure x2 on page 7), with examples of my practices which contributed to the theorization of complex difference and negotiatory adaptivity. Together these categories constitute a theory about my practice in the Teamwork which I shall present at the beginning of next chapter.

3.2.1 Negotiating for a socially entrepreneurial programme

Creating a postgraduate programme with characteristics of social entrepreneurship was my personal goal throughout the Teamwork. In the Teamwork this goal involved three objectives guiding my practices: facilitating equal access to resources, enhancing programme financial sustainability, and creating immediate impact in local communities via the programme. These objectives constitute one part of the theoretical subcategory actor-action reciprocity (see Table 3 on page 22). In this section I illustrate how actor-action reciprocity intersects with the other subcategory complex difference as I negotiated for equal access to resources, programme financial sustainability, and immediate impact. Final decisions concerning these topics will be presented in chapter 4.

Facilitating equal access to resources

In developing the social entrepreneurship curriculum there were two things I considered as resources: quality education and networking possibilities. During five years’ studies in educational sciences I had fostered my own understanding of quality education by the time I engaged in the Teamwork. I scrutinize this impact in the last sections of this chapter. In order to facilitate equal access to resources I prioritized diversity under various topics in the curriculum development.

With regard to student admission I approached diversity from the angles of physical capability, gender, migration history, and socio-economic status. Persons who are physically
impaired working as social entrepreneurs are present both in the video presenting the postgraduate programme for attracting applicants, and on a slide I had presented in the Teamwork prior to the design of the video (see Appendix 1). The same slide also includes examples highlighting the work of female entrepreneurs, as well as challenges for migrants in Brazil to work as entrepreneurs. In contrast, entrepreneur-speakers in the postgraduate programme video were white, middle-aged male speakers, and that the programme was launched without being accompanied by a policy for non-discrimination. The programme video, questions and tasks used in student admission, and the list of admitted students exist beyond the scope of my research. However, data collected for this study suggest that most of my practices in negotiating for applicant diversity focused on socio-economic status:

In order to guarantee fairness and accessibility...already in the application and admission phase, I believe we ought to consider...not only the average living cost, but also how affordable higher education is in Brazil and especially in the region, so that affordability wouldn't be a barrier for applicants!

-My RJ

Questioning is one strategy I used to draw my teammates’ attention toward the possibility that applicants to the social entrepreneurship programme might come from different socio-economic backgrounds, and hence their capacity to pay tuition could be diverse:

...What is the financing model for the programme?... Paulo, is tuition going to be tailored according to individual[s’] financial ability?

-My email

In addition to questioning, I attempted to add legitimacy to a personal opinion by backing it in academic research. According to Echtner (1995), influential network built on work experience - when used as an admission criterion for entering entrepreneurship training - can indirectly sustain inequality. I shared this reference with Paulo when negotiating for a set of admission criteria where eligibility would be independent of work experience in business:

With admission we may be aware that some people with potential and talent might not have had a chance to create or access influential network, or their work experience is yet limited. In my opinion (and in a study) entrepreneurial experience should not be a dominant criterion.

-Online conversation with Paulo, February 10

Aspiring social entrepreneurs, or people without former work experiences in social enterprises, but who are inspired to pursue a career in that field have been given special atten-
tion in academic discussions about social entrepreneurship education strategies (see Pache & Chowdhury, 2012). In addition to tuition and admission criteria, pedagogical arrangements is a third topic in curriculum development where I negotiated for diversity. I negotiated for diverse formats, environment, and techniques for learning. Building legitimacy through a use of academic knowledge, and questioning as a communication strategies were practiced also in my negotiation for pedagogical arrangements that would accommodate diverse learners’ needs:

Thanks for sharing the references and yes, I believe it's way better to mix real life experiences (projects) with multiple case studies (enriched by the class' opinion, knowledge and discussion).

- Nastássia’s email

How would you like the idea of beginning the semester with B01? A01 and A02 would then be more interesting and integrated to reality, because students could first share what they have found out from the visits. That would be an "experience first, theorize later" approach.

I have good news for you Qiqi. The idea is to have, during 5 weeks, the A01 at tuesdays/thursdays + the B01 at fridays. After these 5 weeks, A02 starts. So, just as you wanted it!

-Online conversation with Paulo

By analyzing my teammates’ reactions and the reflection in my RJ, I have identified questioning and the use of academic knowledge as two negotiation strategies. Orientation in knowledge use and strategic communication are concepts constituting the subcategory of complex difference (see Figure 1 on page 18). Strategies I applied in the Teamwork for facilitating equal access to resources thus connect actor-action reciprocity with the subcategory complex difference.

Enhancing programme financial sustainability

To make activities in tackling social problems financially sustainable is a challenge faced by social entrepreneurs (Miller et al., 2012; Tracey & Phillips, 2007; Zahra et al., 2009). Taking into account this characteristic of social entrepreneurship, I negotiated for a progressive tuition model as well as scholarship availability.

Qiqi mentioned Paulo and [HEI] could create models like...25 students indirectly paying for the tuition of 35 students…

-Nastássia’s meeting notes
My idea originate from an experience I had during my stay in Brazil. My participation in a training was made possible because applicants were charged according to their individual ability to pay. I shared this experience with Paulo and Nastássia in a discussion about the tuition model, and argued for its positive impact on solidarity among learners. By referring to a personal experience in Brazil that generated gratitude in me, I attempted to create a sense of cultural affiliation with my teammates. Besides critical thinking, and building legitimacy via use of academic knowledge, to add credibility to an idea by relating it to personal experience also contributes my orientation in knowledge use.

Is it possible to save 10% of the income to build a pool for future scholarships? This fund should be managed by a student union.

-My email

Relating an idea to my personal experience of its functionality can be recognized from the data as an orientation in knowledge use. In the above excerpt I spoke for the creation of a fund pool where tuition fees paid by students admitted to the postgraduate programme would be stored and managed as a source of scholarship. This was a continuation to my suggestion of the ‘indirect paying’ which would support a progressive tuition model and facilitate more equal access to resources. What had inspired my proposal is a scholarship system in my own university. All restaurants on campus were partially subsidized by the government, and every year scholarships were granted based on the surplus of income generated from selling lunches and snacks. Under the topic of enhancing financial sustainability of the postgraduate programme, the theoretical categories complex difference and the action-part of actor-action reciprocity are united by my orientation in knowledge use which relies on positive personal experiences.

Creating immediate impact

If social entrepreneurship education were to support a transformation of capitalism, the societal impact of educational operations need to be addressed (Driver, 2012). Both the topic of facilitating equal access, and that about enhancing programme financial sustainability were considered in connection with the postgraduate programme’s societal impact.

In order to have positive social impact in terms of the programme, it would be better to encourage people who cannot afford.

-Nastássia’s meeting notes
Moreover, the postgraduate programme was expected to create positive social impact via actions of prospective students:

Interviewees from the Pilot Research Interviewees think that the Programme should take in students who have working experiences as managers/leaders/decisionmaking in order to create impact in their organizations while/after attending the programme.

-Nastássia’s meeting notes

University-community partnerships provide fertile ground to reciprocal collaboration. For universities awareness of field practices enhances the relevance of academic teaching, research, and theory development. Reciprocally community actors benefit from access to information and resources that have been critically examined. (Nocon & Nilsson, 2013)

As one of the objectives in developing a programme with social entrepreneurship features, I negotiated for a requirement of practical work as a part of the curriculum. According to Porter (cited in Drive, 2012, p.428) one way to create positive social impact in local communities is to support entrepreneurs with educational resources. My suggestion was that in order to complete the postgraduate degree, students would need to contribute to the welfare of local communities by sharing knowledge and skills with entrepreneurs. To negotiate for this arrangement as part of the curriculum I applied yet another communication strategy:

I also made the decision to prioritize their prioritization...by first hearing what they have to say about what they have done so far. I still stand behind my own interest (tuition/scholarship, admission criteria/target groups, and social impact via service learning), but perhaps it would be a better idea to mention them in connection to what Nas and Paulo are involved with at the moment and their priorities.

-RJ, May28th

To integrate my objectives with my teammates’ priorities is also one of the communication strategies I used in the Teamwork. When developing the curriculum I aimed for a postgraduate programme which would manifest features of social entrepreneurship. My practices in the Teamwork were guided by three key objectives: facilitating equal access to resources, enhancing programme financial sustainability, and creating immediate impact. Organized through data analysis, these objectives allowed me to conceptualize an action part of the theoretical subcategory actor-action reciprocity. This subcategory interrelates to the other subcategory complex difference which illustrates my orientation in knowledge use, and strategic communication (see Figure x. on page 7).

Various topics addressed in the social entrepreneurship curriculum development gave rise to an interrelation between actor-action reciprocity and complex difference. In facilitating
equal access to resources, enhancing programme financial sustainability, and creating immediate positive social impact through the postgraduate programme I used questioning and prioritizing as negotiation strategies. My orientation in knowledge use involved use of academic knowledge and positive personal experience to legitimize values I promoted. In the coming section I focus on the actor-dimension of actor-action reciprocity (see Table 3 on page 22) and how it connects with complex differences through my intention in professionalizing as if I were a social entrepreneur.

3.2.2 Adapting as if I were a social entrepreneur

Social entrepreneurship shares various similarities with entrepreneurship, and there are multiple angles from which these phenomena can be studied (Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010; Nielsen et al., 2012). Data analysis of this study suggest two points of connection between social entrepreneurship and my professionalization through the Teamwork. In this section I shed light on how my confrontation with failure in the Teamwork, and my awareness of information related to the field of entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship have led to theory construction of the actor-dimension of actor-action reciprocity.

Confronting failure

…how the [Teamwork] facilitated my professionalization as an educator…(involves) choosing to accept and reinterpret "failure"…I have learn(t) not to take all the blame on myself when a situation mismatches my expectation!

-My RJ

The first point of connection between social entrepreneurship and my professionalization is how failure was confronted in the Teamwork. While failure is related to setback in venture creation in entrepreneurship literature (Nielsen et al., 2012), in this study I have used the term to refer to my subjective experiences of failing. In the Teamwork failing was interpreted against the set of objectives I had defined in relation to developing a postgraduate programme with social entrepreneurship features. Self-doubt is one of the recurrent negative emotions in the data which I accounted for when constructing the complex difference-subcategory (see Figure 1 on page 18).

I'm wondering what I did wrong (if I did wrong)...after proposing how we could work with the revision of curriculum, I have heard no reply from my teammates. An alarm rang off in my mind, warning about getting too much into details and (unintentionally) making my teammates uncomfortable by suggesting what they could do. It is tricky to find a balance in
asking for support and making my counterparts feel that too much is demanded from them or (even worse) the ways in which they've been working haven't been effective enough.

-My RJ

...Nas introduced me as the one in the team focusing on the programme's social impact. I also felt extremely uncertain: what have I done wrong? If social impact is that important for the [programme] and I was expected to contribute...why was I not informed about the meeting? ...I remain critical of what impact my participation has had on the curriculum work so far.

-My RJ

Through data analysis I discerned several characteristics of self-doubt. First, it co-existed with other negative emotions, such as fear for causing unpleasant feelings and misunderstanding, and frustration and disappointment when I interpreted my teammates’ behaviour as exclusive. Second, the expressions of ‘doing wrong’ suggest that I tended to interpret my own behaviour as solely responsible for stressful occasions in the Teamwork. Third, all experiences of self-doubt led to a response. The third point is particularly important for theory construction, since the nature of my response evolved during the Teamwork.

I did try to write the email explaining why their participation would be important: "Please let me know if this is ok for you. I'll be glad to modify my part if needed. I believe the discussion and evaluation would be more fruitful with these different perspectives... Evaluating the curriculum together with you would save us from hearing comments from me that are irrelevant or [un]realistic..." [Italics in the original] Perhaps I should write another short email to confirm that our work does already have good quality and the teamwork has been interactive? In my earlier emails I did thank them for engaging and fruitful conversations... Perhaps they were just too busy to reply? I don't want to be pushy, either...

-My RJ

My earliest experiences of failure in the Teamwork emerged from subjective interpretation of not getting responses from Nastássia and Paulo within a period of time I had expected. My reaction to negative emotions associated with this ‘failure’ exhibits three traits. One, it is interpersonal, as I aimed to involve my teammates in collectively changing the situation. Two, my selection of words in the email sent to Paulo and Nastássia conveys a lack of confidence. Three, instead of bringing emotional relief, this approach to confront failure sustained anxiety. In contrast, my later confrontations with self-doubt in the Teamwork took an intrapersonal turn to target my disposition toward failure.

Alongside the Teamwork a friend of mine and I worked on an idea which we submitted to the Nordic Independent Living Challenge (Norden, n.d.). We researched about the field, talked to potential end users and service providers, and started writing a business plan. De-
spite the effort we had spent, our idea was not selected for the following stage in the competi-
tion. Reflecting on this experience of failure inspired me to practice the same attitude in
confronting failure in the Teamwork:

…failure IS inevitable on any entrepreneur's path… It is more meaningful and beneficial to
compare with myself than with others. ...Let me take on an entrepreneurial stand to the mat-
ter: what are the things I have learned about dealing with failure what I can practice[s] now?

-My RJ

Prior to this reflection I had not questioned why waiting for my teammates’ emails had led
to overwhelming feelings of self-doubt. I became aware of possible explanations for my
self-doubt as I examined - in the RJ - negative emotions I experienced. I carried out this
practice in a question-and-answer format. First, I described situations in the Teamwork
where self-doubt arose. Then I identified parts of the description that were based on factual
information, for example delay in completing tasks in the curriculum development. By
contrasting factual information with my interpretations, I recognized that some of the nega-
tive emotions I experienced did not have a factual basis. This practice also involved ques-
tioning the effect of childhood events in causing sensitivity in adult life.

I feel how I feel now because I have a tendency to feel less appreciated when my attempts to
contact are not responded to. ...blaming myself for having had expectations just makes mat-
ters worse (I feel more resentful!), and to require myself to not have expectation is unrealis-
tic as well as disrespectful towards my partners in cooperation. ... What I CAN change is
how to deal with a mismatch between expectation and reality. … I believe failures are also a
great source for learning, and future researchers and people developing HE curricula as a
cross-cultural practice may benefit from the lessons I learnt.

-My RJ

The actor -dimension of actor-action reciprocity has emerged from how I confronted situa-
tions in the Teamwork which I had first defined as failure. With respect to self-doubt as
caused by subjective experience of failure, introspection was an efficient way in bringing
relief to negative emotions. As illustrated by the above excerpt, my practice of introspec-
tion involved articulation of emotions and seeing value in failing. The value I saw in fail-
ing was based on a belief that readers of this study would become aware of my practices in
confronting negative emotions. Later in this chapter I elaborate on how acceptance of per-
sonal emotional suffering, and wishing others to be exempted from suffering constitute two
bridges between my theory construction and extant theories in social entrepreneurship.

Field awareness
So far in this chapter I have presented three subcategories for the grounded theory I am constructing: complex difference, actor-action reciprocity, and negotiatory adaptivity. The current section weaves these subcategories together by referring to incidents in the Teamwork. Actor-action reciprocity is related to complex difference via my practices in negotiating for social entrepreneurship characteristics to be embedded in the postgraduate programme. Equal access to resources, financial sustainability, and immediate social impact were key objectives guiding my actions. To negotiate for these objectives I employed communication strategies, including questioning and prioritizing. Several features of my orientation in knowledge use were also detected from the negotiatory practices. These features include critical thinking and strategies to legitimize ideas, such as reference to academic research and reference to positive personal experiences.

Sensitivity towards events and research in entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship and respective educational initiatives permeated my practices in the Teamwork. The term field awareness pinpoints this sensitivity. As visualized in diagram 3.2.2., field awareness involves several types of information sources, including academic sources, websites of social entrepreneurship projects, news articles, and events related to entrepreneurship.

Figure 2. How field awareness supported my objectives in curriculum development

During my participation in the Teamwork information sharing influenced decision-making in two ways. In some of the online meetings I directly referred to particular sources. The
example presented earlier on facilitating equal access to resources involves use of project websites and news reports (see Appendix 1). On other occasions the influence of my field awareness was more subtle. Here I provide more examples on how field awareness was channeled to the social entrepreneurship curriculum Teamwork.

Referring to Hytti & Kuopusjärvi’s illustration of entrepreneurship education and evaluations, Braun (2012) identifies 3 aims for training programmes: learning about entrepreneurship, learning entrepreneurial skills, and learning to become a startup entrepreneur. Reference: Braun, G. (2012), Evaluating entrepreneurship education programmes in developing countries: Lessons from experience ...Good ideas for activities "...Approaches such as case studies, real-life projects, and experiential exercises are preferred to the traditional lecture... Useful techniques include management games, field trips to existing businesses, roleplay situations...and individual counseling/mentoring by successful entrepreneurs (Loucks 1998a:14)." Reference: Echtner, C. M. (1995), Entrepreneurial training in developing countries

-Provisionally, academic sources account for the type of information source I most frequently used in the Teamwork communication. While I made direct references to project websites and events in conversations with my teammates, not all of my referencing to journal articles were recorded in meeting notes or emails. For this reason the use of academic sources was, on occasion, a subtle way in which field awareness influenced the Teamwork. In Appendix 3 I list articles I had read during the Teamwork.

How to professionalize as an educator acting as if I were an entrepreneur remains a key question in actor-action reciprocity (see Table 3 on page 18) that requires further elaboration. Confronting failure is one example illustrating how awareness of entrepreneur literature (Nielsen et al., 2012) and activities (Norden, n.d.) affected my practices in the Teamwork. However, the educator -dimension of my professionalization awaits for more discussion. Field awareness bridges this chapter with the next, where I refer to theoretical literature on educator professionalization, and research on entrepreneurship in order to increase the scope of theorizing in this study. Before moving on, I end this chapter by reviewing the substantive theory about my professionalization grounded in the Teamwork.

In this chapter I have illustrated how I theorized the Teamwork data. My practices in social entrepreneurship curriculum development exhibits negotiatory adaptivity in an interplay between complex difference and actor-action reciprocity. I present an emergent theory of my practice at the beginning of next chapter.
4 THEORIZING EDUCATOR PROFESSIONALIZATION

Theoretical grounding (Goldkuhl & Cronholm, 2010), or the action of bringing an emergent theory into a dialogue with extant theories is one way to increase the scope of theorizing in the grounded theory methodology (Urquhart, 2013). In this chapter I do so in two steps. First I provide an overview of the emergent theory of my practice in the Teamwork. Then I identify three dimensions through which I merge theoretical literature with the emergent theory. The result is an enhanced substantive theory (ibid; Littlejohn & Foss, 2011) which, hopefully, enriches academic debates in entrepreneurship education with theoretical relations synthesized from the empirical data from the Teamwork. While I walk the two steps of theory up-scaling in this chapter, the usefulness of this study and the consequent theory will be discussed in the final chapter of this thesis.

4.1 The Emergent Theory

In the previous chapter I explained how theoretical subcategories interrelate in the theory of my Teamwork practice. In the Teamwork I negotiated for equal access to resources, programme financial sustainability, and immediate impact as characteristics the postgraduate programme would manifest. In situations which I experienced as causing dispersion to teammate relations I adapted by confronting failure in various manners. Theory about my practice in the Teamwork emerges from an intersection among complex difference, negotiatory adaptivity, and actor-action reciprocity. What have facilitated such intersection are objectives in actor-action reciprocity, communication strategies and knowledge use in complex difference, and how my practice in pursuing certain objectives manifests negotiatory adaptivity. Figure 3 on the next page visualizes this emergent theory. Interrelations among the three theoretical subcategories are expressed by overlapping areas among the circles. The emergent theory locates in the very center, where all three circles intersect.
As a part of negotiatory practice I raised awareness toward diversity among prospective applicants to the postgraduate programme. This practice associates negotiatory adaptivity with actor-action reciprocity through my objective of promoting equal access to resources. Issues and materials I introduced into Teamwork discussions touched upon diversity of identity signifiers such as gender, class, ethnicity, and bodily able-ness, as well as economic status with its possible effect on one’s ability to afford higher education. I also addressed diversity among learners by providing various formats for learning and assessment. Furthermore, my practice of questioning as a communication strategy, and the use of academic research, are components of the complex difference subcategory which bridges negotiatory adaptivity with actor-action reciprocity.

Enhancing the postgraduate programme’s financial sustainability is one other objective constituting actor-action reciprocity. In the Teamwork I proposed a progressive tuition model and an idea for creating a fund pool to generate and manage scholarships. Negotiatory adaptivity in relation to this objective was manifested by my use of academic research knowledge, questioning, and reference to positive personal experience as negotiatory practice. For the objective of creating immediate impact through students’ practical work.
hours in the social entrepreneurship curriculum, I employed questioning as well as prioritization as negotiatory practice. For the objective of creating immediate impact through students’ practical work, which resulted in a 90-hour entity in the social entrepreneurship curriculum, I employed questioning as well as prioritization as negotiatory practice.

In both the field of entrepreneurship, and educator professionalization professional action and professional identity construction take place simultaneously (Kauppinen & Daskalaki, 2015; Morris et al., 2012; Cautreels, 2003; Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015a, 2015b; Wong, 2014). Actor-action reciprocity hence bridges the emergent theory with theoretical literature in these two fields of practice. In order to adapt to situations in the Teamwork where I experienced demotivating emotions, I confronted failure through personal reflection. Academic knowledge and field awareness about entrepreneurship allowed me to become more aware of my bias in defining failure. Writing in a reflective journal (RJ) was a central practice which mediated this growth of awareness. Later in this chapter I explore reflection and reflexivity as professional action which facilitates educator professionalization.

Practical theory is composed of concepts and their dynamic relations, principles, and philosophical assumptions (Littlejohn & Foss, 2011). While I presented my philosophical assumption in chapter 2, I explained subcategories and their relations in chapter 3. Principles are knowledge claims which inspire practical verification of a theory (ibid.). I consider principles of practical theory (Littlejohn & Foss, 2011) as correspondent to assertions in self-study of practice (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009), because both of them express practical knowledge in an informative manner. Based on my participation in the Teamwork of social entrepreneurship curriculum development I propose following knowledge claims:

1. The design and implementation of social entrepreneurship education, including subject areas, and practical operations in an educational programme are subjected to the influence of personal objectives of participants in curriculum development;
2. Personal objectives influence curriculum development through negotiatory and adaptive practices, including communication strategies, use of knowledge, and ways to confront emotionally challenging incidents;
3. Influence of personal practice can be revealed by analyzing the practitioner’s reflection in contrast to other records of communication in social entrepreneurship curriculum development.
The grounded theory methodology (GTM) results in propositions which may be verified through subsequent research (Urquhart, 2013). In addition to the three assertions for action and understanding presented above, the application of GTM in analyzing my Teamwork practice also resulted in propositions based on the theoretical overlapping and intersection of the subcategories. The three circles symbolizing complex difference, actor-action reciprocity, and negotiatory adaptivity overlap in pairs (see Figure 3 on page 36). These dynamic relations lead to the following propositions:

1. Where complex difference overlaps with negotiatory adaptivity: communication strategies and orientations of knowledge use can exhibit as difference among participants in curriculum development. When these strategies and orientations are applied to negotiate for certain objectives, they can lead to positive or negative emotions in the collaboration depending on the topic area in curriculum development;

2. Where negotiatory adaptivity overlaps with actor-action reciprocity: It is not self-evident that social entrepreneurship education programmes incorporate all characteristics of social entrepreneurship. The integration of social entrepreneurship values and operational structures might require intentional negotiation among curriculum developers;

3. Where actor-action reciprocity overlaps with complex difference: An educator negotiating in curriculum development can benefit from attitudes, skills, and field knowledge related to social entrepreneurship.

In addition to overlapping as pairs, the three theoretical subcategories also intersect (see Figure 3 on page 36). The core of the emergent theory responds to the first research question of this study by taking into account the knowledge claims and theoretical propositions presented above. The Teamwork in social entrepreneurship curriculum development has revealed three aspects of my professional practice. First, it is sensitive toward difference and its implications on emotions in interaction. Second, evaluation of work quality relies heavily on reflection and introspection. Third, facilitated by interaction, my professionalization happens through the updating of professional practice via independent learning. This composition of my professionalization informs the next phase in theory generation, where the notion of difference, reflection, and social entrepreneurship form a connection between the theory of my professional practice in the Teamwork, and extant literature.
4.2 Theory Up-scaling

In grounded theory methodology (GTM) one can scale up the scope and degree of abstraction of an emergent theory by associating its key aspects with extant theoretical literature, and it is up to the theorist to select foci for this association (Urquhart, 2013). Abbott (1988, cited in Jóhannesson, 1996) critiques such conceptualization for depicting professionalization as a unidirectional, field-specific, and static phenomenon. Responding to such critique I explore three complementary dimensions where the emergent theory and extant literature converge. My intention is not to present abundant literature reviews, but to tap on the potential of these dimensions for theorizing educator professionalization for entrepreneurship education.

In the first dimension I bridge the emergent theory with literature about professionalization by focusing on the notion of difference. In the second dimension I problematize reflection as a practice to construct professional knowledge (Boyer, 2004; Cautreels, 2003; Gillentine, 2006; Kalet *et al.*, 2007; Rué, Font, & Cebrían, 2013; Schön, 1983; Wong, 2014) focusing on the educator. I engage in an exercise of reflexivity as one way to critically examine reflection (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003; Sandywell, 1996; Shaw, 2013). Confrontation with setbacks in the Teamwork took place in a transition. My adaptivity toward uncertainty improved as I moved from over-identifying with my negative emotions to greater awareness of self-compassion (Neff & Vonk, 2009). The third dimension in which I scale up the emergent theory bridges self-compassion with compassion in social entrepreneurship (Miller *et al.*, 2012). Together these three dimensions scale up the emergent theory to a substantive one (Urquhart, 2013; Littlejohn & Foss, 2011) which I present at the end of this chapter.

4.2.1 Cosmopolitanizing professionalization

Through the emergent theory I have fostered an understanding of my practice in the Teamwork of developing a postgraduate programme in social entrepreneurship. Recognizing how my practice differed from those of my teammates allowed me to clarify my objectives, to modify negotiation strategies, and to adapt to negative emotions via reflection. Reconciliation of difference seems to be a trans-disciplinary denominator for negotiatory practices (see for example Zartman, 1977; Rogoveanu, 2010; Findlay & Thagard, 2014). Among health promoters ‘negotiating difference’ (Waterman, cited in Smith & Jenkins,
2011, p.165) has contributed to professionalization by sustaining solidarity among grass-root practitioners. Interest in and openness to difference account for professional practice which a cosmopolitan orientation (Smith & Jenkins, 2011). While the conceptualization of difference can be studied from as many perspectives as there are categorizations of difference, I have three reasons to find cosmopolitanism a rewarding source of literature for theorizing educator professionalization in social entrepreneurship education (SEE).

First, theorizing educator professionalization in the direction of cosmopolitanism responds to current trends in global development. According to the Kondratieff theory of socio-economic development waves, the global society has recently entered an era of development where resource efficacy could be strengthened by ethical motivation, including corporate shared value and social mission (Wilenius & Kurki, 2015). Educators in social entrepreneurship programmes can contribute to a transformation of capitalism by encouraging redefinition of value creation (Porter, cited in Drive, 2012, p.428) where the highest value includes positive social change in addition to financial gains (Drive, 2012). Cosmopolitanism as an orientation of professionalization (Smith & Jenkins, 2011) would serve this purpose, not only by defying social stratification among professionals (ibid.), but also by associating social movements to shape new transnational frameworks (Vertovec & Cohen, 2002). The emergent theory has been constructed through, and as, a self-study of practice (SSP). SSP has started as a movement among teachers and teacher educators to redefine their professionalization by gaining autonomy in the construction of their professional knowledge basis (Hamilton & Pinnegar, 2000; Lunenberg & Samaras, 2011).

Moreover, there is correspondence between the theory of my professionalization in the Teamwork and what cosmopolitanism encompasses. Summarizing various conceptualizations of cosmopolitanism, Vertovec and Cohen (2002) highlight ‘socio-cultural processes or individual behaviour, values or dispositions manifesting a capacity to engage cultural multiplicity’ (p.1) as one form of cosmopolitanism. In the Teamwork cultural multiplicity was acknowledged not only by me, but also by my teammates:

I'm loving to work with you two...our different approaches, back[A]ound[s] and cultures are making the whole process really interesting.

-Nastássia’s email

Qiqi...don't fe[e]l [like] a "stranger" on Brazilian seas...you have a very good notion of our culture, so feel free to express your thoughts about the program.
The above excerpts from the Teamwork demonstrate how cultural multiplicity captures attention from those who engage in social entrepreneurship curriculum development. Cultural-cognitive systems contribute to professionalization via the construction and claiming of ownership of specialized expertise, or profession-specific knowledge (Barrett, 2010). Making knowledge claims in connection to the emergent theory can be seen as my attempt to construct specialized expertise as an educator in social entrepreneurship. To take on a cosmopolitan stance in professionalizing requires me to problematize how university-based training affects educator professionalization (Barrett, 2010) with regard to cultural multiplicity. I engage in this inquiry in section 4.2.2.

In addition to formulating a response to global trends, and linking the emergent theory with extant literature through the concept of cultural multiplicity, I have a third reason to adopt cosmopolitanism in theorizing educator professionalization. As I shall demonstrate in following sections, the way how difference is theorized in the light of cosmopolitanism adds coherence among the three dimensions I use for theory up-scaling.

### 4.2.2 Reflexivity and educator living contradictions

My aim in this chapter is to theorize educator professionalization in and for social entrepreneurship education, taking into account both the emergent theory about my practice in the Teamwork, and literature on professionalization. The emergent theory illustrates relations between my practice and the social entrepreneurship curriculum development Teamwork as an interactive entity. One part of the data where this theory is grounded is my reflective journal (RJ). Reflection has been utilized for the construction of professional knowledge across disciplines (Cautreels, 2003; Gillentine, 2006; Kalet et al., 2007; Hamilton et al., 1998; Lassonde et al., 2009; Rué, Font, & Cebrián, 2013).

In the field of education, reflections have been studied to understand perceptions of professionalism and professionalization (see Boyer, 2004; Okas et al., 2014), as well as contextualized formation of professional knowledge and identity (Pinnegar & Hamilton; 2009). Critical examination of one’s personal normative beliefs contributes to educator professionalization (Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015b). By problematizing the practice of reflection I move on from theorizing about my professionalization in the Teamwork to theorizing educator professionalization on a more general level.
A reflexive inquiry interrogates the logic, methodology, and investigation paradigm of reflection (Sandywell, 1996). In entrepreneurship education reflexivity unites educators with co-instructors as well as learners. In learning for - rather than learning about - entrepreneurship reflexivity cultivates collaborative relations in which both educators and learners engage in a critical inquiry about their ‘ways of being, understanding, and acting’ (Higgins, Smith, & Mirza, 2013, p.151). Given that there is a need for a higher degree of relevancy between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial practices (Miller, Wesley, & Williams, 2012), reflexivity would enhance the quality of entrepreneurial learning by facilitating co-creation of knowledge, experience and professional identity (Higgins, Smith, & Mirza, 2013).

As researchers conducting qualitative data analysis, Mauthner and Doucet (2003) exercise reflexivity by providing an account of their academic and personal biographies. Following Mauthner and Doucet’s (2003) example, I now inquire upon reflection as a method contributing to the emergent theory, and as a method for my professionalization, by examining my academic background and cultural biography.

Depending on the topic area in the Teamwork, I was occasionally associated with my major subject of specialization, or the country or continent my academic education is located in. During and prior to the Teamwork I enrolled in the Degree Programme in Intercultural Teacher Education (henceforth ITE) in the university of Oulu, Finland. On its official website the ITE is featured as a programme which provides competences for international tasks in the field of education by responding to challenges posed by multiculturalism (University of Oulu, n.d.). The ITE emphasizes on intercultural competence (Jokikokko, 2010) as an ideal in professional development of educators.

As a student in the ITE I practiced reflection during my actions. Through the use of lecture diaries and a pedagogical portfolio ITE-students engage in writing reflectively about individual and collective learning processes, and how those experiences were contributing to their understanding about educator professionalism. Reflection had targeted manifestations of culture and its elements affect professional interaction. In addition, ITE-students were encouraged to form a habit of questioning, and to challenge knowledge presented by authority figures. My practice of reflection and questioning illustrates how my academic background impacted the Teamwork.
Since the beginning of the Teamwork Paulo, Nastássia and I come from different cultural backgrounds. I consider myself as culturally diverse. I have spent my childhood in mainland China, and have lived in Finland since teenage. I believe I had shared with Paulo and Nastássia some understanding of the Brazilian culture, because I had lived in the same city as they do for half a year prior to the Teamwork. My awareness of manners and values I considered common to national identities of Brazilians, Chinese, and Finnish people informed my reflection in curriculum development. My personal biography has contributed to the emergent theory by helping to reveal educator living contradictions, or incidents of discrepancy between a practitioner's actions and their beliefs (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2010).

The synergy between my academic background and cultural biography led to one of the educator living contradictions. My academic background in the Intercultural Teacher Education (henceforth referred to as the ITE) programme has provided much occasions and material for critical thinking, with intercultural competence (Jokikokko, 2010) as a component of educator professionalism. In the Teamwork I avoided the use of national identity to rationalize behaviour. I was unwilling to confirm stereotypes attributed for Chinese, Brazilians and Finns. On the other hand, I regarded my awareness of Finnish, Brazilian, and Chinese values and manners in communication as a resource I could use to understand the Teamwork.

When a situation was experienced by me as outside of my comfort zone, I often attempted to explain it by reflecting on differences among Brazilian, Finnish, and Chinese models of action and understanding. During the Team I also had the presumption that emotional closeness could be nurtured through “my Brazilian side” and its relation to my Teammates, because it represented my knowledge of the local context for the curriculum. Furthermore, I expected “my Finnish side” to grant legitimacy to the content and methods I used for the Team because of Finland’s reputation in organizing high quality education, and because I participated in the Team as a student in a teacher education programme in Finland.

A second educator living contradiction also originates from my personal and academic background. As student-teachers the ITE undergraduates had been taught the importance of teachers’ involvement in curriculum development. For example, Grundy’s (1987) work about curriculum as emancipatory praxis was included as course reading. At the beginning of the Teamwork I suggested to invite prospective teachers for the postgraduate programme to develop the social entrepreneurship curriculum. In a later discussion I support-
ed the idea of organizing a workshop, where potential teachers would collaboratively design teaching methods based on a discussion about the curriculum. However, neither attempts to involve teachers in curriculum development was realized. After hearing how such arrangements would be ‘unfamiliar’ to prospective teachers, I chose to ‘adapt’ to what I considered as insider knowledge embedded in my teammates’ cultural background. Adaptivity as compromising to opinions justified by cultural background ran contrary to the curriculum as praxis-ideology (Grundy, 1983) I appreciated as a part of educator professionalism.

The educator living contradictions presented above gives an example of how reflexivity enables a practitioner to recognize tension between her epistemology and the social reality of developing a social entrepreneurship curriculum. My Teamwork-practice of negotiating and adapting involved friction between ideologies cultivated through my academic education and how I appropriated my decisions in curriculum development. Given that educator professionalization involves change in the self (Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015a), it is worthy to consider integration and synergy as two ways in identity construction through cosmopolitan learning (Mikhaylov & Fierro, 2015). My RJ expresses alliance with integration, where I related to different cultures depending on the context in curriculum development. The option of synergy, or the creation of a new culture which incorporates aspects of different cultures (ibid.) offers an alternative to encounter educator living contradictions.

In addition to reflection on practice, regulation of one’s emotions is a key element of reflexivity for entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship educators (Higgins, Smith, & Mirza, 2013). My adaptivity in the Teamwork-practice was refined through reflecting on my emotional responses to stressful situations in curriculum development. In the following section I explain how regulation of emotions bridges my reflexivity with self-compassion and compassion in entrepreneurship.

4.2.3 Compassion and social entrepreneurship

In the subcategory relations for the emergent theory ‘events’ constitute a source of field awareness contributing to my adaptive practice in the Teamwork (see Figure 2 on page 33). I became aware of the relation between compassion and entrepreneurship when listening to a radio programme about the CoPassion research project (see CoPassion, n.d.). When interviewed about the CoPassion-research team’s work Professor Anne Birgitta Pes-
si defined compassion as “feeling with another person” rather than “feeling for” them, and as action taken on behalf of that person when needed (Pessi, in press). Internationally, research suggests positive correlation between compassion and corporate success (CoPassion, n.d.). This radio programme not only contributed to my field awareness in the Teamwork, but it also encouraged me to explore theoretical literature about compassion and entrepreneurship.

Grimes et al. (2013) consider compassion as an enduring motivation for solving social problems. Compassion as a motivation for social entrepreneurship (Miller et al., 2012) facilitates a dialectic orientation toward seemingly incompatible objectives. In traditional entrepreneurship literature delivery of sound solutions to social problems, and maintenance of economic efficiency are viewed as competing and incompatible objectives (Tracey & Phillips, 2007). As a responsive strategy social entrepreneurship education needs to prepare students in bridging social welfare, commercial and public-sector logics (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012).

Establishing a financially viable organization while serving a social cause has been featured as a ‘double bottom line’ social entrepreneurs face (Tracey & Phillips, 2007). This challenge can be met by integrative thinking - a cognitive process triggered by compassion (Miller et al., 2012). Integrative thinking enables reconciliation of ostensibly competing goals through openness to complexity and problem-solving which recombine diverse approaches (ibid.). Moreover, compassion engages the social entrepreneur in prosocial cost-benefit analysis. In prosocial cost-benefit analysis the cost of inaction toward a social problem is considered more costly than the solutions to solve it. Enhanced social welfare as an outcome of entrepreneurial behaviour is considered a benefit which makes it worthwhile to invest time, resources, and emotional energy in a venture. (Miller et al., 2012)

In addition to integrative thinking and prosocial cost-benefit analysis, compassion triggers the affective process of committing to the alleviation of other people’s suffering (Miller et al., 2012). With respect to professionalization, compassion offers a cosmopolitan approach to engage with cultural multiplicity (Vertovec & Cohen, 2002) and alterity (Josephides, 2010). The Other-oriented aspect of compassion fosters emotional connection between a social entrepreneur and those who are suffering. This connection allows reinforcement of a prosocial identity that is formed through taking actions to alleviate suffering. (Miller et al., 2012)
Buddhism has provided insights on and teachings about compassion (Neff & Vonk, 2009). His Holiness the Dalai Lama describes compassion as “a mental attitude based on the wish for others to be free of their suffering…associated with a sense of commitment, responsibility, and respect towards the other” (Dalai Lama & Cutler, 2011). Compassion can be cultivated by associating one’s past experiences of suffering with those of other sentient beings, as well as by thinking inductively that the wish for happiness is shared by all, and hence wishing well for others (Dalai Lama & Cutler, 2011).

The Teamwork in developing a curriculum and a postgraduate programme for social entrepreneurship lasted for more than nine months in 2015. During the same period of time I proceeded with my undergraduate studies as well as tasks outside this research study. Writing in the reflective journal (RJ) not only contributed to the emerging theory with archived data, but the action was one way to process the emotions I was experiencing. Negative emotions - stress, disappointment, and self-doubt in particular - eventually drew my attention toward how my participation in, and study of, the Teamwork were affecting my well-being. As I familiarized with literature about compassion, I experienced a lack of integrity: “I’m learning about compassion, but am I treating myself compassionately?”

While watching a videotaped lecture presented by Dr. Kristin Neff (2013) on the Compassion & Business -conference organized by Stanford University’s Center for Compassion and Altruism Research and Education (CCARE), I found myself relating to Kristin Neff’s experience in becoming a self-compassion researcher. Suffering from negative emotions during her PhD-studies, and the awareness of how Buddhist meditation practices had helped her to adapt had led Kristin Neff to study the effects of compassion (ibid.). The CCARE video conference also inspired me to for associations between compassion, self-compassion, and educator professionalization for social entrepreneurship education.

For Neff (2013) self-compassion is essentially the same as compassion for others. Self-compassionate people have been found to have an accurate self-concept when rating their performances, and emotional resilience when facing difficulties (Neff & Vonk, 2009). Unlike the concept of global self-esteem which is positively associated with narcissism, self-compassion enhances mental health by cultivating a sense of self-worth based on self-kindness, recognition of shared humanity, and mindfulness in confronting personal weaknesses (ibid.). These three aspects of self-compassion strengthen adaptive psychological functioning by counteracting self-judgment, feelings of isolation, and over-identification
with negative emotions when confronting failure (Neff, Hsieh, & Dejitterat, 2005; Neff, Kirkpatrick, & Rude, 2007; Shepherd & Cardon, 2009).

In sum, there are several reasons why compassion is a worthwhile direction for theorizing educator professionalization for social entrepreneurship education. First, the theorization of compassion can contribute to social entrepreneurship education via its association with entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship (CoPassion, n.d.; Miller et al., 2012; Neff, 2013). Second, compassion relates with the emergent theory of my Teamwork through the practice of self-compassion (Neff, Hsieh, & Dejitterat, 2005; Neff, Kirkpatrick, & Rude, 2007; Neff & Vonk, 2009). Third, compassion converges with cosmopolitanism in their common recognition of shared humanity (Smith & Jenkins, 2011; Neff, 2013; Neff & Vonk, 2009). In the following section I present a theory of educator professionalization in and for SEE.

4.3 The Substantive Theory - A Beginning

A demand to strengthen the relation between higher education research and contemporary society has emerged in many parts of the world (Kinti & Hayward, 2013). There is a lack of clear theorization for and a need for innovative ways to approach social entrepreneurship education (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012; Higgins, Smith, & Mirza, 2013). In section 4.1 I elaborated on the emergent theory about my professionalization in the Teamwork by presenting theoretical propositions. In order to sustain theoretical cohesion (Goldkuhl & Cronholm, 2010) I present the up-scaled theory as one theoretical proposition:

Social entrepreneurship education (SEE) can facilitate, and benefit from, educator professionalization where the practice of reflection-in-action is examined from perspectives of cosmopolitanism and compassion.

This self-study of practice demonstrates how curriculum development for SEE has provided me an opportunity to examine my professionalization. Reflection-in-action (Schön, 1983) contributed to the theorization of my professionalization as a subject for critical examination. Reflexivity as a way to interrogate the methodology of reflection (Sandywell, 1996) revealed educator living contradictions (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009) experienced by me in the Teamwork. Hence the examination of reflection-in-action had two implications. One, the living contradictions suggest that a cosmopolitan regard of difference may en-
hance professionalization by providing options to engage with cultural multiplicity. A synergy-approach to identity construction as an alternative to the integration-approach (see Mikhaylov & Fierro, 2015) might allow for more flexibility and less stress during educator professional identity formation.

Two, the examination of reflection-in-action can draw attention towards inaccurate evaluation of one’s practice or over-identification with negative emotions when encountering failure. Such mindfulness (Neff & Vonk, 2009) would benefit SEE by enhancing integrity in educator professionalization, where the promotion of compassion as a motivation for social ventures (Miller et al., 2012) is complemented with self-compassion practiced by the educator. Moreover, the likelihood of unsustainable decisions being made based on compassion (Beckmann, Pies, & von Winning, 2012) could be decreased through reflexive professional practice.
5 EVALUATION

To serve the research purpose of understanding my professionalization as an educator I have conducted a self-study on my practice in a ten-month collaboration in developing a postgraduate programme in social entrepreneurship. Participation in the Teamwork and insights reached through this self-study have allowed me to construct theory for social entrepreneurship education from the perspective of educator professionalization. In this chapter I first evaluate how the integrated use of self-study of practice (SSP) and the grounded theory methodology (GTM) have supported the research purposes of this study. Then I present considerations on the axiological aspects of my research.

5.1 Methodological Soundness

Whereas procedures of the grounded theory methodology (GTM) and self-study of practice (SSP) were explained in chapter 2 in this thesis, in this section I evaluate the quality of this study by examining how my utilization of SSP and GTM have served the research purposes.

Educator professionalization and professionalism may be enhanced through self-study research (LaBoskey, 2005; Mitchell et al., 2005; Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015a, 2015b). How well self-study of practice (SSP) supports educator professional identity formation can be evaluated through aspects of academic scholarship (Lunenberg, Zwart, & Korthagen, 2010). One of these aspects points to the researcher-practitioner’s knowledge about how a topic bridges the problem at hand with research literature (Coppola, 2007, cited in ibid.). Whereas I had been aware of the practice of reflection as a method used in educator professional formation, the connection between educator professionalization and social entrepreneurship education has been constructed throughout this study. In this study GTM has been utilized as a research methodology that is complementary to SSP. Application of the grounded theory methodology (GTM) allows the researcher to make theoretical associations between data and literature (Dunne, 2011; Kelle, 2005; Thornberg, 2012; Goldkuhl & Cronholm, 2010). As one part of GTM, theory up-scaling (Urquhart, 2013) connects this inquiry with literature related to educator professionalization and social entrepreneurship (see chapter 4). I have become more informed about academic debates in
these areas by applying a methodological framework where SSP and GTM complement one another.

Intentionality is one other aspect in which SSP contributes to educator professionalization via the formation of a scholarly identity (Lunenberg, Zwart, & Korthagen, 2010). By clarifying why I theorize my practice in the Teamwork (see section 1.1.), and by articulating how the research methodologies assist me in responding to the research questions (see sections 1.2. and 2.2.) I have explained how SSP fulfils my intention in gaining an understanding about my professionalism and about the Teamwork as an experience of professionalization in social entrepreneurship education. In connection to data presentation and analysis I have given examples of my Teamwork-practice (see Table 2 on page 10, and chapter 3). Documentation and publication of one’s work also constitute the scholarly aspect of educator professional development which can be strengthened via SSP (ibid.). From the perspective of scholarly identity formation, SSP connects my practice in social entrepreneurship curriculum development with the research purpose of theorizing about my professionalization as an educator.

In a context of teacher education research the validity of SSP is examined through reframing of practice (see Hamilton & Pinnegar, 2000). While this study is situated in social entrepreneurship education, the SSP research method of reflection (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009) has enabled me to reframe my practice for developing a social entrepreneurship curriculum. In the theory construction and up-scaling parts of this study (see chapter 3 and 4 respectively) reframing of practice took place for a second time. Among other data sources archived from the Teamwork in social entrepreneurship curriculum development I reevaluated my reflective journal (RJ) in order to analyze my Teamwork-practice as an entity and in retrospective. By accounting for my educator living contradictions (see section 4.2.2) in the light of extant literature I reframed my practice-for-professionalization. The result is an aspiration for cosmopolitan educator professionalization which would help integrate compassion into social entrepreneurship education through the practices of reflexivity and self-compassion (see chapter 4).

Application of SSP enables transformation of private theory into public theory (Hamilton & Pinnegar, 2000). In this study grounded theory methodology (GTM) enhanced this transformation through theory up-scaling (Urquhart, 2013). My utilization of the GTM has been informed by the works of constructivist grounded theorists in a qualitative research tradi-
Qualitative constructivist inquiry has a subjective, interpretive and explanatory nature (Mikhaylov & Fierro, 2015). Among my philosophical assumptions I have emphasized these features of theorizing (see section 2.3.). I now explain in detail how these features in my epistemological and methodological framework have led to partiality of the theory presented in this study.

The theory about my practice in the Teamwork for social entrepreneurship curriculum development consists of theoretical relations among complex difference, actor-action reciprocity, and negotiatory adaptivity (see section 4.1.). Emotions constitute one type of patterns in the data which led to my conceptualization of complex difference. While expressions of emotions are directly noticeable from all three sources of primary data (Table 2 on page 10), how they affected cohesion among members of the Teamwork is an interpretation I have made based on my subjective experience of the social atmosphere in the collaboration. The same applies to patterns of my practice that are conceptualized for complex difference (see Figure 1 on page 18). Regardless of written records of my practice in the Teamwork, my theorizing of their effects on team cohesion is based on my subjective interpretation based on the emotions expressed in the data.

The notion of crystallization (see Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009) has informed data interpretation in SSP as well as the way I present theorization. The novelty of crystallization lies in its potential for constructing dimensions that would illustrate complexity of theorizing (Bowers & Schatzman, 2009. Data analysis is contextually situated in time, place, culture, and situation (Charmaz, 2006, p.131). To address the partiality of theorizing in this qualitative inquiry informed by constructivist grounded theory I have presented my philosophical assumptions in section 2.3. Such clarification increases transparency and comprehensiveness of data analysis (Bowers & Schatzman, 2009). Moreover, a good grounded theory analysis can be recognized from an ability to create abstract concepts and to engage a theory with other theories (Urquhart, 2013). In this study my application of GTM has yielded in abstract theoretical subcategories (chapter 3) and engagement with theoretical literature on cosmopolitanism, reflexivity and compassion (chapter 4).

Whereas the application of SSP and GTM satisfies the research purpose of theorizing educator professionalization in and for social entrepreneurship, there are a couple of areas worthy of scholarly attention. The first issue concerns optimization of data. Since it is not
my intention to evaluate the social entrepreneurship curriculum developed for the post-
graduate programme in Brazil, I have not examined my practice in the light of curriculum
development. A more vigorous scrutiny of secondary data (see Table 2 on page 10), or
knowledge resources for curriculum development could serve this other research interest.
The other issue relates to the comparative logic in GTM procedures which allows the theo-
rists to categorize data based on similarities and differences among patterns (Glaser &
Strauss, 1967). Staying in line with the research purpose, comparisons made between my
practice and those of my teammates’ have been guided by a focus on my professionaliza-
tion rather than on evaluating Paulo’s or Nastássia’s performance in the Teamwork.

5.2 Axiological Considerations

The axiology aspect of practical theory directs attention toward how the researcher’s work
is influenced by institutional values, political and economic ideologies. It also questions
the effect of a study on the subject for inquiry. (Littlejohn & Foss, 2011) In this section I
first discuss how my actions taken as a researcher might have affected the Teamwork
through my participation. Then, I problematize the research purpose by reflecting on some
of the political and economic ideologies which have informed this study.

Nastássia and Paulo - my teammates in social entrepreneurship curriculum development –
had been aware of this study since its beginning. While I had expressed interest in conduct-
ing a study on the curriculum development project at the first meeting with Nastássia in
Brazil, Paulo heard about my research on the first online conference held between the three
of us. I had explained that the focus of this study is my professionalization as an educator,
and that it is not my intention to evaluate their participation. In addition to their consent to
take part in my research, Paulo and Nastássia considered unnecessary to remain anony-
mous in this study. In contrast, I have modified the names of the institutions represented by
my teammates, because I have not received confirmations from the institutions regarding
their participation in my research.

On the one hand, the presence of my teammates in this thesis in their real names helps to
maintain my integrity as a self-study researcher. By having Nastássia’s and Paulo’s voice
heard through the examples of data, all three of us may claim ownership of the knowledge
gained through our practical experience of developing a social entrepreneurship curricu-
ulum. Self-study of practice (SSP) presents knowledge as collectively constructed in interac-
tion, and owned by practitioners rather than owned by a researcher (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009).

On the other hand, I regret not to articulate policies and practices of the institutions involved in the curriculum development which created difficulties in developing the postgraduate programme. Although the engagement of Legacy and HEI in social entrepreneurship education (SEE) in the future might benefit from making change in organizational power relations, explicit description of administrative and structural arrangements at the time of the Teamwork could harm my teammates’ relations with their employers. The ethical stance of SSP is coherent with the Aristotelian notion of ethics as attention to individual human flourishing (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2010). My axiological dilemma lies in between exposure of sensitive information given by my teammates about their institutions, and the potential for future SEE students to access a better programme.

In addition, the Teamwork in social entrepreneurship curriculum development was influenced through my attempt in gathering feedback from my teammates via a questionnaire (see Appendix 2). The questions were designed for learning about Nastássia’s and Paulo’s views on the Teamwork. I had wished to identify themes in my practice which were drawing the most attention from my teammates, and hence focus on those aspects in the following collaboration. After sending the questionnaire in the name of a ‘feedback form’, I informed Paulo and Nastássia that they could ask about the questions, omit some of them when replying, or choose not to answer any of the questions. Regardless of emails exchanged where the questionnaire was mentioned, none of the questions was answered by either of my teammates. My adaptivity in the Teamwork concerned not only curriculum development, but also adjustment done as a researcher. As an adaptive response to the omission of the questionnaire, I interpreted the situation as an opportunity to develop as a researcher. This incident affected the Teamwork by drawing my attention toward studying the curriculum development process instead of focusing on developing the curriculum.

My other axiological consideration questions that value basis for the research purpose of this study. As mentioned in section 4.2.2, intercultural competence (Jokikokko, 2010) is an ideology embedded in my institutional and academic background in the Intercultural Teacher Education. Intercultural competence is “an ethical orientation to people, life and diversity”, and “less related to specific skills and knowledge than it is comprised of a holis-
tic approach to issues” (ibid, abstract). I had volunteered to participate in the Teamwork in order to gain a clearer understanding of my professionalism.

The other research purpose in this study is to generate theory for social entrepreneurship education from a perspective of educator professionalization. Jóhannesson (1996) views professionalism as “the main way to institutionalize expertise in industrialized countries”. There are various approaches to theorize professionalism and professionalization where educator’s professionalism is considered to consist of expert knowledge, and legitimacy awarded by administrative and educational institutions of a society (see Barrett, 2010; Hargreaves, 2000; Jóhannesson, 1996). With this study I wish to illustrate how professional knowledge can be constructed through intercultural practice, and that - regardless of the influence channeled through ideologies embedded in institutional backgrounds - educator professionalization can transgress national and geographical borders through the practice of theorizing (see Hooks, 1994).
6 DISCUSSION

Regardless of increasing interest toward social entrepreneurship being integrated into compulsory education and as a part of entrepreneurship programmes, practitioners in social entrepreneurship education (SEE) are missing a consistent body of knowledge which provide general advice for their practice (Brock & Kim, 2011; Kummitha & Majumdar, 2015; Miller, Wesley, & Williams, 2012; Naia et al., 2014). At the same time there is need for entrepreneurship education curricula to serve diverse contexts and learners (Blackwood et al., 2015; Blenker et al., 2012; Naia et al., 2014). In addition to the intrinsic motivation of understanding my own professionalization as an educator in curriculum development, I have conducted this study to contribute to the formation of a knowledge basis for educators in SEE.

The Teamwork addressed in this study provided an authentic environment for a self-study of practice (SSP), through which I crystalized manifestations of my professionalism into knowledge claims and theoretical propositions. Knowledge claims in this study correspond to assertions for action and understanding in SSP (see Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). My participation in, and research on, the Teamwork illustrates how SEE is subjected to the influence of personal objectives of curriculum developers. The practices in which my objectives influenced the curriculum exhibit negotiatory adaptive features. As an assertion for action I encourage scrutiny of SEE practitioners’ reflection and other types of data involved in curriculum development, so that possible relations may be observed between objectives in curriculum development and the quality of SEE.

Theoretical propositions generated through this study resonate with visions in existing SEE curriculum development literature. I have illustrated through data analysis and theory construction how characteristics of social entrepreneurship are not always incorporated by SEE programmes, and that the integration of these values and structures might require intentional negotiation from curriculum developers. These theoretical propositions resonate with strategies employed for creating an educational programme, where SEE took place in a multidisciplinary manner (see Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010). This programme at Elon University implies that there is a need to enhance awareness toward social entrepreneurship among participating institutions and communities (Jones, Warner, & Kiser, 2010). In addition, I have also proposed that an educator would encounter emotionally challenging
situations when negotiating for certain values in curriculum development, and that social entrepreneurial attitudes, skills, and field knowledge could help the practitioner overcome such challenge. The field awareness –aspect of my professional practice echoes the curriculum development strategy proposed by Jones, Warner, and Kiser (2010) in terms of familiarity with social entrepreneurship literature. Furthermore, the actor-action reciprocity – component of the emergent theory resonates with the application of entrepreneurial logics in the curriculum development of SEE programmes (see Kummitta & Majumdar, 2015).

The utility of SSP studies is manifested by how the practitioner-researcher inform public issues by interrogating “personal troubles” in a particular professional context (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p.182). In this study the “personal troubles” correspond to educator living contradictions I recognized through a reflexive examination of my practice in curriculum development. Whereas the theorization of my practice in the Teamwork was grounded in the content of my reflection, educator living contradictions shed light on reflection as a method in educator professionalization. Educator professionalization is strongly influenced by the practitioner’s reflection upon particularities in the working context (Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015a). Social entrepreneurship education (SEE) can facilitate, and benefit from, educator professionalization where the practice of reflection-in-action is examined from perspectives of cosmopolitanism and compassion. This is the main principle of the practical theory I have generated through this study.

Taking into consideration that cultural awareness and values need to be considered in order to enhance sustainability of entrepreneurship curricula in higher education (Fitrianto & A’la, 2014), future endeavours in SEE may benefit from this study by taking a cosmopolitan stance in curriculum development. Cosmopolitanism in educator professionalization would imply engagement with cultural multiplicity (Vertovec & Cohen, 2002) as well as clarification of the cultural biographical roots of one’s objectives in curriculum development.

Collective endeavours are influenced by the vicissitude of a practitioner’s self-concept (Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015a). In this study I have related educator professionalization with the practice of self-compassion (Neff & Vonk, 2009), which is inherently integral to compassion (Neff, 2013). On the one hand, regardless of a positive correlation between compassion and competencies needed by social entrepreneurs, compassion is considered more significant by social entrepreneurship education organizers than it is viewed by social
entrepreneurship practitioners (Miller et al., 2012; Miller, Wesley, & Williams, 2012). On the other hand, uncritical use of compassion can cause unsustainable results (Beckmann et al., 2012). The theorization in this study involves reflexivity as one way to support reflection. Facilitation of professionalization has articulated as one of its goals to have participants make explicit their normative views about what it means to be a good profession (Vanassche & Kelchtermans, 2015a). The main theoretical proposition pictures holistic professionalization where the educator would relate to the practice of reflexive thinking while treating oneself and others in SEE with compassion.

This study provides a record on processes involved in the creation of a postgraduate programme in social entrepreneurship. From a perspective of programme impact evaluation (see Smith, 2015) future research in SEE may benefit from the description and analysis of the Teamwork. Last but not least, I hope the intellectual journal of conducting this research would inspire educators to engage in developing their professionalism through SSP.
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Appendix 1 A slide on the ‘Entrepreneurship education - key elements’ presentation I created
Appendix 2 My questions for Paulo and Nastássia sent as a “feedback form”

1. How did you get involved in this project? What are the things that motivate you?

2. What kind of roles have you embraced or recognized from yourself during this working process?

3. What kind of skills did you need for taking care of responsibilities in the different roles?

4. How has the teamwork influenced your awareness of relevant skills?

5. What are some qualities/features you appreciate in our teamwork including communication, task division and their accomplishment?

6. Thinking about what you have done on your own and with us as a Team, what have you learnt? (You could for example think of things that matched your expectations, what came [as] unexpected, and what you find challenging/rewarding/significant.)

7. What makes our Team and teamwork unique?

8. Imagine a different team planning a social entrepreneurship education programme. What do you suggest them to consider? How can they learn from our experience?

Free space (anything in mind that doesn’t relate directly to the questions but you’d like to share):