

PART I
INTRODUCTION

1

Case-based entrepreneurship education in and for the Nordic region

Lise Aaboen, Dag Håkon Haneberg, Siri Jakobsen, Thomas Lauvås, and Karin Wigger

SETTING THE SCENE

Entrepreneurship refers to a process of exploring and exploiting entrepreneurial opportunities to create and capture economic, environmental, and social values (Baron & Shane, 2007). Entrepreneurship is an important means of creating our future (Pacheco, Dean, & Payne, 2010). Educating students to have the necessary entrepreneurial skills and mindset to act entrepreneurially (referred to as entrepreneurship education) is therefore high on the agenda of many higher education institutions. Examples of entrepreneurial skills that entrepreneurship education aims to increase are identifying new opportunities in the presently unknowable, creating value in uncertain situations, and making decisions based on few concrete details (Nabi et al., 2017).

The aim of increasing students' entrepreneurial skills and mindset distinguishes entrepreneurship education from other—more functional—disciplines at higher education institutions, such as business and management education (Nabi et al., 2017). Entrepreneurship educators often draw on experiential learning process and make use of game- and design-based learning approaches to teach students these distinct entrepreneurial skills (Neck & Greene, 2011). Case teaching is a popular pedagogical approach to teaching entrepreneurship (Neck & Greene, 2011) because using cases enhances students' active participation, reflection, and discussion, which are critical elements of an experiential learning process to increase students' entrepreneurial skills and mindset.

Despite these differences between teaching entrepreneurship and more functional disciplines, such as management and business, many entrepreneurship educators currently borrow case teaching methods and accompanying cases from business and management education to teach students the art of entrepreneurship (Neck & Greene, 2011). Scholars argue that too much functionality lessens the entrepreneurial spirit of the students and in the classroom

(Shepherd & Douglas, 1997). Consequently, this book argues that the case method needs to be reframed for entrepreneurship education. This book provides examples of how it can be designed and utilized to ensure that case-based entrepreneurship education facilitates pedagogical interventions aimed at increasing students' entrepreneurial skills and mindset.

Traditionally, the case approach builds on a narrative from the 'real world'—although the case narrative can also be fictional (Greenhalgh, 2007). The case narrative puts the reader in the role of a participant, and thereby provides meaningful connection to practitioners, such as entrepreneurs (Ellet, 2007). In this book, we define cases as authentic and often incomplete narratives of some form of entrepreneurial action that are open to interpretation and subjectivity. Entrepreneurial action, such as sensing and pursuing opportunities and mobilizing resources, happens in all types of entrepreneurial ventures; for example, start-ups and corporate entrepreneurship set the scene for entrepreneurial narratives. Stimulated by the case narrative, teaching entrepreneurship with the case method enables students to step into the role of an entrepreneur and engage in entrepreneurial thinking (Blenker et al., 2011; Fellnhöfer, 2017).

Although the case method is a student-centred teaching method, educators play a crucial role during the case process, including their preparation *before* the case intervention, execution *in* class, and reflection and evaluation *after* students have solved the case. Case teaching does not necessarily need to revolve around a pre-written case; other mediums may also be used, and teachers, students, and the 'case entrepreneurs' may have several different roles in case development and solving. Subsequently, there is a lot of underutilized potential in adapting case teaching to entrepreneurship education to ensure that students are actually in the role of an entrepreneur when working with a case.

When reality is brought into the learning space, the challenge of contextualizing entrepreneurship needs to be interpreted (see further Welter, 2011; Welter et al., 2016). The case method, entrepreneurship, and education are practised around the world, and so the particularities of different regions and countries must be considered when borrowing educational concepts, teaching methods, and materials developed in another context. Using the case method in entrepreneurship education requires an understanding of the context in which the case is embedded. To maximize learning from the teaching case, the contextual understanding that students bring to classes and the case study's context should be aligned in the best possible ways. Indeed, Zahra (2007) claims that context matters highly in entrepreneurship.

To further elaborate on the context issue of the case method, we provide illustrative examples of why context matters and why an understanding of the context of the case narrative is essential for an optimal learning outcome. Framework conditions, innovation systems, and other formal and informal institutions, such as regulations, norms, and habits, vary from country to country but are crucial for understanding entrepreneurial action and for practices and norms at higher education institutions. Hence, context is an important aspect of entrepreneurship education because (1) institutions develop specific particularities to respond to the context and (2) students bring with them experiences and backgrounds that define their contextual understandings; at the same time, case narratives are highly contextualized. At the time of writing this book, Nordic higher education institutions tend to use cases from North America that do not consider the Nordic context. Having said this, we acknowledge that case

narratives from all over the world are important; however, they require that students have the necessary understanding of the context.

Hence, this book solves three interrelated issues for case teaching in entrepreneurship education at Nordic higher education institutions. First, it develops cases and case teaching methods *in* and *for* the Nordic context. Second, it suggests case teaching methods that enable students to take the role of an entrepreneur. Third, it provides cases that focus on entrepreneurial action. This book includes entrepreneurial narratives of persons who want to become entrepreneurs, who are at the early stage of venture creation, and who are acting entrepreneurially in established organizations. Hence, the book covers a broad range of entrepreneurship.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

Acting like and being an entrepreneur requires a distinct mindset and skills (Kuratko et al., 2021). Entrepreneurship education at higher education institutions aims to provide students with exactly this mindset and skills. Thus, entrepreneurship education is regarded as promoting various forms of entrepreneurship and as a means to increase entrepreneurial activities in general. The main outcomes of entrepreneurship education relate to attitude change, knowledge and skills change, feasibility, entrepreneurial intention, socio-economic impact, business start-up rates, and business performance (Nabi et al., 2017). The outcomes from entrepreneurship education can be grouped into five categories: cognitive, skill-based, affective, conative, and behavioural (Longva & Foss, 2018). In other words, entrepreneurship education provides understanding of entrepreneurship concepts, skill sets for developing business, and changing attitudes and intentions. To achieve all these outcomes, there is an inherent embeddedness in practice where learning is linked to business (Boon et al., 2013); for instance, by entrepreneurs giving lectures, students obtaining real-world experiences by interacting with the entrepreneurial ecosystem, or students doing entrepreneurship (Neck & Corbett, 2018).

Many entrepreneurship educators (e.g. Kassean et al., 2015; Nabi et al., 2017; Pittaway & Cope, 2007) argue that entrepreneurship education should provide students with learning situations where they take part in real entrepreneurship action combined with reflective processes in an environment without too much financial risk. Entrepreneurial knowledge can be seen as a synthesis of primary and secondary entrepreneurial experience, where the primary experience is the act of entrepreneurship, and the secondary experience is the reflection upon the same experience (Hägg & Kurczewska, 2020). The synthesis in turn is the input for new entrepreneurial experiences. To structure the different entrepreneurship education approaches where real-world experience and reflection are combined, Aadland and Aaboen (2020) identified a six-class taxonomy. The taxonomy consists of three categories of learning contexts (imitation, pretence, and real) and three education concepts (teacher-directed, participatory, and self-directed). Case teaching in business schools has primarily been characterized as teacher-directed and imitation; however, in recent years, it has begun to develop in the direction of participation with the introduction of, for instance, live cases. However, entrepreneurship education also covers real and self-directed concepts and thereby challenges case teaching to expand its scope and boundaries.

The Case Method

The case method was first developed at Harvard Law School in the 1870s and over the following decades spread to most well-known law schools in the United States (Weaver, 1991). When Harvard Business School was established in 1908, its curriculum was based on practice, and the teaching method was the case method, emphasizing classroom discussion (Merseth, 1991). Since then, the case method has spread to other business schools and to other educational fields around the globe. Consequently, various case method types, formats, and traditions have emerged to provide students with a distinct mindset and skills (Greenhalgh, 2007). For example, in medical education, cases pose problems that require objective and analytical solutions, and in business education, cases typically represent business problems that require solutions and decision-making (Greenhalgh, 2007).

The case method is an example of active learning, where educators act as facilitators who pose open-ended questions to stimulate students' self-reflection and interpretation of the case and ensure group dynamics that enable critical and creative thinking and dialogue (Grant, 1997). Using the case method successfully demands that both the educator and students take active roles. In contrast to traditional lectures where the educator disseminates their expert knowledge to students, learning through case activities allows the educator to play the role of facilitator of students' learning. It requires students to read and prepare before class and to be active participators in class (Desiraju & Gopinath, 2001). This is typical for Harvard cases where students prepare written responses to a case text that enables them to participate in an instructor-led oral discussion in a classroom or preferably a Harvard amphitheatre classroom (Forman & Rymer, 1999). The approach is also widely used in entrepreneurship education, and the interactions among students and between students and lecturer during case discussions have been found to improve the emotional engagement of students and thereby their individual learning process and performance (Nkhoma, Sriratanaviriyakul, & Quang, 2017).

However, the traditional case method has met with criticism. Pasricha (2016) claims that most cases used in classrooms are outdated and do not reflect current issues faced by managers, business owners, and entrepreneurs. This aligns with Steiner and Laws' (2006) claim that the Harvard case study is limited in preparing students to deal with real-world problems, and that many lecturers have limited or no working experience in the industry (Pasricha, 2016). Although this critique may be too unilateral, educators may benefit from being aware of both the drawbacks and possibilities of case teaching, and that case teaching may be altered to fit the educational needs of students—for example, entrepreneurship students. There is a growing understanding of the need to adjust and reframe the case method for entrepreneurship education.

Narratives, which the case method typically builds on, are considered an important technique to inspire students, construct entrepreneurial identity, invoke role models, and contribute to the creation of entrepreneurial opportunities (at least from a social-constructionist perspective) (Blenker et al., 2011; Gartner, 2007). Hence, not surprisingly, narratives have been actively used in entrepreneurship education in different forms, such as storytelling, documentaries, or embedded in teaching cases (Fellnhöfer, 2017). Following this line of thinking, the case method has the potential to facilitate the learning process in entrepreneurship education.

Typically, case teaching in entrepreneurship education comes with associated action-oriented tasks for students, which provides students with either simulated or authentic entrepreneurial experiences that may be applied in practice. Hence, teaching entrepreneurship with cases calls for creative teaching approaches. Further, and related to today's continuously changing business environment, there is a particular need for teaching methods that reflect these times in both content and context (Neck & Greene, 2011). Thus there is a continuous need for new or renewed cases that can be used in entrepreneurship education, reflecting the entrepreneurial context these entrepreneurship students will face.

The Nordic Perspective

The Nordic perspective is often associated with a high level of trust, low power distance, a well-developed social welfare system, happiness, independence, and a low-risk acceptance rate (Delhey & Newton, 2005; Dvouletý, 2017; Hjorth, 2008; Hofstede, 2022). Such cultural values, norms, and traditions define how certain phenomena are understood and interpreted, such as entrepreneurial actions and the way people act in particular situations, for instance when facing uncertainty. Moreover, the Nordic countries are small and very open economies, which distinguish them from, for example, North America or China, which are the contexts of many traditional teaching cases. In this book, we argue for the importance of context sensitivity in the teaching materials and learning approach—that is, student-centred learning through real-world cases—as a starting point for the Nordic contextualization and focus in the book.

The Nordic countries are Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden, located in Northern Europe. These five countries share similar historical and socio-cultural aspects, such as the Viking era, the Sámi Indigenous people, and the storytelling tradition rooted in Saga and similar business practices, including those linked with starting a company and employee-driven innovation practices (Hjorth, 2008). We acknowledge important differences and nuances among these countries as well. For example, Finnish is a Uralic language, and the other Nordic countries speak languages that belong to North Germanic languages. For this introductory chapter, however, we approach the Nordic as a collection of the five countries and focus on the patterns and aspects that constitute the Nordic, in particular regarding entrepreneurship and education.

The Nordic are known not only for their extensive creative economy, biotech industry, Nordic design, and ICT-related innovation (Hjorth, 2008), but also for more traditional industries, such as timber, fishing, and the oil and gas industry. Moreover, Stockholm's start-up scene and Finland as an innovation nation are often named alongside the Silicon Valley and other innovation hubs and clusters, such as the blockchain hub in Zug (Dvouletý, 2017). Although there are many examples of the Nordic entrepreneurial spirit, the Global Entrepreneurship Monitoring (GEM) report and research on Nordic entrepreneurship show a more nuanced picture. The GEM report shows a lower-than-average rate of entrepreneurial and start-up activities (Dvouletý, 2017). The reasons for the low start-up activities are multifaceted, ranging from incentives to start a company given stable job markets and the large public sector, to the perceived attraction of being an entrepreneur and the lack of entrepreneurial skills and competences. Conversely, entrepreneurship is regarded as an important driver for the transition

of the Nordic movement, in particular of peripheral communities, towards more sustainable Nordic societies and technological advancements. Hence, there is a need to provide prospective entrepreneurs with the necessary entrepreneurial skills.

Prior to the 1980s, entrepreneurship education gained little attention in Nordic higher education institutions. However, since then, new entrepreneurship education programmes and courses have been developed with the aim of increasing entrepreneurial skills and competences, as entrepreneurship is regarded as an important complement to management education aimed at large, well-established organizations, which has led to discussion on how to teach entrepreneurship (Warhuus & Basaiawmoit, 2014). Nordic higher education institutions typically have a stronger focus on basic rather than applied and vocational education, in particular science and technology institutions (Warhuus & Basaiawmoit, 2014). Further, Nordic higher education institutions are known for their close university–industry interaction, which provides access to entrepreneurs and companies. These characteristics influence the way of teaching at higher education institutions. For example, while the case method originates from vocation-based aspects of different types of education, such as business and management education (Rippin et al., 2002), reframing the case method for Nordic entrepreneurship education thus means incorporating these specificities so as to make it relevant and applicable to the context of entrepreneurship education.

While the case method might need to be reframed to utilize its full potential for Nordic entrepreneurship education, we argue that the Nordic tradition of storytelling and learning using narratives favours the use of the case method at Nordic higher education institutions (Blenker et al., 2011). Indeed, storytelling and narratives are an important means of communication and learning and have been used for centuries. Conversely, entrepreneurship scholars argue that through narratives and storytelling, an entrepreneurial mindset comes into being, as they define how students construct their identities and facilitate the creation of opportunities.

CONTENT AND OUTLINE: PERSPECTIVES ON HOW TO USE THE BOOK

This book consists of 27 chapters divided into three parts. Part I, Introduction, introduces the book, entrepreneurship education, and case teaching. Part II then provides a set of carefully selected chapters that reframe the case method in entrepreneurship education. These chapters inform and inspire theoretical perspectives and practical procedures related to case teaching in entrepreneurship education. By reading Part II, you will be informed about concepts and practices at the forefront of case teaching within the field. Nevertheless, case teaching would be nothing without the actual cases, which is where Part III of this book comes into play. Part III offers a selection of cases that may be used as they are or that have been adapted by educators according to their own needs and preferences.

This book is intended to be useful for multiple audiences and in different situations, although the core readers are entrepreneurship educators at higher education institutions in the Nordic countries. For the experienced reader, the book can provide inspiring, perhaps thought-provoking, perspectives on case teaching (Part II), as well as a fresh set of teaching

cases to revamp their teaching in entrepreneurship education (Part III). For readers who are less experienced in entrepreneurship education, the book is useful as an introduction to entrepreneurship education and to the applicability of case teaching in entrepreneurship education (Part II), as well as providing some hands-on examples of cases that can be applied in the classroom from day one (Part III). The different perspectives on case teaching in entrepreneurship education inform not only how case teaching may be applied in one way or another but also *why* and *upon which grounds* you may choose case teaching as your preferred pedagogical approach in given situations. With this book, we show that there is no one way of case teaching in entrepreneurship education, while there is already a considerable knowledge base to depart from as an entrepreneurship educator. In the book, we provide many examples, hints, tips, and suggestions, but as always, your course or programme—your way.

Reframing the Case Method: Outlook and Lessons Learned

The chapters included in Part II of this book are divided into three groups: (1) Framing the case method for entrepreneurship education, (2) Applying the case method in entrepreneurship education, and (3) Methods for case teaching in entrepreneurship education. Table 1.1 provides an overview of the chapters included in each group.

Table 1.1 Overview of chapters in Part II

| Framing the case method for entrepreneurship education | Applying the case method in entrepreneurship education | Methods for case teaching in entrepreneurship education |
|---|--|--|
| Chapter 2: Breum Ramsgaard and Austin Understanding cases as narratives in entrepreneurship education: a conceptual framework | Chapter 5: Lindahl Thomassen and Breum Ramsgaard Experiences from live casework with Nordic micro-enterprises: contextualizing learning designs in entrepreneurship education | Chapter 9: Larsen and Kaspersen Student case development based on entrepreneurial experiences: a guide for entrepreneurship educators |
| Chapter 3: Woodwark and Schnarr How to conduct live cases in entrepreneurship education | Chapter 6: Westerberg Using self as case in teach-the-teacher courses in entrepreneurship to reflect on experiences as student and teacher | Chapter 10: Solvoll and Haneberg Student challenges in entrepreneurship education: planning for uncertainty |
| Chapter 4: Aarikka-Stenroos et al. Bringing environmental sustainability and the circular economy into entrepreneurship education with stakeholders: four case methods from hackathons to role-model cases | Chapter 7: Ilonen and Hytti Teaching together in entrepreneurship education: live case method | Chapter 11: Åmo Teaching as guiding: the case of live business cases |
| | Chapter 8: Hägg The moral perils when positioning student entrepreneurs in real-life contexts: balancing the nature–nurture of educative live case experience | Chapter 12: Wigger et al. From utopia to sustainable entrepreneurship: a novel case methodology |

The first group of chapters in Part II frames the use of cases in entrepreneurship education. In Chapter 2, Breum Ramsgaard and Austin conceptualize cases as narratives and argue that explanation- and experience-based approaches to case-based education relate to different pedagogical underpinnings and therefore imply different learning methods and processes that need to be scaffolded in different ways. Woodward and Schnarr introduce live cases in Chapter 3 by defining how they are different from traditional cases and consulting projects, as well as providing practical advice on how to source and teach live cases. Aarikka-Stenroos et al. connect cases, entrepreneurship education, and sustainability in Chapter 4.

The second group of chapters in Part II focuses specifically on the facilitation aspect when applying the case method in entrepreneurship education. In Chapter 5, Thomassen and Breum Ramsgaard contextualize case teaching in the Nordic setting, and Westerberg provides examples of teach-the-teacher initiatives in Chapter 6. In Chapter 7, Ilonen and Hytti show the benefits of including educators from several disciplines in case teaching. In Chapter 8, Hägg warns about the ethical pitfalls when allowing students to engage in action-based education. Action, pushing boundaries, and competitiveness are part of acting entrepreneurially, and when this type of learning takes place in the real world instead of a classroom, it is important that students are equipped with a moral compass.

In the third group of chapters in Part II, four concrete methods for case teaching in entrepreneurship education are presented. In Chapter 9, Larsen and Kaspersen present their experience with the SWIF (student-written, instructor-facilitated) method in a venture-creation programme (VCP) where students start a venture as part of their education. In a VCP setting, SWIF allows entrepreneurship students to write a case based on their own venture, which facilitates reflection and pinpoints issues to be solved in their own practice. Chapter 10, by Solvoll and Haneberg, focuses on student challenges that are defined as different from live cases in terms of their purpose, how the addressed problem is formulated, and the suggested time frame. Using experiences from seven student challenges building on similar pedagogical underpinnings but taking place in different contexts and with partly different stakeholders, they illustrate that in student challenges, students become leaders of an innovation process where they develop and propose solutions to problems presented by an external actor. In Chapter 11, Åmo presents tour guiding, which describes how to best facilitate learning in connection with visits to companies. Finally, Chapter 12 authored by Wigger et al. on utopia shows the benefits of dreaming and represents an example of when students are allowed to depart from the current and mundane nature of entrepreneurship cases, unrestricted by today's problems and practices when solving sustainability issues. All four concrete exercises have elements of live cases in that the teaching and facilitation does not depart from a pre-written text but has components of exploring reality and thereby engages students in authentic learning and wicked problems. The uncertainty aspect of the case may come in many different forms: as part of the case itself, as the solution to the case, or as facilitation of the case.

Nordic Teaching Cases for Entrepreneurship Education: Outlook and Lessons Learned

Part III of the book consists of 15 teaching cases divided into three main groups related to becoming an entrepreneur, early-phase venture creation, and acting entrepreneurially in established organizations. This is meant as an overall guide according to different phases of the entrepreneurial process; Table 1.2 provides a more detailed overview that will help you choose the right case(s) for your course or lecture. The first column in the table refers to the chapter number and case authors to help you find the right case once you have decided which one to use. The second column will guide you in choosing a case related to different topics such as opportunity development, business models, or sustainability. This column also specifies in which industry the cases are set, which can be useful if you want to relate your lecture to a specific industry. However, if you would rather choose a case to teach a specific theory, the third column provides an overview of the main theories applied in each case. The last column shows the teaching methods employed. Be aware that Table 1.2 is based on the main assignments given in each case, and that there are suggestions for alternative use in most cases.

Table 1.2 Overview of teaching cases in Part III

| | Chapter number: authors | Topic, industry/context | Theoretical perspectives | Teaching method |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---|---|
| The journey of becoming and being an entrepreneur | 13: Ausrød and Færgemann | Business model, incubators, digitalization | Effectuation, value creation | Decision-making, analysis, reflection |
| | 14: Persson-Fischier et al. | Sustainability, stakeholder engagement, tourism industry | Effectuation, resource management, co-creation | Role play, discussion |
| | 15: Lahikainen et al. | Academic spin-off, support system, product development, sensor industry | Effectuation | Consulting, discussion, reflection |
| | 16: Wong and Solheim | Opportunity development, stakeholder engagement, support system, food industry | Entrepreneurial opportunity, resource management | Analysis, discussion, role play, consulting |
| | 17: Åmo | Opportunity development, stakeholder engagement, sports industry | Effectuation, entrepreneurial learning, resource-based view | Decision-making, theory assessment |

| | Chapter number: authors | Topic, industry/context | Theoretical perspectives | Teaching method |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Early-phase venture creation | 18: Howard et al. | Start-up, investment process, due diligence, valuation, venture teams, IT industry | Practical approaches to analyse investment methods | Role play, discussion |
| | 19: Laage-Hellman and Lind | Technology development, product development, stakeholder engagement, internationalization, academic spin-off, composite industry | Industrial marketing, research and development management | Role play, presentation |
| | 20: Senderovitz, Jebsen, and Suder | Business model, sustainability, identity authenticity, pig farming | Triple bottom line, growth, resource management, financing and human capital, marketing | Analysis, reflection, decision- making |
| | 21: Veisdal | Opportunity development, software development, two-sided platform, pivoting, digitalization | Ambidexterity, critical incidents | Analysis, reflection, discussion |
| | 22: Aadland and Sørheim | Sources of entrepreneurial financing, aquaculture industry | Financing | Analysis, decision- making |
| Acting entrepreneurially in established organizations | 23: Gullmark and Vestrum | Public sector entrepreneurship, opportunity development, stakeholder engagement, public healthcare sector | Public sector innovation and entrepreneurship, dynamic capabilities | Group work, reflection, discussion |
| | 24: Lauvås et al. | Sustainability, opportunity development, design thinking, fish-farming industry | Sustainability and triple bottom line, opportunity development, design thinking | Game-based learning, group work |
| | 25: Eriksson and Nummela | Global value chain, global factory, international entrepreneurship, educational technology | Dynamic capabilities | Role play, discussion |

| | Chapter number: authors | Topic, industry/context | Theoretical perspectives | Teaching method |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| Acting entrepreneurially in established organizations (continued) | 26: Vestrum | Community, cultural, and public sector entrepreneurship | Resource mobilization, legitimacy, social embeddedness | Role play, discussion |
| | 27: Lauvås and Jakobsen | Sustainability, circular economy opportunity development, collaboration, furniture industry | Effectuation, sustainability, circular economy | Group work, reflection, discussion |

The first five chapters in Part III are related to the journey of becoming and being an entrepreneur. In Chapter 13, Ausrød and Færgemann present a case about an art student who engages in the university incubator. The case follows the student's initial 2 years from her first encounter with the incubator to her first paying customers. The teaching activities revolve around presentations, discussions, and reflections on effectuation, various forms of value creation, and the affordable loss principle. Chapter 14 by Persson-Fischier et al. follows an entrepreneur in the tourism industry in Sweden. The case focuses on sustainability in offering recreational fishing to customers from all over the world, and through discussions and role play students gain insight into sustainability challenges facing an entrepreneurial venture. In Chapter 15, Lahikainen et al. show the start-up process in a university-based spin-off and illustrate that even in the systematic university setting, entrepreneurs rely on the resources and capabilities they have at hand. The case activities challenge students in applying the theoretical concepts of causation and effectuation when analysing the case and, further, reflect on the context of university spin-offs. Chapter 16 by Wong and Solheim tells the story of an immigrant entrepreneur who grows vegetables in a bomb shelter using a hydroponic method. The case focuses on how the entrepreneur seizes opportunities in the development of his business, and in the case activities students play the role of the entrepreneur's board and advise him on the next steps for his business. The last case in this section is Chapter 17 by Åmo, where an entrepreneur looks back at the last 5 years of his entrepreneurial journey, reflecting on challenges met and decisions made. The students working on this case are invited to sort out the root problem in the complex case story, and to do that they need to select one or more suitable theories.

The next five chapters in Part III focus on early-phase venture creation. Chapter 18 by Howard et al. follows the first investment round between a newly founded IT start-up and a venture capital firm. The case follows the investment process through three parts: (1) the static viewpoint of the first due diligence on the initial investment, (2) the dynamic viewpoint of the progress made until the decision point of the final tranche of investment, and (3) the outcome and reflections. In Chapter 19, Laage-Hellman and Lind tell the story of a Swedish high-tech university spin-off that aims to commercialize a novel technology. To do so, the firm needs to build a collaboration strategy for further product development, and the students working on the case propose this strategy based on the information provided. Chapter 20 by Senderovitz et al. takes us to a small-scale pig farm with a mission to produce premium-quality pork based on sustainability values and considerations. The case activities start with students'

personal reflections on their sustainable purchases before focusing on the firm and its sustainable growth barriers and suggesting possible growth strategies. In Chapter 21, Veisdal focuses on student entrepreneurs and the dilemma of either continuing to sell the software they had developed and risk not acquiring the necessary revenue to fund salaries after they graduate, or risking both the venture and their graduate studies by investing time in a pivot of the service. The case illustrates the paradox of exploration versus exploitation, and the case questions encourage students to map and analyse the activities the student entrepreneurs engage in as either explorative or exploitative. The last case considering early-phase venture creation is Chapter 22 by Aadland and Sørheim on early-stage financing for a start-up in need of more capital. The case illustrates different financial options where all might seem favourable. The case activities put the students in the entrepreneur's position, where they evaluate the different options before deciding.

The last section in Part III deals with acting entrepreneurially in established organizations. In Chapter 23, Gullmark and Vestrum tell the story of a public sector entrepreneur over several years, illustrating the drivers and barriers in public sector entrepreneurship. The case ends when the entrepreneur faces stagnation, and the case activities encourage students to analyse the situation and decide whether the entrepreneur should continue or abandon the project. Chapter 24 by Lauvås et al. takes us to a fish-farming firm on a small island in Norway with high ambitions for sustainability. The case shows how the firm has taken entrepreneurial actions towards sustainability, and the case activities build on game-based learning where the students develop an educational game about the actions made by the firm towards sustainability. In Chapter 25, Eriksson and Nummela present a case about a Finnish small-to-medium enterprise (SME) in the educational technology industry with global operations. It focuses on the value chain and the challenges of managing an international network of partners. In the case activities, students act as the top management team and discuss how they should organize the firm's global value chain. In Chapter 26 by Vestrum, we meet an entrepreneur who develops a music festival in a rural community in Norway. The case revolves around cultural, community, and public entrepreneurship and illustrates the challenging task of mobilizing resources from diverse stakeholders in developing a non-profit community enterprise. From the case activities, students learn how entrepreneurs can build legitimacy to mobilize resources from different sectors. The last case on entrepreneurship in established organizations is Chapter 27 by Lauvås and Jakobsen about a small Norwegian furniture company that has made a strategic choice to become more sustainable. The case describes the process from the decision through to the launch and success of a sustainable product. In the case activities, students employ theories on effectuation and sustainability to map the firm's resources and discuss how they used their existing and new resources to pursue new sustainable opportunities.

CHANGING THE SCENE FOR THE CASE METHOD IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION IN AND FOR THE NORDICS

This book shows that entrepreneurship education greatly benefits from the case method when designed for entrepreneurial learning purposes. This book includes manifold discussions about case teaching in entrepreneurship education, such as the way reframing the case method and case activities can be approached. Evaluating the lessons from the 26 individual contributions of this book, we argue that the case method provides entrepreneurship educators with great potential to be entrepreneurial and to think outside the box when adjusting the case method for increased entrepreneurial learning. Further, experiences from testing Nordic teaching cases at Nordic institutions indicate that the closeness and authenticity engage students and create immersive learning moments. We believe that this book will provide great inspiration to educators wanting to use the case method in their teaching.

While each chapter makes an important contribution to case-based entrepreneurship education, clear themes emerge throughout the book. First, the book argues that innovative case method designs, such as SWIF (Chapter 9), student challenges (Chapter 10), and tour guiding (Chapter 11), incorporate experience-based learning elements to teach entrepreneurship. In general, the discussions in Part III of this book suggest case narratives that address thorny problems or build on authentic stories to tap into emotions to create novel learning situations, for which traditional analytical teaching cases are not necessarily equipped. Emotions, however, are regarded as important in entrepreneurship education (Arpiainen et al., 2013). Such learning moments are believed to be even more effective when the situation allows for uncertainties. For example, Chapter 10 argues that when students embrace uncertainties, they increase the entrepreneurial learning effects of pedagogical interventions. In general, this book illustrates that the case method does not necessarily need to build on a written case with predefined case activities; instead, the case can be co-created through the learning moment.

Second, and relatedly, we suggest that experiential learning situations can be created by allowing students to create or co-create the case. For example, this can be done by letting the student write a teaching case (see Chapter 9) or by designing an open-ended case approach so the students can define which case they want to work with within a given frame (see Chapter 2). Hence, we suggest that in entrepreneurship education, the case method can be designed more broadly and have a wider scope of utilization than cases borrowed from, for example, business or management education. Thereby, the case method in entrepreneurship education expands the traditional utilization of creating a narrative that students must analyse to make a certain managerial decision (Grant, 1997).

Third, the case activities of the 15 teaching cases included in this book suggest a broad range of case activities and tasks that are suitable for the case method—for example, a game-based approach (see Chapter 24) or role play (see Chapters 14, 16, 18, 19, 25, and 26). We argue that teaching entrepreneurship with the case method allows students to think beyond the traditional set of questions accompanying the case. Further, Chapter 18 is an example where the case is divided into three parts, and a new part is only introduced after the students have completed the case activities of the previous part. Moreover, Chapter 12 suggests that the

case narrative can be introduced later. This is particularly crucial when teaching sustainable entrepreneurship in order to address the normativity and future orientation of the concept of sustainability.

Fourth, we argue that the Nordic tradition of storytelling and learning through the use of narratives favours case-based teaching (Blenker et al., 2011). Moreover, entrepreneurship scholars argue that through narratives and storytelling, an entrepreneurial mindset comes into being, as they define how students construct their identities and facilitate the creation of opportunities (Blenker et al., 2011). To illustrate, the case narratives indicate that Nordic entrepreneurship in many ways builds on a high level of trust, which is not necessarily as common in other parts of the world. For example, Chapter 24 starts by telling the story of how the owner handed over the business to his son-in-law and trusted the new management team to make non-trivial strategic decisions. Further, the contributing authors were met by the case owners with a lot of trust and openness, which was ultimately an important aspect in developing the case narratives included in this book.

Fifth, given the call for more innovative case method designs, case approaches, and activities for Nordic case-based entrepreneurship education, we suggest redefining what a teaching case is. Based on the insights from the chapters in this book, we see teaching cases for entrepreneurship education as entrepreneurial narratives that can also be applied in current and future entrepreneurial situations that require entrepreneurial action. Hence, we regard the case as a tool to frame and package an entrepreneurial story or situation that can be told and retold.

Although the chapters in this book make an important contribution to Nordic case-based entrepreneurship education, further research on the case method in entrepreneurship education and innovative practices and designs to utilize cases remains to be pursued. We are confident that this book will inspire entrepreneurship scholars to further explore the case method in entrepreneurship education with the aim of increasing students' entrepreneurial skills and mindset.

REFERENCES

- Aadland, T., & Aaboen, L. (2020). An entrepreneurship education taxonomy based on authenticity. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 45(5), 711–728.
- Arpiainen, R. L., Lackeus, M., Täks, M., & Tynjälä, P. (2013). The sources and dynamics of emotions in entrepreneurship education learning process. *TRAMES: A Journal of the Humanities & Social Sciences*, 17(4), 331–346.
- Baron, R. A., & Shane, S. (2007). Entrepreneurship: A process perspective. In eds.: Baum, J. R., Freese, M., & Baron, R. *The psychology of entrepreneurship*, 19–39. Taylor and Francis Group, New York.
- Blenker, P., Korsgaard, S., Neergaard, H., & Thrane, C. (2011). The questions we care about: Paradigms and progression in entrepreneurship education. *Industry and Higher Education*, 25(6), 417–427.
- Boon, A., Raes, E., Kyndt, E., & Dochy, F. (2013). Team learning beliefs and behaviours in response teams. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 37(4), 357–379.
- Delhey, J., & Newton, K. (2005). Predicting cross-national levels of social trust: Global pattern or Nordic exceptionalism? *European Sociological Review*, 21(4), 311–327.
- Desiraju, R., & Gopinath, C. (2001). Encouraging participation in case discussions: A comparison of the MICA and the Harvard case methods. *Journal of Management Education*, 25(4), 394–408.
- Dvouletý, O. (2017). Determinants of Nordic entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 24(1), 12–33.

- Ellet, W. (2007). *The case study handbook: How to read, discuss, and write persuasively about cases*. Harvard Business Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Fellnhöfer, K. (2017). A framework for a teaching toolkit in entrepreneurship education. *International Journal of Continuing Engineering Education and Life Long Learning*, 27(3), 246–261.
- Forman, J., & Rymer, J. (1999). The genre system of the Harvard case method. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 13(4), 373–400.
- Gartner, W. B. (2007). Entrepreneurial narrative and a science of the imagination. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(5), 613–627.
- Grant, R. (1997). A claim for the case method in the teaching of geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 21(2), 171–185.
- Greenhalgh, A. M. (2007). Case method teaching as science and art: A metaphoric approach and curricular application. *Journal of Management Education*, 31(2), 181–194.
- Hägg, G., & Kurczewska, A. (2020). Toward a learning philosophy based on experience in entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 4(1), 4–29.
- Hjorth, D. (2008). Nordic entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32(2), 313–338.
- Hofstede, G. (2022). *Country comparison*. Retrieved 11.01.2022 from <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison>.
- Kassean, H., Vanevenhoven, J., Liguori, E., & Winkel, D. E. (2015). Entrepreneurship education: A need for reflection, real-world experience and action. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 21(5), 690–708.
- Kuratko, D. F., Fisher, G., & Audretsch, D. B. (2021). Unraveling the entrepreneurial mindset. *Small Business Economics*, 57(4), 1681–1691.
- Longva, K. K., & Foss, L. (2018). Measuring impact through experimental design in entrepreneurship education: A literature review and research agenda. *Industry and Higher Education*, 32(6), 358–374.
- Merseth, K. K. (1991). The early history of case-based instruction: Insights for teacher education today. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(4), 243–249.
- Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Fayolle, A., Krueger, N., & Walmsley, A. (2017). The impact of entrepreneurship education in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(2), 277–299.
- Neck, H. M., & Corbett, A. C. (2018). The scholarship of teaching and learning entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 1(1), 8–41.
- Neck, H. M., & Greene, P. G. (2011). Entrepreneurship education: Known worlds and new frontiers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2010.00314.x>.
- Nkhoma, M., Sriratanaviriyakul, N., & Quang, H. L. (2017). Using case method to enrich students' learning outcomes. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 18(1), 37–50.
- Pacheco, D. F., Dean, T. J., & Payne, D. S. (2010). Escaping the green prison: Entrepreneurship and the creation of opportunities for sustainable development. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5), 464–480.
- Pasricha, T. (2016). Sorry Harvard, but I don't like the case method. *International Journal of Higher Education Management*, 3(1), 41–48.
- Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). Entrepreneurship education: A systematic review of the evidence. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(5), 479–510.
- Rippin, A., Booth, C., Bowie, S., & Jordan, J. (2002). A complex case: Using the case study method to explore uncertainty and ambiguity in undergraduate business education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 7(4), 429–441.
- Shepherd, D. A., & Douglas, E. J. (1997, June). Is management education developing, or killing, the entrepreneurial spirit? In *Proceedings of the 1997 USASBE Annual National Conference Entrepreneurship: The Engine of Global Economic Development*, San Francisco, CA. USASBE, Decatur, IL.
- Steiner, G., & Laws, D. (2006). How appropriate are two established concepts from higher education for solving complex real-world problems? *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 7(3), 322–340.
- Warhuus, J. P., & Basaiawmoit, R. V. (2014). Entrepreneurship education at Nordic technical higher education institutions: Comparing and contrasting program designs and content. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 12(3), 317–332.
- Weaver, R. L. (1991). Langdell's legacy: Living with the case method. *Villanova Law Review*, 36, 517–595.

- Welter, F. (2011). Contextualizing entrepreneurship: Conceptual challenges and ways forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 165–184.
- Welter, F., Gartner, W. B., & Wright, M. (2016). The context of contextualizing contexts. In eds.: Welter, F. & Gartner, W. B. *A research agenda for entrepreneurship and context*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA, pp. 1–15.
- Zahra, S. A. (2007). Contextualizing theory building in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(3), 443–452.

PART II

REFRAMING THE CASE METHOD FOR TEACHING ENTREPRENEURSHIP