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Abstract

Entrepreneurship has during the last decades gained an immense interest in academia, politics and practice. It is argued from politics that more entrepreneurs are necessary for the economic development. In addition, nowadays entrepreneurship is also perceived as a solution to social and societal challenges. This drives a need for entrepreneurial people everywhere in society who can cope with the inconstant and uncertain world of today. As a consequence, there are around the world numerous educational initiatives trying to inspire and fuel an entrepreneurial mind-set. Here, educations of all kind become relevant contexts since they provide an opportunity to affect children, youth’s and adult’s interest and attitudes towards entrepreneurship, and as such give a possibility to reach a vast number of people.

Sweden is no exception, and in 2009 the Swedish Government launched a ‘Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education’ in which entrepreneurship is said to run like a common thread throughout education. The main focus is that self-employment is to become as natural as being an employee. As such the Government took an active stand for implementing entrepreneurship in the school setting on a broad front, from preschool to adult education.

This development can be seen as part of New Public Management; a development where concepts from the private sector are lent and transferred to the public sector. Thus, when introducing entrepreneurship in the Swedish educational system, this at the same time means introducing a traditional business concept in a public setting. Therefore, the overall aim of this thesis is to increase knowledge of and insights on how a business concept – entrepreneurship – is operationalised and constructed in a public setting.

When placing entrepreneurship in new societal contexts other questions arise and complexity intensifies. In this qualitative research, the empirical context in focus are schools. It investigates how entrepreneurship is constructed among teachers in their work. But also how this business concept is included in a non-business setting by studying how the entrepreneurship strategy is operationalised in educational practice.

As such the thesis and its findings contribute to the scientific discussions on societal entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education, as well as on strategy and strategising in a public context. The research also aspire to serve inspiration, insights and food for thoughts on discussions and reflections on entrepreneurship within the school practice.

This compilation thesis include five papers. To be able to fulfil the aim this research use a broad theoretical base and multiple qualitative research methods. The combination of methods include semi-structured interviews, in-depth interview using the stimulated recall method, focus group interviews, participative meetings, observations, document studies, digital questionnaires, written inquiries, analysing texts and critical incidents questionnaires.
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1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the research in this thesis. It describes the background and motives and positions it in the field of research. Further, it articulates the aim, objective and research questions. To create an understanding of the context where research is performed, one section briefly presents an outline of the Swedish educational system and how it is governed. Also relevant steering documents relating to education and entrepreneurship are briefly described. The thesis outline is presented at the end of the chapter.

1.1 The need for entrepreneurial individuals in society – hope and means for entrepreneurship in education

In 2009 the Swedish government launched a Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009). Their intentions were clear: the Ministry’s idea was that starting a business would be just as natural an option for individuals as being employed. The strategy also states that entrepreneurship should be a common thread throughout the educational system.

It can be said that within politics, as well as among the public, this is considered necessary for the economic development of Sweden; that there is a need for business entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial individuals in society. In this manner entrepreneurship education provides both hope and a means to ensure a bright future in a free market economy. The prevailing global economic system puts pressure on countries to be innovative, productive and constantly competing for financial success in a seemingly never-ending battle for shares of the world market and business growth. Ongoing technical development and expanding markets, along with a growing population, increase challenges and demand new products and services. This has given the traditional view of entrepreneurship, with roots in economics (Landström, Harrichi & Åström, 2012) and inherited connotations such as start-up, business and growth activities (Gibb, 2002) a visible function in society. However, as developed during the last decade entrepreneurship is no longer limited to business (Mahieu, 2006). It is intertwined with society in many ways. For instance, in many countries the very existence, funding and quality of many key ele-
ments of society, such as education and health care, directly or indirectly depend on the continual spinning of the economic wheel. Furthermore, there are many societal challenges such as climate change, poverty, social injustice and migration that need to be addressed, where entrepreneurship and innovation can contribute. Thus, the modern view of entrepreneurship to be used as a driver for change and new solutions has increased interest in, and the status of, entrepreneurship in society.

Though it has been claimed that people are natural entrepreneurs by birth, the prevailing view among scholars today is that entrepreneurial competencies can be learnt (Drucker, 1985; Carrier, 2005; Neck & Geene, 2011). Further, a prevailing view is that entrepreneurship is considered a process (e.g. Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990; Rae & Carswell, 2000; Cope, 2005; Landström & Benner, 2010). If accepting these perspectives, in theory it means that anyone can become an entrepreneur or entrepreneurial by learning and exercising the necessary knowledge, skills and processual thinking.

These notions fit well with the political need for more entrepreneurial people everywhere in society who can cope with the fast-paced, inconstant, uncertain world of today and see change as the natural state (Johannisson, 2010; Jones & Iredale, 2010). As a consequence, there are numerous initiatives regarding ‘fuelling the entrepreneurial mind-set’ (Acs, Arenius, Hay & Minniti, 2005 p. 23). One context of interest in this respect is education, since it provides an appropriate setting for beginning this development and offers the possibility of reaching a vast number of people. This view is also supported by Peterman and Kennedy (2003) stating that children and adolescents are the most appropriate age groups for acquiring positive attitudes towards entrepreneurship. Starting at early ages is further supported by research from Lindström (2013) stating that children even as young pre-school age can adopt an entrepreneurial approach. Therefore, as Henry, Hill and Leitch (2005) suggest, schools provide a natural environment for education about, in and for entrepreneurship. Accordingly, as supported by research from Kuratko (2005), Johansen and Shanke (2013) and Fayolle (2013), governments worldwide seek to stimulate entrepreneurship through educational initiatives, and in the past few decades these actions have exploded.

Sweden is no exception, and inspired by developments and actions on the European level (OECD, 1989; EC, 2007), the Swedish government launched its Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education in 2009 (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009). Further, it implemented the strategy’s ideas by including entrepreneurship in the national curricula and in government assignments to their executive public authorities. Thus, the Swedish government took an active stand for introducing and operationalisation entrepreneurship in education on a broad front.

Related to this development, some researchers, such as Hjorth and Steyaert (2004), Berglund, Johannisson and Schwartz (2012), Hjorth (2012) and
Höglund (2015) suggest entrepreneurship can be perceived as more of a societal phenomenon affecting our daily lives. Hjorth and Steyaert (2004) and Johannisson (2010) point out a lack of information, suggesting a need for a deeper understanding of entrepreneurship in these wider contexts, and for many purposes. This development means that currently entrepreneurship can be found also in cultural, social and, as in the focus of this thesis, educational contexts. All this leads to increased complexity and, as Steyaert and Katz (2004), Mühlenbock (2004) and Leffler (2006; 2012) suggest, questions of meaning, legitimacy, language, culture, content and implementation in these new societal settings must be dealt with. Therefore, context matters when discussing entrepreneurship, and everything that people interpret, construct and make of entrepreneurship in their social interactions is of interest (Anderson, Drakopoulou Dodd, & Jack, 2009; Korhonen, Komulainen & Räty, 2012), especially since its introduction in the public education system context is fairly new.

The inclusion of entrepreneurship in education in the Swedish school context\(^2\) is ongoing. Previous research by Komulainen, Naskali, Korhonen and Keskitalo-Foley (2011), Korhonen et al. (2012) and Berglund (2013), show the introduction of entrepreneurship in compulsory school and upper secondary school has already met some resistance and challenges among teachers, who for example do not accept it as part of their educational task, or who mistrust its inclusion, viewing it as imposing neo-liberalist and capitalist values. The teachers’ approaches and attitudes are important since, as Korhonen et al. (2012) and Sagar (2013) point out, teachers play the most important role in the process of transforming entrepreneurship education into teaching practice and learning outcomes. They, as Hattie (2009) argue, strongly influence student’s interests at school. But also, as Sharma and Anderson (2007) express, powerfully affect how, and to what extent, the curriculum is implemented. There are discussions (see e.g. Gibb, 2002; Leffler, 2009; Hoppe, Westerberg & Leffler, 2016) of what kind of entrepreneurship was intended in the strategy – a narrower business-focused interpretation aimed at encouraging pupils\(^3\) and students to create new companies and growth, or a broader enterprising discourse focusing on pupils/students and learning. However, as will be discussed in coming chapters, based on the written strategy (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) as understood in this thesis, the initial main

---

2. When I refer to the ‘school setting’ in this thesis it is used as a broad term, including the different contexts and levels of education from preschool to adult education in the Swedish educational system. Though, the word ‘context’ and ‘setting’ are sometime used as synonyms.

3. When I refer to pupils, I mean children and young people attending preschool, junior and lower secondary school and upper secondary school. Those attending university, I refer to as ‘students’. However, other scholars also make reference in their research to children and young people at other levels of schooling as ‘students’. This note is to make the reader aware that there are differences.
ambition from the political sphere was a narrower business focus, in order to enhance the number of entrepreneurs in society.

Considering the above research showing reluctance among compulsory school and upper secondary school teachers, it would be quite easy to take a critical stand in this thesis, blaming the teachers for not just accepting and doing what they are told, i.e. to implement what is written in the strategy. However, there is more to the picture. Think again of the professional teachers. This task is imposed on them from above, and from one day to the next they were expected to understand and integrate entrepreneurship in their work. This is a big apparatus involving many people. It would be naïve to believe this development is implemented hastily. Rather, in the social constructionism perspective of this thesis, it involves viewing the effort among teachers of what to construct and do with entrepreneurship as a continuing process. There are also other challenges to this process. As Seikkula-Leino, Satuvuori, Ruskovaara, and Hannula (2015) point out, one such challenge is that teachers responsible for teaching entrepreneurship often lack formal education and practical experience in entrepreneurship and business.

Thus, there is still much to be done concerning entrepreneurship education in a school setting, both in practice and research. Fayolle (2013) suggests a need to attain further insights into what teachers actually do when teaching entrepreneurship, from pedagogical and methodological perspectives. Further, Mäkimuuto-Koivumaa and Belt (2016) request more research on how entrepreneurship education is integrated in specifically non-business settings and school curricula.

In addition, there are other things to consider when discussing the strategy introduction and operationalisation, in relation to both the teachers as civil servants, and the pupils. In Sweden, compulsory education is mainly a public institution. It is built on political ideas and funded and governed through the public institutions. Most compulsory education is also provided by public entities and thus the teachers here are public employees (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2017a). Thus, in this thesis the educational settings in focus are considered public contexts. From an overall perspective, discussions on strategy and entrepreneurship are receiving increased attention in both the private and public sectors. However, as Mulgan (2009) describes, the private and public entities are different in many respects, with disparate ideals, goals, structures and challenges. Today, according to Osborne (2010), public entities feel pressured to boost efficiency and deliver more and more value for money and to be innovative and entrepreneurial in their organisations. Thus, say Rosenberg Hansen (2011) and Weiss (2016), public organisations often look for ideas and solutions in the private sector, which could be understood as part of new public management (NPM) changes. Over the years, public organisations have borrowed, imported and tried to implement a variety of management and performance methods as well as concepts such as strategy (see e.g. Poister, 2010; Walker, Andrews, Boyne, Meier & O’Toole, 2010; Andrews & Van de
Walle, 2013; Rosenberg Hansen & Ferlie, 2014; Ferlie & Ongaro, 2015) and entrepreneurship (Moore, 2005; Boyne & Walker, 2010; Osborne, 2010). Therefore, it is no longer enough for public employees to be trustworthy and careful civil servants; nowadays they also have to learn to constantly adopt and cope with new concepts and include them in their work.

This development could support Morales’, Gendron’ and Guénin-Paracini’ (2014) idea of an ongoing third wave of neoliberal governmentality, which suggests that public servants today are expected to act and think as business entrepreneurs. However, this brings on certain challenges in the tax-funded public sector. For instance, there is built-in tension between entrepreneurial behaviour and public-sector bureaucracy. On the one hand, every citizen is entitled to expect the same actions, treatment and response from a public authority. At the same time, in the public context, when hiring people to think outside the box, there is an expectation that the employees will think and act for themselves. Therefore, it is a challenge to combine the traditional public-sector characteristics with an entrepreneurial approach that also, through the introduction of the strategy (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) in the educational context, now affects teachers, making them challenge their own roles as public employees. They are also challenged in relation to what they actually do when it comes to entrepreneurship in education – they are to be creative, entrepreneurial and encouraging, in a sense striving for the unique, individual and egoistic, while at the same time fulfilling the aim of providing an equal, collective and democratic education.

Sundin and Tillmar (2008), Özcan and Reichsten (2009) Luke, Kearins and Verreyenne (2011), Bernier (2014) and Höglund (2015) all point out a lack of research on public-sector entrepreneurship. In this thesis focus, this also means public education. Klein, Mahoney, McGahan and Pitelis (2010) in particular state that there is a shortage of work concerning the nature, incentives, constraints and boundaries of entrepreneurship directed towards public ends. According to Sundin and Tillmar (2008), Luke et al., (2011) and Höglund (2015), until recently most traditional strategic management research focused on private companies, on theoretical perspectives and on the macro level, thus bypassing practice-based approaches and micro-level studies. Thus research that includes aspects of both strategy and entrepreneurship in a public sector, is important but scarce. Therefore, research on introducing entrepreneurship in education through a political strategy is also of interest in this research field.

However, the introduction of the business concept of entrepreneurship into compulsory education has an inherent difference compared to entrepreneurship strategies being introduced in many other public organisations. First, it is quite massive, since it affects many people: approximately 2 million children, teens and adults in education, and approximately 285,000 teachers (and other personnel) working in education from pre-school to upper-secondary school and adult education (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2017b). Even teacher education programmes at the university level are affected since they’re
educating future teachers. Secondly, as opposed to many other business concepts being introduced in public organisations that target adults, this aims at influencing children and youths. It is intended to change their attitudes towards entrepreneurship, to become more positive and willing to act as entrepreneurs, to believe in the glory and good in entrepreneurship. It is not only about teaching pupils, it is about transforming them at an influenceable age.

From a more critical perspective, this can be viewed as the Swedish government building and educating their own entrepreneurial army (to lend a parable from Ericsson, 2010) who will think and act as entrepreneurs in their future lives. Early on, Rose (1992) and Peters (2001) critically discussed ideas of the necessity of creating entrepreneurial citizens for the future society with an underlying economic motivation, stating that such ideas could be found in the neoliberal thoughts and discussions on the creation of the enterprising self. In the concept of the enterprising self, becoming entrepreneurial is presented as positive and obtainable by all; however, this view has also received criticism (Ainsworth & Hardy, 2008). There is a risk of marginalisation and exclusion of people unable or reluctant to behave in an entrepreneurial way (du Gay, 1995), and the responsibility of being employable and enterprising is transferred to the individual, pressuring them to succeed (Vandenbroeck, 2007). These aspects are even more important to consider in public education, since the Swedish educational system is meant to be open, equal, democratic and inclusive. A number of stereotypes flourish in the entrepreneurship field; for example, presenting an entrepreneur as a white, middle-aged man (e.g. Komulainen et al., 2011; Neck & Greene, 2011). Depending on how strong these stereotypes are, other groups might not feel included.

To sum up, entrepreneurship as a concept is no longer exclusive to business; it can also be perceived as a societal phenomenon, turning up in all parts of our everyday lives. Placing entrepreneurship in new societal contexts gives rise to new questions and greater complexity. This is what currently is happening with the introduction of entrepreneurship in the school setting. It creates a need to further consider the constructs and implications of including a business concept in a non-business setting.

1.2 Entrepreneurship as a phenomenon and a concept

In this section I would like to discuss how entrepreneurship is to be understood as a concept and a phenomenon in this thesis. Entrepreneurship is a concept with business-related and economic roots (Landström et al., 2012) as well as inherited connotations such as start-up and growth activities (Gibb, 2002). However, this thesis also discusses entrepreneurship as a societal phenomenon. I use the term societal (as e.g. Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004; Johannisson, 2010; Hjorth, 2012) and not social entrepreneurship to avoid confusion with
research discussing social entrepreneurship, as in social entrepreneurs who have a social purpose to their actions, which they carry out through a business (Zahra, Newey & Li, 2014). However, societal entrepreneurship need not be business related. In this thesis, regarding societal entrepreneurship as a phenomenon means that the traditional concept of entrepreneurship has moved into other societal spheres. From my perspective, the development of the wider societal entrepreneurship is an empirical phenomenon, which means that in today’s society, entrepreneurship can be found not only in companies, but also in cultural, educational and social contexts. This, as noted earlier in the introduction chapter, increases complexity and raises questions of meaning, legitimacy, language, culture, content and implementation in these contexts (see e.g. Steyaert & Katz, 2004; Mühlenbock, 2004; Leffler, 2006; 2012).

Thus, this thesis is not an attempt to disconnect the business-related concept from its economic roots, but rather to try to understand what happens when it is introduced in these other contexts in society. Therefore, when discussing entrepreneurship in this thesis, as for example Boettke and Coyne (2009) have previously pointed out, context matters. Also, people matter, as Johannisson (2011) showed, viewing entrepreneurship as an act(ivity), as well as Steyaert (2007), who expressed entrepreneurship as a verb, i.e. entrepreneuring. When introducing entrepreneurship among the broader masses of human beings, as happens in the setting I am studying, this means emphasising the importance of human action, interaction, interpretations and social constructs in relation to this development; when something turns up on everyone’s doorstep it becomes embedded in their everyday lives. This further opens up a circumstance that people will be included in entrepreneurial activities even if they do not consider themselves entrepreneurs, as Holmquist and Sundin (2002) and Berglund and Wigren (2011) suggested, and perhaps would rather label their activities as something else, such as acts of intrapreneurship, creativity or openness to change.

Hjorth (2003) and Steyaert and Katz (2004) aim to disconnect entrepreneurship from economics in order to be able to open the door for entrepreneurship to be looked upon as a multi-dimensional phenomenon in society as a whole, as also suggested by Bill et al. (2010). However, although I can perceive this empirical development that entrepreneurship as a phenomenon has spread to other parts of society, this thesis does not want to lose sight of the connection to the business concept. In this thesis, entrepreneurship as a phenomenon and entrepreneurship as a concept are linked together, because to be able to discuss the phenomenon, you have to discuss the related concept. As will be further described in the theory chapter, complexity thickens when the

---

4. But also to avoid confusion with the English translation of the word ‘social’ in Swedish, which can be interpreted as both social and societal.
entrepreneurship concept is perceived as multifaceted with many different definitions.

1.3 Positioning the work

This research falls into the intersection of entrepreneurship and education, and in some respects strategy. Within the field of entrepreneurship in education it also touches on research on learning. However, this research mainly claims to make a contribution to the theoretical domain of entrepreneurship, studying the entrepreneurship concept in an educational and learning environment. More specifically, it also positions itself as a part of the ongoing discussions among researchers who are reframing entrepreneurship into a more societal phenomenon affecting our daily lives. Previous scholars such as Hjorth and Steyaert (2004), Johannisson (2010), Berglund et al., (2012) suggest a need of further research in this field to gain a deeper understanding of entrepreneurship in these broader contexts. In this thesis the focal societal context is education, more specifically the public school setting. The research thus addresses specific requests for further research on entrepreneurship in education, as a newer societal setting in which entrepreneurship is embedded.

It also addresses entrepreneurship education as such. There are several studies on entrepreneurship education in higher education, especially, as Seikkula-Leino et al. (2015) and Pittaway and Edwards (2012) point out, from activities in business or engineering programmes. However, as Gorman, Hanlon and King (1997), Komulainen et al. (2011), Mueller (2012), Fayolle, (2013) and Leffler (2014) mention, there are fewer studies from the lower school settings. Moreover, researchers such as Ravasi and Turati (2005), Politis, (2005) and Fayolle (2013) highlight the need for further research in the intersection of entrepreneurship and learning and entrepreneurship in relation to learning. Here there are researchers (see e.g. Cope & Watts, 2000; Rae, 2005) focusing on a certain aspect of entrepreneurial learning that is related to entrepreneurs and how they learn in their often small and medium-sized businesses. However, entrepreneurship and learning in a wider educational setting is not as widely researched. This means this area of research needs to be addressed, since the introduction of entrepreneurship in schools on a broader front leads to new challenges and questions regarding entrepreneurship. Therefore, this thesis also aims to contribute to the literature on entrepreneurial learning and entrepreneurship education in additional educational settings.

There are also other related research fields that could benefit from this work. There are, according to Sundin and Tillmar (2008), Luke et al. (2011) and Höglund (2015) very few studies specifically concentrating on strategy and entrepreneurship in public settings. Since the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) is a public strategy aiming at introducing entrepreneurship in the publicly governed
school setting, the research also adds insight from this perspective and for re-
searchers interested in entrepreneurship in public contexts.

This thesis is written in the context of Innovation and Design, which has been my Ph.D. education. Entrepreneurship, as well as innovation, is related to processes of change and change management. In this thesis the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) could be perceived as a way to design content and processes on how to operationalise entrepreneurship in the school setting. The teachers in different school settings are those involved in the processes of change i.e. in the con-
structs of entrepreneurship.

1.4 Aim, objective and research questions

From the introduction so far, it is clear that the interest in entrepreneurship in education derives from both theory and practice. The Strategy for entrepre-
neurship in the field of education was launched in 2009 (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009). Changes in the Swedish national curricula for different lev-
els of education followed in 2010–2012 (Swedish National Agency for Edu-
cation, 2010; 2011a; 2012; 2013). Thus, the journey to interpret, understand and implement entrepreneurship has just begun. In practice, a vast number of active and future teachers are potentially affected by the introduction of this new concept in their daily work. As previously discussed, research suggests this could be seen as part of a new approach to entrepreneurship; as a concept no longer exclusive to the business world, but rather a societal phenomenon that is being embedded in our daily lives. At the same time, there are inherited business linkages of the entrepreneurship concept, and previous research, such as Backström-Widjeskog (2008), Leffler (2009), Komulainen et al. (2011) and Korhonen et al. (2012), highlights tensions in relation to them among teachers.

In this thesis, my attempt is to relate to entrepreneurship as both a societal phenomenon and a business concept. In my perspective the very existence of the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Of-
ices of Sweden, 2009) and operationalisation in public education is an exam-
ple of how entrepreneurship turns up and is embedded in other parts of society. However, instead of avoiding and de-emphasising the economic roots of the concept entrepreneurship, I would like to address and investigate it and its possible constructs and implications when introduced and operationalised in a new public societal context.

Due to the background, framing, needs and challenges discussed in the in-
troduction section so far, the overall aim of the research presented in this thesis is as follows:
The overall aim of this thesis is to increase knowledge of and insights into how a business concept – entrepreneurship – is operationalised and constructed in a public context.

The empirical context of the thesis is Swedish public education i.e. the school setting. This includes both preschool teachers, as the respondents working in the preschools in this thesis prefer to be called, and teachers, which teachers from preschool class to adult education are called. The Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) is set by the government on the national level, and the task to stimulate its introduction and control and monitoring is given to its executive public authority, the Swedish National Agency for Education. But in practice the actual work takes place at the local municipality level, in the pre-schools, schools and adult education. Thus, the thesis looks into steering documents and activities on these different levels. Even if the research underpinning the thesis was not able to cover all aspects, this work nonetheless considers the top-down ideas and through its empirical studies tries to understand what happens in practice, i.e. among those whom the strategy targets. As teachers strongly affect what happens in the classroom, including the introduction and construction of entrepreneurship, they are the in focus of this research.

This leads to the objectives of the research: In order to achieve this aim, the objective is to explore, document and analyse how entrepreneurship is operationalised and constructed in the school setting through:

(i) a search for what happens when introducing entrepreneurship in preschools and schools, understanding how they construct the concept and how this process evolves;
(ii) covering voices from pre-school to teacher education programmes (since the strategy implies that entrepreneurship is meant to run like a common thread throughout the entire educational system), mainly from the teachers’ perspectives: what they say, interpret and do when working with entrepreneurship in their educational contexts;
(iii) investigating how the entrepreneurship strategy develops and is operationalised in educational practice by studying some aspects of the steering documents, stimulating initiatives from public authorities and comparing strategy content with processes in practice.
With the overall aim and the objective in mind, two interrelated research questions are presented below.

**RQ 1: How is entrepreneurship constructed in the school setting?**

The first question is chosen with a focus on what happens in practice. It helps build an understanding of what the teachers make of this concept: their description of what they talk about, interpret and do when it comes to teaching entrepreneurship. It covers teachers’ perspectives on entrepreneurship education from the preschool to university level.

**RQ 2: How is entrepreneurship strategy operationalised in the school setting?**

The second question offers insight into how the entrepreneurship strategy develops and is being operationalised in practice, as well as investigating correspondence between strategy content and processes in practice.

In an attempt to formulate the contribution in this initial introduction chapter, the following can be stated. With this thesis and its studies, guided by aim, objective and research questions, I hope to contribute with insights and knowledge mainly to the scientific discussions in the research field of societal entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education. Also, due to its focus and setting, to contribute to the research on entrepreneurship and strategy work in public organisations where, as Höglund (2015), Sundin and Tillmar (2008) and Luke et al. (2011) state, there are few studies. It also makes an empirical contribution, providing insights into what actually happens when the business concept of entrepreneurship is introduced in a public context. Thus, the research attempts to add understanding to the ongoing discussion of what teachers make of entrepreneurship, their constructs, what they actually do and how, when ‘doing entrepreneurship’. I also look at how this work derived from the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) is being operationalised and develops.

1.5 Swedish education – the context

To create an understanding of the context where this research is being carried out, this section briefly outlines the Swedish educational system and how it is governed. This also helps to give an idea of the setting in which the respondents are situated.
1.5.1 Governance

Swedish education is governed at three levels: national, regional and local. Since Sweden is a member of the EU, EU activities and investigations also affect education. The Swedish Ministry of Education and Research is responsible for the Swedish Government’s education, research and youth policy (Ministry for Education and Research, 2016). Each ministry has an associated public apparatus with public authorities. In the case of the Ministry of Education and Research, their area of responsibility includes the Swedish National Agency for Education and the Higher Education Institutes (HEI), i.e. universities, university colleges and other such institutions. These authorities are tasked with implementing the activities defined by the ministry.

The Swedish National Agency for Education is the central administrative authority of the public school system, publicly organised pre-school and education from the primary level to adult education (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2016). The agency’s task is to ensure that all children and pupils have access to an equal, high-quality education in a secure environment. They prepare regulations and national tests, are responsible for spreading school research and arrange development programmes and in-service training. To stimulate some approaches and activities, they also distribute some development funding. Education can be arranged on national, regional and local levels. However, in practice, most responsibility for education has been transferred in many respects to the local authorities, or municipalities. Sweden has approximately 290 municipalities. Their primary responsibilities include education, social services and care of the elderly. The municipalities are governed by publicly elected politicians. Most municipalities have some sort of manager for both education and enterprising activities. Even if there are approximately 600 independent providers, the main educational providers in Sweden are public entities (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2017a).

1.5.2 The Swedish pre-school and school context

In Sweden, early childhood education is part of the education system. Swedish pre-schools are available for children aged one to five years (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2016). Almost every child attends pre-school; for instance, in 2012 the figure was 84%. The workplace is dominated by women, and there are two staff categories: pre-school teachers with a university degree and day care attendants with a vocational qualification. Pre-school class is a particular school form for six-year-old children, in which almost all children are enrolled; the figure for 2012/2013 was 95% (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2014).

Comprehensive school is compulsory for all children at primary and lower-secondary schools. Compulsory schooling begins at the age of seven, from the autumn of the year they turn seven, and continues for nine years. Compulsory
attendance at school is both a right and an obligation, and the education is tuition free. After completing comprehensive school, all young people in Sweden are entitled to a three-year upper-secondary school education. This education provides basic knowledge that enables further studies and prepares young people for a future working life. Throughout these educational levels there are also special schools for children with learning disabilities. If, later in life, an adult needs to have their education supplemented, the system also includes adult education (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2016). The newly revised curricula for different ages define the content and focus of preschool and school education. (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2010; 2011a; 2012; 2013).

University educators are public authorities directly linked to the Ministry of Education and Research. Higher education is Sweden’s largest public-sector service provider with approximately 50 HEIs and many stakeholders (Swedish Higher Education Authority, 2016). This education is voluntary, subject to competition and tuition-free for Swedish residents. In this thesis one of the studies focuses specially on a teacher education programme, which are offered by more than 20 HEIs.

1.6 The steering documents

In this thesis, relevant steering documents relating to education and entrepreneurship were studied and considered. The launch and implementation of the Swedish Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) serves as a background and is used in the analysis. This strategy further impacted upon the national curriculum for all school levels: the revised preschool curriculum of 2010 as well as new curricula for comprehensive schools in 2011, upper secondary schools in 2011 and adult education programmes in 2012 (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2010; 2011a; 2012; 2013).

1.6.1 The Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education

The Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education was influenced by European initiatives such as the 1989 OECD (1989) report and the European Union’s (2007) framework of eight key competencies for lifelong learning, highlighting entrepreneurship and employability. In summary, the strategy is in this thesis interpreted as focusing on three main ideas: (1) self-employment must be as natural as becoming an employee, (2) the importance of practicing entrepreneurial skills and (3) entrepreneurship should be a common theme throughout the education system. This third objective implies some kind of link or progression of entrepreneurship between the stages of education. The role of the system is to help pupils develop and exercise the
necessary knowledge, competencies and approaches. The main focus is clearly on the entrepreneur and entrepreneurship in a business and economic sense. The government’s interest at this point lies in creating new companies. The strategies, images and language express an image of entrepreneurship connected to craft and manufacturing, to merchandise and a buy and sell perspective. This is exemplified by these extracts from the strategy (Government Offices of Sweden 2009:2-3):

Education that inspires entrepreneurship can provide young people with the skills and enthusiasm to set up and run a business. More companies that build on new ideas are important in increasing employment, strengthening development capacity and boosting Sweden’s competitiveness in an increasingly globalised world. Entrepreneurship and business are closely linked. Entrepreneurship is about developing new ideas and translating these ideas into something that creates value. This value can be created in companies, in the public sector and in voluntary organisations. Many young people are positive to the idea of starting up a business, but are hesitant because they do not know how to, or do not dare to invest in an idea of their own. […] Entrepreneurial skills increase the individual’s chances of starting and running a company.

The entrepreneurial competencies are chosen with the entrepreneur as a role model. The preface and subsequent text states (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009):

Being self-employed must be as natural a choice as being an employee. […] Many of the distinctive features of a good entrepreneur – the ability to solve problems, think innovatively, plan one’s work, take responsibility and cooperate with others – are also qualities that students at different levels need to develop to complete their studies and to be successful in their adult lives. […] Entrepreneurship education may include the specific knowledge required to start and run a business, such as business administration and planning. Entrepreneurship education can also develop more general skills that are equally useful outside the business world, such as project and risk management. Educating entrepreneurs also means inspiring people to be creative and take own responsibility for achieving a goal. […] The Government considers that entrepreneurship should be integrated throughout the education system. […] Entrepreneurial skills increase the individual’s chances of starting and running a company. Skills such as being able to recognise opportunities, take initiatives and transform ideas into practical action are also valuable to the individual and society in a broader sense. (2009: preface, and p. 2–3).

1.6.2 The Swedish national curriculum for education

Entrepreneurship was then introduced in the Swedish national curricula for education. There is no definition of entrepreneurship in the texts and the
tasks are communicated differently in the various curricula for different educational levels. In the preschool curriculum, the concept of entrepreneurship is not expressed per se. Here it is more implicit, declaring that:

A child’s curiosity, enterprising abilities and interests should be encouraged and their will and desire to learn should be stimulated (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2010, p. 6, author’s transl.)

The text (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011b) also states that preschool should promote play, creativity and enjoyment of learning, as well as focusing on and strengthening a child’s interest in learning and gaining new experiences, knowledge and skills.

The content of the curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and the recreation centre (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011a) is somewhat different. The fundamental values and tasks for schools are expressed in the first chapter of the curriculum. Here one paragraph explicitly mentions entrepreneurship:

An important task for the school is to provide a general but coherent view. The school should stimulate pupils’ creativity, curiosity and self-confidence, as well as their desire to explore their own ideas and solve problems. Pupils should have the opportunity to take initiatives and responsibility, and develop their ability to work both independently and together with others. The school in doing this should contribute to pupils developing attitudes that promote entrepreneurship. (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011a, p. 11)

So in this curriculum, entrepreneurship is mentioned once. Yet taking a wider interpretation, as in the case of the preschool, there are also perceptible links to entrepreneurial perspectives and skills in other paragraphs. For instance, it is stated that pupils should discover their uniqueness and personal growth, practice creativity, develop their language and communication skills, influence their education and be able to make choices in school. Moreover, the school’s task is to prepare pupils for life and work in society.

The curriculum for the upper secondary school (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2013) is more explicit, in that it links entrepreneurship to business and start up activities. Furthermore, entrepreneurship strengthens its position at this level of schooling by also being offered to students as a distinct subject.

5. This reference to the Swedish version of the national curriculum for the preschool rather than the English has been chosen due to its more explicit expression of the Swedish word ‘företagsamhet’ which expresses the state of being ‘enterprising’. In the corresponding English version, this is translated as “initiatives” which does not carry the same meaning.
The school should stimulate students’ creativity, curiosity and self-confidence, as well as their desire to explore and transform new ideas into action and find solutions to problems. Students should develop their ability to take initiatives and responsibility, and to work both independently and together with others. The school should contribute to students developing knowledge and attitudes that promote entrepreneurship, enterprise and innovative thinking. As a result the opportunities for students to start and run a business will increase. Entrepreneurial skills are valuable in working and societal life and for further studies. In addition, the school should develop the social and communicative competence of students, and also their awareness of health, life style and consumer issues (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2013, p. 5–6).

The curriculum for the adult education programme from 2012 (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2012, p. 7–8, italics in original) also expresses the importance of stimulating entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial perspectives to facilitate future education, employment or self-employment.

The Adult Education shall stimulate the students’ creativity, curiosity and self-belief, as well as the will to try out and translate new ideas into practice as well as to solve problems. Adult Education shall contribute to the students developing an approach that fosters entrepreneurship, an entrepreneurial perspective and innovation. Thereby, the students can develop capabilities that are valuable in working and social life and in the case of further studies. Such an approach also facilitates starting up and running a business.

To sum up the section on the steering documents, the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) focuses on entrepreneurship and is interpreted in this thesis as consisting of the three main ideas described above: a) self-employment, b) entrepreneurial skills and c) entrepreneurship as a common theme throughout education. There is no definition of entrepreneurship in the various national curricula. The concept of entrepreneurship is not even present in the preschool curriculum. In that context, its tone is more implicit; describing a need for encouraging curiosity and enterprising abilities. The compulsory school curriculum mentions a task of helping pupils developing attitudes that promote entrepreneurship. Meanwhile, in the upper secondary school curriculum, entrepreneurship is emphasised more explicitly and linked to the creation of companies. Thus, there are different needs and concerns to bear in mind as the Swedish National Agency for Education, as part of the Swedish governmental apparatus, operationalise its task of stimulating the inclusion of entrepreneurship in a school setting.
1.7 Thesis outline

The thesis has two main parts; (1) the summarising chapters and (2) the appended papers.

Part 1 presents analyses and discusses the research and its findings. Chapter one introduces the research, describes the background and motives of the investigation and positions it in this field of research. It also articulates the purpose, objective and research questions as well as the contribution of the research. In addition, it gives an insight into the context in which the research is performed. Chapter 2 introduces the research methodology. It includes the research process, studies and analysing methods, i.e. the chosen design and realisation of the research. Further, method and research considerations are discussed, as well as the authors’ pre-understanding. Chapter 3 presents the theory underpinning the research. Chapter 4 provides an overview and summary of the main findings from the empirical studies. It also discusses and analyses the findings. Chapter 5 discusses the research and findings and revisits the aim and research questions. This chapter also presents the research contribution, quality, limitations and some suggestions for future research.

In part 2, the five appended papers developed and written during the PhD studies are presented. Paper one increases our knowledge of what happens when entrepreneurship is put into practice in a comprehensive school setting: what are the teachers’ constructs and content of entrepreneurship, and how is it introduced in the school setting. Paper two addresses similar questions, however focusing on entrepreneurial learning, but in another voluntary educational context – the pre-school setting. Paper three investigates how the strategy is made practicable by a competence development initiative from the Swedish National Agency of Education and its implications for entrepreneurship in the school setting and possible (un)intended consequences. Paper four focuses on the content of the strategy and the process in practice, and their relationship to a search for a possible understanding of the findings revealed in papers one to three. Lastly, since these four papers focus on active teachers’ ongoing work to include entrepreneurship in education, paper five addresses future teachers and the teachers teaching entrepreneurship in a university teacher education programme, which is relevant for the future progression of entrepreneurship in education.
2 Method

This chapter presents the research journey: the research process and approach, a summary of the studies and analytical methods (how I chose to design and conduct the research), plus a section describing my pre-understanding. I also discuss my method and research considerations.

2.1 The initial research process and background

This chapter begins with an illustration of the research process, giving an initial comprehensive picture of the research work. The illustration below provides a broad outline of when the five studies (A–E) and papers (1–5) included in this thesis were conducted and presented. It also shows how they relate to each other and which empirical studies are included in what paper(s), as well as the way in which theory is integrated throughout the process. The obligatory checkpoints during the doctoral student process are marked below the timeline.

Figure 1. A comprehensive illustration of the research process.
The research process has been explorative as the field of entrepreneurship, and focus of this research, are considered new and emerging fields. Even if not apparent in the illustration, the process was iterative. In keeping with Ahrens and Chapman (2006), this means alternating between theory and empirics. The research process phases interact and float into each other.

In its initial phase, the work emerged through several actions: mapping the current understanding, by conducting literature reviews and discussing the initial research ideas and possible contributions within my research group ‘Information Design Research Group’. I also interacted with other colleagues at Mälardalen University and networked and exchanged thoughts within the national networks, CSI Anywhere (mainly researchers) and NELIS – the Network for Entrepreneurial Learning In Schools (authors transl., mainly practitioners). There was also a Nordic network, CIE – Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship in the Nordic Countries (researchers). Some researchers, such as Blessing and Chakrabarti (2009), label this phase of research as ‘clarification’, although the work as a whole does not follow their design research methodology.

The research area and research questions were chosen by a combination of identifying a research gap within the field of entrepreneurship and finding a current and engaging topic that was also of interest in practice and in society; one in which I felt my passion and past work experience could be useful.

The research began with a thorough literature review of entrepreneurship. In a kind of snowball approach, and through continuous discussions with the supervisors, the initial literature also included research into learning, learning styles and entrepreneurial learning. From this initial work, it became clear that the current scope and space of entrepreneurship had spread and expanded from its traditional position in business and was now considered important to society. This is discussed in the section covering entrepreneurship as a phenomenon and concept in chapter one. I found that previous research discussed a lack of research contributing with a yet deeper understanding of entrepreneurship in these broader contexts, where entrepreneurship is viewed as a societal phenomenon affecting our daily lives (Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004; Berglund et al., 2012).

The literature review, which was ongoing throughout the research process, helped provide an understanding and contributed to the iterative process when designing the empirical studies, developing the research findings, going back and forth between empirics and theory etc. It also contributed by serving as ‘theoretical spectacles’; providing a perspective or lens through which the research could be analysed. Initially, the literature review was conducted to establish a thorough current understanding of previous research, mainly within the fields of entrepreneurship, learning, learning styles and entrepreneurial learning. The process and development of the research then led to seeking knowledge in different directions. The theory and previous research relevant for this thesis will be presented in the next chapter.
Coincidentally, early in the open explorative phase of the initial research process I heard of a project being run by a Swedish municipality. The project was focusing on entrepreneurship in a school setting and funded by the Swedish National Agency for Education. I learned that this was linked with a politically driven idea of including entrepreneurship within the whole educational system, launched in a national Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education in 2009 (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009). In my opinion, doing this meant that the Swedish government and public apparatus had decided to implement a business concept in a publicly governed setting – the educational system – across a very broad front. Following this strategy, entrepreneurship was written into the national curriculum. When the Swedish National Agency for Education was given the assignment of stimulating and gearing up its practical inclusion in education, this led to a flood of projects and activities in preschools and schools as they tried to include this concept in their daily work. However, since the territory was unfamiliar, there were many uncertainties and questions among those whose task it was to develop it; mainly the teachers and headmasters. This was noticeable not only in practice; researchers also pointed out new challenges and research gaps regarding what happens in the interaction between entrepreneurship and learning in education. For instance, Fayolle (2013) stated that there is a need to know more about what teachers are actually talking about and doing on different educational levels. Moreover, Leffler (2014) pointed out that there is a need to know more about how the entrepreneurship concept changes and assumes new forms when developing within different educational settings.

These occurrences and insights led to the focus, aim and research questions in this research. As such, the research positions itself within the discussion on entrepreneurship as a societal phenomenon, in which entrepreneurship broadens and develops in many societal contexts other than business. More specifically, it addresses the concept of entrepreneurship in a school setting and, as such, the launch of a business concept in a public context.

Figure 2. Positioning the work. Studying a business concept in a public context.
2.2 The research approach

Research is conducted using different methodological approaches (Starrin & Svensson 1994; Gummesson, 1985). The scientific approach includes a view of what science is, what it is supposed to achieve (the ideal) and its method, i.e. how the research is conducted (Starrin & Svensson, 1994). A scientific approach is based on a certain view of knowledge, of man and of reality. These constitute the essence of what is sometimes called a scientific paradigm.

The two most common contrasting scientific approaches are positivism and hermeneutics (Starrin & Svensson, 1994; Patel & Davidsson, 2011). Though enjoying the positivistic perspectives rooted in the empirical, I do not believe knowledge is always observable or that it is possible for researchers to conduct their work in a totally objective and invincible manner. Hermeneutics, on the other hand, focuses on interpretations and insights. As Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009) describe, analysing empirical data is to be regarded as an insight, not as fact. Human reality is seen as linguistic in nature, and through language one can find the genuinely human. One relevant aspect of hermeneutics is meaning. This approach is connected to the qualitative, to comprehension and the role of the researcher as more open, engaged and subjective. But although I do not claim to take a fully hermeneutic approach, these aspects are more in line with my view.

Social constructionism is rooted in hermeneutics (Lindgren & Packendorff, 2009). Social constructionism is sometimes used synonymously with social constructivism. However, I side with Burr6 (1995) and use social constructionism rather than social constructivism, since the latter can cause confusion. This is because it is sometimes used to refer to Piaget’s cognitive theories, who placed more emphasis on mental models of the world and implied that thoughts are developed within a child before it obtains a language. Therefore, my research within this thesis lies within social constructionism assumptions of ontology and epistemology. Having this perspective on entrepreneurship means that the concept is constructed in social interactions between people and suggests that the researcher’s role is to enhance our understanding of this interplay (Steyaert, 1997; Drakopoulou Dodd & Anderson, 2007). The researcher matters, as they are part of the social construction of the questions, interpretations and findings. Social constructionism is thus about pluralism, acknowledging different meanings and describing complexity. Entrepreneurship as a concept and a phenomenon exists through interpretations and interactions between individuals or groups of people. Thus, what will be considered included or excluded in entrepreneurship depends on who you ask and upon when and in what contexts. This means what at first sight is believed to be ‘natural’ or widely recognised cannot be taken for granted; it could also be

---

6. For a deeper understanding, see for example Burr (1995).
perceived in another way, in another culture or context for instance. This implies that knowledge is withheld by social processes. Viewing knowledge as constantly changing, on the move, being invented and re-invented in social interaction, means that the studies and their findings cannot claim generalisation. Rather, knowledge creation is inter-subjective constructions that are produced and reproduced among people. Therefore, the research approach of this thesis is in keeping with the thoughts of Berglund and Johansson (2007), who state that there are multiple coexisting variations of entrepreneurship which need to be visible and brought into dialogue with each other.

2.3 My pre-understanding

In an interpretative approach, the researcher’s matters and pre-understanding becomes important for the interpretations they make (Arnbör & Bjerke, 1994; Norén, 1995; Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009). Therefore, to create transparency, this section presents my pre-understanding.

What is the sum, or intersections, of a person’s actions, experiences, knowledge, interest and curiosity which has led them to these specific research aims, questions and methodology? Fortunately, the constraints of this thesis prevent me from unnecessary digging into my past. However, some things are worth mentioning which might have a bearing on the orientation of the thesis and I approach this research with that background.

I grew up in an active and communicative family, with parents who worked as teachers and headmasters and who were highly engaged in educational, political and societal matters. This led to many discussions on such issues around the dinner table and, in due course, my brother and sister at first also chose to pursue teaching. However, at this point, I vowed I would never, ever work with, or in, education. Instead, I ended up studying political science at Uppsala University.

However, one thing led to another and here I am at Mälardalen University. During my years here, I have worked in project management on such things as creating the Idea Lab (Idélab), a space for personal development, creativity, entrepreneurship, innovation and entrepreneurial learning, plus start-up activities and coaching for students and researchers wanting to start their own businesses. This has meant working closely with students, teachers and researchers as well as society at large. During this period and to try and really understand the daily activities and challenges of business entrepreneur (and practice what I was preaching), I started a consultancy company. At the University, I have also been working as a teacher and manager on different levels. This granted me opportunities to develop and combine my strategic (managerial) and operative (practical) interests and skills. Furthermore, I have been involved as one of the driving forces behind the work of Mälardalen University’s development to become a co-operative and co-producing university. I
managed a section for external relations and served as Deputy Vice-Chancellor. Being a manager at a university means working closely with strategy and practice, working with external contacts in industry and the public and political sphere, as well as internal administration, education and research. In my opinion, everyone is equally important, contributing with their different perspectives, insights and experiences.

Then the opportunity to become a PhD student opened up and I couldn’t resist it. Twice, I had previously passed on such an opportunity at Uppsala, and I wasn’t going to again. So, third time lucky!

Given my background then, it is perhaps unsurprising that my knowledge base, working experience, private life and personal interests reveal a broad passion for matters of entrepreneurship, business, learning, management, strategy, practice and co-creation in a societal and public setting. All this influenced me when drafting the aims of this thesis and its research questions.

2.4 The research method

The choice of research methods should be guided by the research questions and purpose (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2012). As stated, this research aims to understand how a business concept is operationalised and constructed in the public context.

Empirical studies and inclusion of practice are commonplace in entrepreneurship research. As will be described later, the studies have been conducted in interaction with practice since empirical settings and, in some cases, research focus or overriding questions are developed together. Three of the studies were conducted in one individual preschool and two individual schools, and two studies included multiple schools. The research was conducted in close proximity to the empirics; searching for the teachers’ point of view, their actions and ways of interpreting. I have tried to study the empirics as a whole, whilst considering the studies’ and empirics’ different yet substantial nuances.

To fulfil the aim and answer the research questions, this research thus uses a broad theoretical base and multiple qualitative research methods. The combination of methods includes semi-structured interviews, in-depth interviews using the stimulated recall method, focus group interviews, participative meetings, observations, document studies, digital questionnaires, written inquiries, analysing texts and critical incidents questionnaires. According to Short, Ketchen, Combs & Ireland (2010), the relative richness of entrepreneurship data and insights from qualitative data is regarded as a specific strength of entrepreneurship research.

In summary, given the research aim and questions, the research has been multidisciplinary, empirical and with a qualitative approach. Firstly, this was because combining methods could help to better answer my research questions. Secondly, I concur with the basis presented by e.g. Berglund et al.
(2012) that entrepreneurship is multidisciplinary and contextually dependent. This strengthens my belief that my research would benefit from empirical studies from schools. Also, since I am drawing on material from different empirical settings, as pointed out by Silverman (2010), this makes it possible to see where the data intersects and thus show similarities and disparities.

2.5 The progression and relation of the studies

This section describes how the various studies in the research evolve and interact. As stated, the research orientation has been multidisciplinary, empirical and qualitative in its approach.

For the purpose of this thesis and my involvement in this informative opportunity to use and learn from different methods, I conducted five empirical studies (described in the next chapter). Three studies were initiated, and the empirics collected on my own (A, C, E). The other two were in collaboration with colleagues (B and D). The studies were processed in several steps, and studies A, C and D were initially developed in collaboration with the surrounding society. One was in a municipality, another was with a County Administrative Board and the third was with the Swedish National Agency for Education. Thus, elements of the research for these three studies are presented and written with a somewhat different focus, research questions and empirical aspects. There are three separate reports in Swedish; I (Axelsson, 2013), II (Axelsson, 2015) and III (Axelsson & Haglund, 2016) and, although not included in this thesis, they constitute part of the research process and development. My role here was as a researcher, albeit writing more in the fashion of popular science. This work helped in collecting empirical material.

The studies were initiated after politicians launched their 2009 Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009), which then impacted upon the new and/or revised national curricula introduced between 2010 and 2012 (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2010; 2011a; 2012; 2013). The first step was to take a practical approach and see how entrepreneurship was constructed in the school setting. The first study (A) was carried out in a Swedish compulsory school grades 6-9 in 2012. I was searching for what the teachers and headmasters talk about and do when it comes to entrepreneurship. Did they perceive any initial effects? What were their expectations and challenges? The purpose was to try and understand entrepreneurship in this context.

Fuelled by the findings of study A, the second study B continued along those lines. This study was further inspired by the strategic idea of attaining a common thread throughout education. To search for this and see if there were any overlaps, similarities or disparities between different school settings, study B was conducted in a Swedish preschool. What were the preschool teachers experiences and understanding in practice?
As it turned out, both the school and preschool had previously participated, in different ways, in activities initiated by the Swedish National Agency for Education. The school in study A received funding within a competence development initiative funded by the Agency in which the school created and conducted a larger overall school entrepreneurship project. The preschools’ personnel in study B had taken part in another Agency initiative, which was giving university courses in entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning. The Agency gave the courses in collaboration with (and by funding) higher education institutes. I thus became aware that the Swedish National Agency for Education was conducting different activities in enhancing knowledge and stimulating the inclusion of entrepreneurship in education.

At this point, it felt important to add more flesh to the bones by including more insights through empirical material from more preschools and schools. Thus, the third study (C) was planned and completed. This was facilitated by using empirical data from one of the initiatives provided by the Swedish National Agency for Education – a competence development initiative focused on enhancing interest and understanding of entrepreneurship in education. This study of the initiative covers the period from 2009 to 2014 and helped understand the development process over time. It also provided insight into how the Swedish National Agency for Education conducts its assignment to support schools in undertaking this new task. In other words, how the politically-launched strategy was operationalised through the official apparatus.

The development and empirical findings from the first studies was intriguing. What happened in practice did not seem to correlate entirely with the written output and intentions of the political sphere and from official steering documents, as I understood them. Thus, in this study, I also wanted to investigate the strategy and its content and compare it with what actually happened in practice during the process. Thus, one might reach an understanding of the development.

One of the three main ideas in the strategy is to develop a common thread running through entrepreneurship within education. This calls for a progression of knowledge and skills within and across educational levels. This doesn’t just mean individual schools or preschools working according to a theme; within the Swedish municipalities politicians and managers in the administrative apparatus also have a duty and responsibility to inspire and to act. The fourth study (D) thus tried to investigate how this is understood and operationalised at municipal level. The study includes local politicians, managers in education and enterprise, plus headmasters and teachers in nine municipalities. It helped understand how the work (including entrepreneurship in the public sector) is perceived and evolves and if/how the common theme progresses from politics and management to teachers. The study further investigates what, in the opinion of the stakeholders, works well today and what needs to be improved. However, study D also added deeper knowledge to studies A and B (what are the constructs of entrepreneurship in the school
setting) as it included more insights from teachers and headmasters. Hence, it added knowledge from both multiple schools and actors.

Up to this point, the questions and focus was on the already established and currently active teachers. As noted, these teachers often lacked entrepreneurship knowledge and experience (e.g. Seikkula-Leino et al., 2015). However, since it is included in the curriculum, it should be mandatory to address and discuss this within teacher training programmes. It therefore also seemed interesting and important to see how the universities (as the main educators of these new teachers) were incorporating entrepreneurship; preparing future teachers with knowledge of entrepreneurship and making them familiar with and able to work with it as they progress. In this sense, the university sector has a huge impact on the development of entrepreneurship in the school setting. Furthermore, the universities are simultaneously at one end of the common thread and spearheading it progression because as teacher educators for all grades, they affect all levels. This led to study E, which was conducted within a compulsory course incorporating elements of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning at a university in central Sweden. The study includes both teachers’ and students’ perspectives at the university level.

Figure 3. A diagram summarising the focus of the thesis, visualising the relationship of the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education and the constituent parts of the educational system, as well as the various levels of education included.

2.6 Summary of the studies

The research studies are briefly described in this section. The combination of methods includes semi-structured interviews, in-depth interviews using the stimulated recall method, focus group interviews, participative meetings, observations, document studies, digital questionnaires, written inquiries, analys-
ing texts and critical incidents questionnaires. The methods and analysis chosen will be further presented in relation to the studies. Below is a table with an overview of the studies and data collection methods as well as the year of data collection, connected to research questions and appended papers and reports. The papers are further discussed in chapter four.

**Table 1. Overview of the studies and data collection methods and year of data collection connected to research questions and appended papers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Main data collection method</th>
<th>Year of data collection</th>
<th>Related to paper (and report)</th>
<th>Mainly help answer RQ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Document study, 9 semi-structured interviews, 5 participative meetings, 4 observations</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Paper 1 (Report 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5 critical incidents questionnaire, one in-depth interview (using the stimulated recall method)</td>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>Paper 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Text analysis of 84 documents, document study, 4 participative meetings</td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>Paper 3 and 4 (Report 2)</td>
<td>2, (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18 semi-structured interviews, digital questionnaire, 15 answers</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>Paper 4 (Report 3)</td>
<td>2, (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4 observations, 2 written inquiries (30+33 replies), 2 focus group interviews, 2 semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Paper 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.6.1 The five empirical studies:

The five empirical studies constitute the empirical basis of the thesis as well as appended papers and are therefore also discussed and presented in the papers.

*The first study (study A)* was conducted at the Swedish compulsory school level grades 6-9, during 2012. The study’s objective was to discover and understand what happens when entrepreneurship is put into practice in a school setting – what are the teachers constructs, and how it is introduced in the school setting. At this point the school participated in the aforementioned project financed by the Swedish National Agency for Education aimed at developing entrepreneurship in the school. The study was guided by what the teachers and headmasters talk about and do when it comes to entrepreneurship. What were their constructs and their views of the concept, perceived initial effects, expectations and challenges in this work? The study also investigated the entrepreneurship project and process.
This qualitative research study included a literature study of related research, a document study analysing policy and steering documents from a European and Swedish level and nine semi-structured interviews. In addition, participative meetings were conducted with management of the project (the school principal and the project manager), and project planning sessions, which the schools’ team leaders also attended. I also attended at the school, made observations and did nine interviews with teachers who participated in the ongoing project. The choice of interviews felt relevant since I wanted to create an opportunity to get closer to the teachers’ real-life everyday situations, and by doing this, as Flyvbjerg (2002) points out, receive a more context-dependent knowledge. The interviews were semi-structured and the interview guide contained three overriding themes with open-ended questions: (i) the project and its process, (ii) perceived results and effects and (iii) the concepts of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning. The interviews took approximately 50-90 minutes and were audiotaped and fully transcribed before analysis.

Guided by the above questions, entrepreneurship interviews, documents and notes from the meetings were analysed qualitatively. Firstly, a general analysis involving a thorough read-through of all the collected material was conducted. Then the empirical material was analysed for each interview and each answer. Then there was a comparison, searching for similarities and differences. Some things became more visible through this work, creating a basis for themes and patterns. A more comprehensive description of this study (the methodology and empirics) is available in Swedish (Axelsson, 2013).

The second study (study B) was conducted within the Swedish preschool context. Its purpose was to further investigate the constructs of entrepreneurship in line with the aims of study A, but at the preschool level. It, too, investigated an empirical concept found in study A; the concept of entrepreneurial learning. Further inspired by one of the ideas in the strategy (achieving a common theme of entrepreneurship throughout education), the preschool as the initial step in this thread was of interest. I also wanted to see if there were any overlaps, similarities or disparities between these different school settings. What were their practical experiences and understanding?

The data was collected in two ways: Firstly, in the form of critical incident questionnaires (Flanagan, 1954; Hansson, 1995; Rubin & Rubin, 2004). Five Swedish preschool teachers, who had previously attended in-service training in entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning, participated in the writing of critical incident questionnaires. Use of this method was intended to shed light on specific incidents; what a person did, why they did it and the outcome of their actions. It has been used in recent years, for instance in studying preschool teachers’ experiences of other key concepts such as learning and participation (Johansson & Sandberg, 2010) and gender (Sandström, Stier &
Sandberg, 2013). The reason for using this method was to give each participant the opportunity, through a reflective process, to think and write down in their own words what they felt were positive and negative examples of an entrepreneurial learning situation; why they chose it, where it happened, who participated, and why they felt it was more or less successful. This method was also appropriate since, as Hughes (2007) states, it can help develop a knowledge base that clarifies context, strategy and results. This seemed relevant in this study, since research into entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning in a preschool setting is emerging.

Secondly, to deepen the understanding, empirical data was collected by an in-depth interview using the stimulated recall method, thus (in practice) it constitutes of two related interview situations (Calderhed, 1996; Haglund, 2003). It was attended by one of the preschool teachers, who also was the preschool manager. In so doing, the aim was to challenge and stimulate thoughts of, and actions towards, entrepreneurial learning in preschool and thus capture what preschool teachers do in practice and how they talk about entrepreneurial learning. According to Haglund (2003), the stimulated recall method can be conducted with some variations, however, it is generally a method where the researcher, aided by audio or video recordings, documents an interviewee’s actions. After the interview, the interviewee can see or hear their recording and comment on it. This is supposed to stimulate the respondent’s thought process during the situation being documented. In this study, the preschool teacher was first interviewed about her thoughts on entrepreneurial learning, her definition and why and how she works with it. She then chose a specific situation in which she felt an entrepreneurial learning situation might occur and this was videotaped. In this case, she chose the lunchtime which, according to the subject, was an ordinary working situation. After the observation, a second, interview followed in which the preschool teacher could comment on the recording and what happened. Both interviews were audiotaped and fully transcribed.

In many ways, the qualitative analysis follows what was described in study A. The aim was to explore preschool teachers’ understanding of, and practical approaches to, preschool entrepreneurial learning. The answers from the critical incidents questionnaire and the interviews were read repeatedly to gain a comprehensive picture. The main analysis focused on identifying general perceptions of entrepreneurial learning, i.e. what were commonly viewed as important features of a positive and negative entrepreneurial learning situation for the participants according to the answers in the critical incident questionnaires. Four empirical themes were developed based on the analysis.

The third study (study C) is related to The Swedish National Agency of Education’s assignment to promote the development of entrepreneurship within the educational system from pre-school level to upper secondary school and
adult education (university level is beyond their scope). Between 2009 and 2014, the Swedish National Agency for Education invested approximately 130 million Swedish kronor to stimulate work on entrepreneurship in schools (cf. Ministry of Education, 2013) as part of realising the entrepreneurship strategy in the school setting. The study’s purpose was to add insights into both the research questions of this thesis. Since the initiative covers several years, it helps to understand the development and process over time. Also, it gave insights into how the Swedish National Agency for Education works with its assignment to support schools in undertaking this new task; i.e. how the politically launched strategy is implemented through the public apparatus. Moreover, it increases the understanding through empirical material from more preschools and schools.

This study’s aim was to investigate one of the technologies the Agency used to stimulate the development. This was an effort entitled ‘Entrepreneurship in schools’, in which schools apply for funding to implement entrepreneurship through competence development activities, mainly for teachers. The study included 42 randomly selected schools from those that received funding. This involved a sample of the 232 principal organisers whose applications were passed, out of the 457 principal organisers who applied. The selected schools represent the entire chain in the Swedish school system, from preschool, elementary school, special school, secondary school and adult education. The material includes both the applications and the evaluation reports, thereby adding up to 84 documents. These constitute the main source of data within this study. Investigating them there provided an opportunity to study the initial ambitions as to what entrepreneurship in a school setting was meant to be and what actually developed in practice.

A document study of steering documents was also carried out. This included printed and digital material from public authorities as well as internal operational material from within the Swedish National Agency for Education. Also included were notes from meetings and ongoing dialogue with representatives of the Agency; these contributed information and clarified questions.

Study C generates knowledge from the principal organisers as to how they describe the planned activities and outcome. Their testimonies (through applications and evaluation reports) regarding the competence development activities to strengthen entrepreneurship provided insights into how they themselves describe the inclusion of entrepreneurship in the school setting; its effects and their experiences. The analysis of texts offers a possibility to distance oneself and can provide new discoveries and perspectives (Winther Jörgensen & Philips, 2000). It can also provide an opportunity to treat the material impartially. However, there are also some limitations. There is no way to deepen the understanding in the same way that interviews might do. The material is based upon a form laid down by the Agency, which adds structure to the work. However, it also induces uncertainty as to the reporters’ interpretations. Moreover, it is not possible to know who wrote these applications and reports, so
one cannot understand their previous knowledge and/or insights in what is being reported, even if there are quotes and alleged information from teachers.

The material was mapped by first determining some comparable facts such as which part of the school system the activity concerned, applied and received funding for, which occupational category took part in the competence development activities and the number of people involved in the activities, etc. Then the sections of the applications relating to the research question were studied. Here, the mapping includes investigating the activities’ aims and goals, previous experience in the field, expressed need of competence development activities for the teachers, content and implementation, time plan and cooperation between the school and its local community. Next, the evaluation reports where mapped on content relating to the completed competence development activity and the implementation process, which was then compared to the plans. A search was made to determine what actually developed in practice, looking for cooperation and networking, follow-up and evaluation issues and if/how the schools intended to continue working with entrepreneurship after these activities are completed. The analysis involved a search of how they described entrepreneurship in their school setting and how they described the way they worked with it. The analysis firstly involved a multiple reading of all the material to gain an overview and comprehensive picture. The material was then analysed, according to principal organiser, application and evaluation report; these were compiled and documented. Then the principal organisers’ texts were compared, based on which year they conducted their activities and a comparison made between answers, looking for similarities and variations. Finally, all the years were compiled and compared, so that a developments over time could be seen. Insights and patterns visible through this survey laid the groundwork for six empirical themes. A more comprehensive description of this study (the methodology and empirics) is available in Swedish (Axelsson, 2015).

In regard to the fourth study (study D), one of the three main ideas of the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) was, as previously stated, to develop a common thread on entrepreneurship in education. This calls for a progression of knowledge and skills within and among educational levels. This means not only individual preschools or schools working with the thread, but that within the Swedish municipalities there is also a duty and responsibility for politicians and managers within the administrative apparatus to inspire and act. This research study was conducted in a central-Swedish county consisting of ten municipalities. Nine of these accepted inclusion in the study. The aim, by adding multiple schools and more actors, was to further strengthen the understanding of what characterises entrepreneurship in a school setting and what happens in practice. Thus, this study broadens the empirical material and includes 11
more schools alongside the specific school in study A and specific preschool in study B. However, more stakeholders affect entrepreneurship in the school setting. Therefore, alongside teachers and headmasters, the study includes the current knowledge base plus thoughts and ideas on entrepreneurship (now and in future) from politicians and managers in education or enterprise at municipal level. This also aids understanding of how the common thread is being developed (or not) in the interplay between managers in the municipality and the headmasters and teachers at the schools. Even if some of the respondents perspectives in the end was not included in the focus of this thesis. The study further investigates what, in the opinion of the stakeholders, works well today and what needs to be improved. This helped add to the understanding of how entrepreneurship is being introduced in the public school setting.

As in some of the previous studies, interviews were chosen as a method so that, as Kvale (1996) says, one could get close to practice and have the opportunity to exchange ideas on common theme(s). Also, as Hobson and Townsend (2014) state, interviews offer a chance to cover several issues simultaneously and the informant and interviewer can agree on the meaning of questions. The 18 semi-structured, recorded interviews were carried out between November 2015 and January 2016, covering public preschool, elementary school, upper secondary school and adult education. All interviews lasted 40-60 minutes with active preschool teachers or teachers, or formerly active, in the case where they were currently holding a position as headmasters). The interviews were held on twelve occasions; six were individual and twelve had two people present. Due to some practical implications, four interviews were conducted over the phone. The questions were broadly divided into three themes, or sets, of questions. One theme was more general, including questions on what the present development areas for their schools were, where matters of entrepreneurship stood in relation to this, their perception and definition of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning and their awareness of and possible operationalisations of the entrepreneurship strategy. The second addressed the role of the principals or preschool managers; their awareness, support of and needs in relation to the inclusion of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning. The last addressed the role of the teachers, the teaching and learning situation, thoughts on entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial learning and entrepreneurial competencies, and if/how they work with this in their classroom.

To also understand the politicians’ and managers’ perspectives on entrepreneurship in education on a local level, a questionnaire was sent out via a digital tool to 36 people who held positions as either politicians or managers within the field of education or enterprise. After two gentle reminders, the response rate was approximately 40%. The aim was to gain insights into if/how the municipalities worked with the strategy as well as its content, their familiarity with it and what they say about and perceive as entrepreneurship and whether it has been developed around this in the local schools.
Notes were written out and interviews transcribed prior to the analysis. The study was analysed to understand any correlation between the content of the strategy and what happens in practice and to compare them to see where there were similarities and disparities. A more comprehensive description of this study (the methodology and empirics) is available in Swedish (Axelsson & Haglund, 2016).

The aim of the fifth study (study E) was to see how entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning are included in the teacher training programme at university level. Active teachers might not have any training in/about/through entrepreneurship, but giving additional support to these students during their training offers an opportunity to address this challenge. The student interest, attitudes and insights are important factors in the future development of the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education and of entrepreneurship (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) as an ingredient in the national curriculum. In this sense, the university sector has a huge impact on the development of entrepreneurship in the school setting.

Despite this, only a few universities in Sweden have, or had, plans for activities linked to entrepreneurship training (Leffler & Svedberg, 2013). This study follows a novel initiative to introduce entrepreneurship broadly in teacher training programmes located in a university in central Sweden. The research was conducted in a compulsory course educating future elementary and secondary teachers in entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning. The study followed 54 students in two separate groups between April and June of 2016. So as to experience the actual learning situation, the study included six classroom observations; three with each group. Furthermore, in the first and last lessons the students were able to voluntarily complete and submit written questionnaires. Thirty-three students handed in the first one, which contained questions about their perceptions and previous knowledge of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning. In the second, they were asked to reflect upon and assess the lessons. Thirty students handed in this questionnaire, which included questions on the content, their own learning in relation to themselves and the learning outcomes of the education. The questionnaires were also discussed afterwards, during the lessons.

In addition, two semi-structured interviews were conducted with the participating teachers, to try to grasp the teachers’ thoughts and constructions of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning. The questions related to constructs of entrepreneurship in this setting, and to Fayolle and Gailly’s (2008) teaching model framework for entrepreneurship education which means there were questions regarding what (content), why (motives), how (as in methods and approaches), for whom and for which results the entrepreneurship education had been developed.
To gain a deeper understanding of the students’ beliefs and attitudes on entrepreneurship and their perceived learning outcomes, influenced by Merton, Fiske and Kendall (1990) of the possible positive effects of focus group interviews in getting participants to interact and openly discuss and share thoughts with each other, the study also includes two focus group interviews with students in the teacher training programme. All interviews lasted between 60 and 80 minutes and were recorded and later transcribed. The reason for using these interrelated methods was a desire to investigate the motives and ideas of the planned entrepreneurship education what happened and how it developed in practice.

The overall focus in this study was to discuss the concepts of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning plus questions related to Fayolle and Gailly’s (2008) teaching model framework for entrepreneurship education, on the ontological, and mainly the educational levels. On the educational level the model thus focus on what, why, how, for whom and for which results. This was taken into consideration when planning and forming the collection of the empirical material, thus influencing the questions and themes in the interviews, focus group interviews and written questionnaires. But the teaching model framework was also the main analytical tool in this study. This helped form a more comprehensive picture and understanding of the entrepreneurship training’s conceptualisation, design and learning outcomes. The analysis was further devoted to a search for different contextual tensions affecting both the ontological level and educational level and to understand how the teachers had approached them, and their understanding of its development. The students’ perceptions added their perspective and helped illustrate and contrast the findings.

2.7 Analysis

A challenge of qualitative analysis is to create meaning from a large amount of data. It is, as Patton (2002) says, about discerning the trivial and the essential and finding important patterns. Depending on the goal of the study, developing new theories or further developing or questioning existing ones requires different analytical aims. For instance, Flick (2014) suggests that the aim could be to describe or explain. A key research interest of this thesis lies in comprehending what happens when a business concept is introduced in a public setting (entrepreneurship in education, for this thesis). The focus lies in what happens in practice, how teachers make sense of the concept in their day-to-day work and its meaning, interpretations and actions.

However, the research also requires study and analysis of texts if it is to follow developments in relation to the initial political idea (the strategy) and governance, i.e. its operationalisation through the public apparatus. Thus, my aim in the analysis is to both describe and explore. Describe, in the sense of
trying to analyse what happens with the concept in practice; explore, since the area is fairly new and insufficiently researched, the introduction of the business concept of entrepreneurship in a public setting. The separate studies contained much more empirical material than is included in this thesis (some of which faded away during the process, or was irrelevant to the analysis based on the aim and research questions). Other parts of the empirics were kept and highlighted. For instance, the voices of the headmasters, politicians and civil servants were deselected in favour of focusing on teachers’ perceptions. This was done because I wanted the thesis to focus on the constructs and actions of teachers in relation to entrepreneurship. Throughout the research process, the questions were adjusted from my doctoral proposal seminar to the mid-way seminar and to final doctoral seminar. I had gained meaningful insights during my PhD education, as well as challenging questions and comments from senior researchers. Accordingly, I had to revisit the empirics many times. As stated by Silverman (2010, p. 86), the beauty of qualitative research is that the data can offer an opportunity to change focus in an ongoing work, as the ongoing analysis suggests. However, this does not come out of the blue; it occurs due to the interplay between concepts, theory and the empirical material. The analytical methods are described for each study and paper, but in this compilation thesis I have also analysed all studies as a whole. Thus, another kind of meta-analysis took place; one in which the insights from each study added to the understanding and built on each other. This will be more explicit within the analysis chapter.

Analysing qualitative material is a process in which the researcher systematically investigates and organises her material (Fejes & Thornberg, 2015). Thus, in qualitative studies the analysis can be seen as a process in which analysis and interpretation develop in several steps: the primary (sensations), secondary (empirical) and tertiary (analysis of the empirical) (Ahrne & Svensson, 2011). To relate this to my work, when doing individual and focus group interviews I began the work of immediately analysis upon each visit to the various schools and preschools. This started during the interaction between me and the respondents in interviews. There was then a second analysis took place when transcribing the material, in which I listened to the interviews multiple times. The third analysis was when reading through the written material and reflecting on the transcripts. The same process applied to observations and participative meetings; first attending and listening at discussions, then transcribing my notes and lastly multiple read-throughs and reflecting over what has been said and has happened. In contrast to the interviews analyses, when analysing different texts (which was part of the empiric) and the written questionnaires, applications and evaluation reports (which were a part of studies C, D and E), the analysis took off from the third analytical stage.

In this third part of the analysis, I was inspired by how Miles and Huberman (1994) defined an analytical process as consisting of three ongoing, coexisting flows of activity: data reduction, data display and conclusion-drawing. In the
beginning of the third part of the analysis, I was trying to handle the chaos problem and a representative problem; challenges considered common within qualitative analysis, according to the literature and as pointed out by Rennstam and Wästerfors (2011). This meant I had much material to consider and since I was unable to show it all and thus represent all the material, I needed to reduce and choose carefully. In this regard, discussions and co-operations with senior researchers have been very important, as has the ability to learn from them. So as to focus and simplify the material, I wrote analytical notes in margins that led to an initial level of summarising. The process was open with the empirical material as a starting point. Then there was a search for similarities, variations and relationships that could be compared and challenged. The insights and patterns were then aggregated and reorganised into themes, topics or actions that became visible through the analysis. From my analysis, some recurrent stories or narratives became visible and these were summarised in writing. This work and the themes chosen are in my hands and are analytical choices. Accordingly, I had a lot of influence on the way the material was handled. However, I believe this work helped sharpen and highlight the material, which has in turn helped in pointing out findings. Further, some of the studies addressed similar questions which provided a chance, to some extent, to cross-analyse the studies and see a tentative development over time.

To recap: I opted to search for entrepreneurship and all through the work, even when finding something else or something different. I tried to decode the material and understand what happens in the school setting. In this compilation thesis, the analysis was guided by my aim and research questions. But to answer both research questions, for the purpose of the analysis, I drafted some analytical sub-questions to help me reflect on the empirical material. In relation to the first research question, these were: what and how are the teachers talking about entrepreneurship? How do they construct and interpret the concept? How do they work with entrepreneurship? With what content do they fill the concept? In relation to the second research question, these were: what is described in the steering documents? How do the teachers relate, or not relate, to this? Does strategy correlate with what happens in the school setting, i.e. how and what the teachers construct, talk about and actually do? How does this process evolve in practice at the school?

As said before, the research process has been iterative (Ahrens & Chapman, 2006) alternating between theory and empirics. Thus, the literature review also contributed to the analysis, and prior research within this area was critical to and influential on the analysis. The theoretical literature review laid the foundation and also revealed the gaps in this research. It contributed to the research design and focus. Accordingly, it impacted on what the studies searched for and how, and thus the analysis. At times it was used as a theoretical lens or spectacles through which to view the empirical findings. By trying to interpret, deconstruct and explore the empirics and, at the same time connect it to theory and previous research, I was able to deepen my understanding and analysis.
2.8 Method and research considerations

This section describes and discusses some of the general method and research considerations of the thesis. Qualitative research methods are suitable when studying human beliefs, attitudes, thoughts, feelings, actions and experiences, and are more scientifically close to viewing the world as changeable and non-objective (Silverman, 2010). Instead, the research is dependent on the researchers’ interpretations, which in turn are affected by many things such as their knowledge, values and pre-understanding (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009). This fits well with this thesis’ social constructionism perspective, in that it is focused on what people actually say, do and thus construct about the entrepreneurship concept in their setting. Starting from a more integrative approach, thus altering the empirical findings and theoretical perspectives, the qualitative research material is used to develop and understand the concept of entrepreneurship in a public context. The studies tried to build knowledge and understanding from experiences in practice; collecting information, analysing and offering contextually-dependent insights, rather than claiming generalisation. Understanding has been sought through a more holistic approach, rather than looking at a set of variables and by describing and understanding entrepreneurship in a school setting.

Due to the research approach, aim and questions, the research methods of this thesis are qualitative, with the exception of using a digital questionnaire. This means I am in the midst of the social world that I am researching. In keeping with Lindgren and Packendorff (2009) this means that all empirical work can be regarded as interaction between researchers and those being studied. When viewing entrepreneurship as a social construct, this also suggests that some fieldwork approaches and methods are appropriate. For example, participative observations, in-depth interviews, stories or discourse analysis. However, all methods can be used in both a constructionism and non-constructionism manner. I have tried to use them in the former sense. I cannot claim that my research has an explicit social constructionism method. But I can say that both hermeneutics and social constructionism have influenced my work in many ways.

The qualitative methods may be criticised for being time-consuming and expensive (Liamputong, 2007). This research may be criticised for not containing a sufficient amount of empirical material, but there is always the delicate balance in relation to resources. These considerations naturally affected my research in regard to the number of interviews and focus group interviews completed (in this thesis, 30 interviews and two focus group interviews) and in what other methods were chosen. This means there is a possibility that, in some studies, the research could probably be strengthened if it included more empirical data. However, considering the advantages of qualitative inquiries in relation to this research, they offer the possibility of in-depth understanding
and a closeness through direct encounters with individuals in real-life situations (Flyvbjerg, 2002). The people involved in the process are able to describe their thoughts and experiences, which is important considering my research approach. This also relates to another aspect of which type of interview technique is used: how flexible or guided the interviews are. Merriam (1998) divides them into structured, semi-structured or un-structured interviews. When interviewing, my research used a semi-structured approach to open up areas I might not have considered. (For a deeper description of the themes and questions, please see the summary of the studies under 2.6, as well as chapter 4 on the empirical findings and the appended papers).

This research could further be criticised for not being founded on an obvious core theoretical foundation in regard to entrepreneurship. However, as pointed out earlier, this is also true since the entrepreneurship field is multifaceted, fragmented and lacking its own explicit theoretical base (Jones, Covella & Tang, 2011). This means the research has been conducted within a research area in theory-building and method enhancing at the same time and can therefore contribute to a field that is in development. This implies a need for more explorative studies to build up sufficient knowledge to form robust theories (Bygrave, 1989). In my explorative approach this involves attempting to ask more open questions and focusing on trying to understand a new knowledge field. Thus, I try to address and contribute to this need. As already stated, for a deeper description of the themes and questions, please see the summary of the studies under 2.6, as well as chapter 4 on the empirical findings, and the appended papers.

Within qualitative research, the researcher’s interdependence and impartiality can be questioned. However, with my chosen approach I see my pre-understanding mainly as an asset, albeit having to be attentive to it and how it affects the research; being openly aware of this and continuously reflecting on its possible impacts helps create transparency in my research (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009). The importance of pre-understanding was pointed out by such researchers as Arbnor and Bjerke (1994), Norén (1995) and Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009). Thus, when processing and analysing the collected data I tried to work close to it, while continuously considering my position and pre-understanding. I also tried to maintain a questioning approach.

According to Seale (1999), not all qualitative researchers acknowledge the idea of discussing validity in qualitative research. In this research, my intention is rather to be transparent and communicative on how the research was conducted, the empirical data collection, the process, how interviews and other methods were completed, the analysis and the concepts used. The aim was to help the reader see how the studies were conducted and from which basis, what considerations were made and why. Also, trying to be flexible in doing what is possible and what works, whilst respecting what is studied by trying to find methods well-suited to the aim and questions.
However, even if still using the validity concept (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009; Silverman, 2010) in study A, respondent validation was achieved by letting the interviewees read and verify the findings and read the report before printing. In study B, the in-depth interview, using the stimulated recall method, made some validation possible because it involves viewing the video together and then discussing the findings. In study C, I validated my findings by discussing them with representatives of the Swedish National Agency for Education, but not with all participating schools due to time and cost restrictions. Also, in study E, the findings were presented and discussed with the participating teachers. In these discussions, as well as in other dialogues concerning my work with other researchers interested in or working in the field, this research has aimed to find alternative understandings and has included multiple perspectives.

The research was organised with respect for, and consideration of good research practices and ethics as laid down by The Swedish Research Council’s expert group on ethics (Swedish Research Council, 2011). For this thesis this meant, for instance, that I treated the respondents and other participating actors with respect and truthfulness, informing respondents beforehand of the research aim and how the work would be conducted and if/how the research findings will be presented (the so-called information requirement). This also includes ensuring participants cannot be harmed by taking part, keeping the data secure and describing to them what actions I took to offer anonymity (the confidentiality requirement). In the studies, including interviews, the participants agreed to participate by signing an informed consent document (the consent requirement). However, I am aware that anonymity has other drawbacks, such as possible peer auditing.

Finally, some clarifications: not all schools in Sweden are publicly run, some are private or operated by associations. However, in this thesis, the focus is on public schools because I wanted to find out how entrepreneurship is being introduced in a public school context. Thus, I have made this delimitation. Even so, choosing to focus on one thing (not addressing the private schools, for example) may also cause partial ‘blindness’ and a missing of relevant information.
This chapter presents the backdrop and frame of reference for this thesis. It includes relevant research relating to the aim, objectives and research questions. The previous research will be used later, to analyse and discuss the studies and findings of entrepreneurship in education. Entrepreneurship as a concept rooted in business, and societal entrepreneurship, as a newer phenomenon in which entrepreneurship is introduced in other societal contexts, provides the theoretical backdrop throughout the research. These help explain how the material is viewed and perceived by providing a comprehensive review.

To understand the various aspects of entrepreneurship in a school setting that are included in this thesis, the work is further supported by a frame of reference comprising of previous research into entrepreneurship in education, strategy and strategising and governmentality and the enterprising self. The material in this theory chapter thereby helps provide a backdrop and theoretical lens through which the research can subsequently be analysed.

3.1 Entrepreneurship as a concept and research field

In recent decades, the interest in entrepreneurship shown by contemporary society has increased and become a topic of discussion amongst a wide variety of groups, including politicians, practitioners and researchers. The field of entrepreneurship research is 30–40 years old and has grown considerably since the 1980s (Landström et al., 2012). Entrepreneurship has theoretical and practical roots in business. Interest in the concept has traditionally been economically motivated, with entrepreneurship perceived as a crucial factor in business development and global economic growth. Gibb (2002) details entrepreneurship connotations such as business, rapid growth, technology firms and value-creation activities. The idea is that entrepreneurial people will create future goods and services, start building up companies or otherwise contribute to economic development (Gibb, 2005). Accordingly, attraction of entrepreneurs has increased. The economic crises of the 1970s and 1980s and subsequent structural transformation of industry led to unemployment and ushered in the expression “small is beautiful” and a more positive attitude towards small business. Once a background figure, the entrepreneur as the self-made
small businessman could enter the national and global scenes; reshaped, mystified and glorified. A development that would become enhanced over the succeeding decades.

As with all emerging research fields, despite the positive developments in practical entrepreneurship, when it comes to entrepreneurship research there are challenges and opportunities. For instance, there has been a critique and ongoing discussion within the field about the lack of a common definition (e.g. Gartner, 1985; Low & Mc Millan, 1988). Researchers such as Bygrave (1989) and Short et al. (2010) have highlighted the way in which the field has been accused of being fragmented, suffering from theoretical insufficiency and in need in becoming more robust by having its own approaches. As it is a fairly new field, methods and methodological approaches have instead been borrowed and imported from more established fields. This is because entrepreneurship attracted scholars from other research fields (Landström et al., 2012) and over time they contributed with methods, aspects and angles from their respective fields. This has stimulated pluralism and knowledge development, but perhaps at the expense of unification and complexity. Shane and Venkataraman (2000, p. 217) spice up this discussion by saying that the field of entrepreneurship hosts a ‘hodgepodge of research’. However, as Jones et al. (2011) said, if one accepts the process of theoretical development as incremental and gradually growing, then it is provocative and premature to demand something else.

One way of framing entrepreneurship as a scholarly domain is to view it by taking primary approaches to defining entrepreneurship, as suggested by Landström et al. (2012). These are (i) entrepreneurship as a function of the market, (ii) the entrepreneur as an individual and (iii) entrepreneurship as a process.

Firstly, some brief comments on the three main pioneers within economics, who view entrepreneurship as a function of the market. Schumpeter saw the change (or innovation) as ‘… the carrying out of new combinations’ (Schumpeter, 1934, p. 66). He thought that these innovations must be carried out by someone, therefore giving the entrepreneur a central role as ‘[...] the bearer of the mechanism of change’ (Schumpeter, 1934, p. 61). In his perspective, anyone could become an entrepreneur. However, it is not a profession so much as a role, as it only lasts while the new combinations are actually being carried out. However, according to Schumpeter the entrepreneur is never the risk-taker since that is the role of the person investing the money. In another pioneer’s, view, Kirzner (1973; 2009), the entrepreneur instead identifies and acts upon an unnoticed and unexploited opportunity that allows more gain from an exchange than had thus far been possible. The entrepreneurial element in individual decision-making is defined by Kirzner (1973; 2009) as alertness. This may be seen as the ability to notice (earlier than others) changes that have occurred. It is about knowing where to look for knowledge. Knight (1921),
unlike Schumpeter, views the entrepreneur as a risk-taker. He argues that opportunity arises from uncertainty during change and that entrepreneurs profit by decision-making under what he labels ‘true uncertainty’. Hence, entrepreneurial competence is the individual’s skill to handle uncertainty.

During the 1950s and 1960s, there was some interest in the entrepreneur as an individual. It has been claimed that some people are innately natural entrepreneurs. McClelland (1961), for one, was a personality and motivational psychologist who, through massive quantitative measurements, tested how people get motivated to perform; known as the n Achievement factor (nAch). Another is Hagen (1962), who tried to find link-specific entrepreneurial characteristics to an entrepreneurial mode of behaviour. However, according to Brockhaus (1982), this has proved difficult to find and the search for the entrepreneurial gene has essentially been abandoned.

Today’s view of entrepreneurship is mainly grounded in management theories; viewing entrepreneurship as a process (Landström et al., 2012). Gartner (1988) made this behavioural shift and suggested that we should not look at who the entrepreneur is, but what he or she does. This perspective of entrepreneurship has been discussed and reflected on by many researchers such as Low and MacMillian (1988), Rae and Carswell, (2000) and Cope (2005). In keeping with this, Stevenson and Jarillo (1990, p. 23) define entrepreneurship as ‘… a process by which individuals - either on their own or inside organisations - pursue opportunities without regard to the resources they currently control.

Similarly, Shane and Venkataraman (2000, p. 218) focus on process and opportunities, but specify that it is about creating goods and services and thus define entrepreneurship as ‘… of whom, by whom and with what effects opportunities to create future goods and services are discovered, evaluated and exploited’. According to Lundqvist and Williams Middleton (2010), this definition underpins a major strand within entrepreneurship research. Sarasvathy (2001) relates entrepreneurship more to an attitude and introduces the concepts of effectuation and causation. She argues that the essential agent of entrepreneurship is the effectuator, an imaginative actor who acts upon possibilities, exploiting them with any and all means to reach a diversity of possible outcomes; many created by the decision-making process and not given a priority. Rather, the outcome of causation processes is market shares in existing markets.

When acknowledging entrepreneurship as a behavioural circumstance (even if not inherited) and a process and, as Drucker (1985) says, that entrepreneurship can also be learned, this opens the way for possibilities and developments relevant to the research and focus of this thesis. In theory, anyone can become an entrepreneur by attaining a processual perspective and learning and exercising the necessary knowledge and skills.

Thus, in relation to entrepreneurship in business, there is an ongoing discussion on what competencies are necessary for an entrepreneur, but no consensus on which ones. As mentioned above, Schumpeter (1934) needs him or
her to become the bearer of mechanisms of change (but no risk-taker), Kirzner (1973) suggests the entrepreneur needs to be alert to possibilities, and Knight (1921) suggests the entrepreneur must be a risk-taker, able to handle true uncertainty. There are more recent researchers claiming that the necessary skill is the ability to discover and make use of opportunities, which Timmons, Muzyka, Stevenson and Bygrave (1987), Neck and Greene (2011) and Muñoz, Mosey and Binks (2011) suggest. Plaschka and Welsch (1990) place significance on creativity and innovation skills and Minniti and Bygrave (2001) emphasise learning from failure. Karataş-Özkan (2011) raises the relational aspect in which entrepreneurs can learn individually from teams and networks, thereby paving the way for teamwork and social skills. So, there is much to consider in learning how to become an entrepreneur. This discussion on competencies relates to what is labelled ‘entrepreneurial learning’. In a business setting, this means research contributing to the understanding of how an entrepreneur (often a business owner) learns in his or her often small or medium-sized startup company and the entrepreneurial processes in this setting, as researched by such authors as Deakins and Freel (1998), Minniti and Bygrave (2001), Cope and Watts (2000), Rae (2000), Cope (2005) and Politis (2005). More recently however, voices have also been raised in favour of further research in the overlapping areas of entrepreneurship and learning both from a business perspective, for instance Politis (2005), and from the pedagogical educational perspectives suggested by Leffler (2006; 2012), Mueller (2012), Komulainen et al. (2011) and Fayolle (2013). The latter will be discussed in a later section of the theory chapter.

3.2 Societal entrepreneurship

Even if the entrepreneurship research field strives for unity and common positions in theory and practice, another development is also discernible in which entrepreneurship is astir. Steyaert and Hjorth (2003) suggest that entrepreneurship should no longer be described as one entrepreneurship but many in terms of focus, definitions, scope and paradigms. They recommend multiplying entrepreneurship and following and studying its movements. One movement is based on a broadening of traditional entrepreneurship, while in another movement entrepreneurship intertwines with other areas of research. Both will be briefly described before arriving at the position of this thesis on societal entrepreneurship.

Firstly, research stemming from traditional entrepreneurship broadens its scope and usage. For example, when Gibb (1999, p. 3) defines entrepreneurial capabilities he states they are necessary ‘for the pursuit of effective entrepreneurial behaviour individually, organisationally and societally in an increasingly turbulent and global environment.’ Thus, he places entrepreneurship outside business and suggests entrepreneurship is usable in different contexts.
This is also supported by Hannon’s (2013) thoughts on entrepreneurism, the development of a set of individual behaviours, skills and attitudes that can be applied in many societal contexts. An even broader proposition by Sarasvathy and Venkataraman (2011) conceptualises entrepreneurism as a general method for human development. Thus, an interpretation is that entrepreneurism spreads from its business premise. Even if this seems like a new development, Schumpeter had already introduced entrepreneurism as dynamic behaviour in non-economic parts of society in his seventh chapter, which was lost in the English translation of his original work in 1911/12 of *The Theory of Economic Development* (Schumpeter, 1934).

Secondly, entrepreneurship research spreads and intertwines with other areas of research, thus paving the way for new concepts and multi-disciplinary linkages such as social entrepreneurship (Zahra et al., 2014), ecological entrepreneurship (Marsden & Smith, 2005) and societal entrepreneurship (e.g. Steyaert & Katz, 2004; Hjorth, 2012). This development could be useful in explaining entrepreneurship in relation to other developments in society, but it also raises new challenges and questions that need to be answered. Within different entrepreneurship hybrids, the business link can be kept semi-detached or possibly be decoupled. One stream in which the business roots are still relevant is social entrepreneurship. For example, as described by Zahra et al. (2014), when a social entrepreneur has a social purpose to their action, but conducts it through a business. Lundqvist and Williams Middleton (2010) suggest that when entrepreneurship also accentuates the societal aspect in this way it tallies in many respects with Shane and Venkataraman’s (2000) definition of entrepreneurship. Another stream has a wider view of societal entrepreneurship which includes cultural, educational, social and humane perspectives. According to von Friedrichs, Gawell and Wincent (2014), this has received a lot of attention in a rather short space of time from societal actors who believe in its capacity to solve problems and meet societal challenges. The potential of societal entrepreneurship in this setting lies in contributing to development from many aspects and perspectives in society; not just the traditional, commercialised one. Thus, societal entrepreneurship is essentially about active civic participation combined with an entrepreneurial act. According to Johannisson (1990) and von Friedrichs et al. (2014), societal entrepreneurship was already discussed in the 1980s in Sweden in relation to regional development in local society. In the last decade, interest in societal entrepreneurship rekindled among scholars and has been strongly discussed among some Swedish researchers such as Berglund et al. (2012), Lundqvist and Williams Middleton (2010) and Westlund and Gawell (2012).

As stated above, societal entrepreneurship is of interest in this thesis, which considers it as a phenomenon in which entrepreneurship enters new societal contexts. In the specific context in focus for this thesis some predecessors to
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the discussion on entrepreneurship in the school environment are Johannisson, Madsén and Hjorth (1997). This thesis is inspired by ideas from Steyaert and Katz (2004) and Hjorth (2012), who initiated the discussion of an entrepreneurship movement in which entrepreneurship enters new societal contexts. This more all-encompassing approach tries to detach from the economic discourse and proposes that entrepreneurship belongs to society and not only (as traditionally understood) to business. (Steyaert & Hjorth, 2003). Hjorth and Steyaert (2004) refer to entrepreneurship as forms of social creativity taking place primarily in societal rather than business contexts. It is a societal force that changes our daily practices and the way we live. According to Steyaert and Hjorth (2003), to view entrepreneurship solely through an economy lens is to reduce entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship should be seen as a much broader concept, with reference instead to the social, cultural, ecological and political dimensions of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship is thus moved beyond the economic relationship and connected to the creation of societies. Entrepreneurship is not only about creating jobs, but about creating people’s lives. Correspondingly, entrepreneurship occurs in multi-social spaces; neighbourhoods and communities as well as the economic sphere (Steyaert & Katz, 2004). This aligns with Johannisson’s (2010) discussion that there is a currently need for enterprising people everywhere in society.

Thus, understanding this spread and development means either keeping the business link or letting it go. Although energised by the thoughts of Steyaert, Hjorth and Katz (2003; 2004) described above, the path chosen for this thesis is, in a way, a slightly different one. Instead of disconnecting the business roots of entrepreneurship, this thesis acknowledges its roots whilst trying to understand what happens when entrepreneurship develops in other societal contexts. Furthermore, as Gawell et al. (2009) say, having entrepreneurship that focuses on society means the focus is on people, since societies are comprised of citizens. Therefore, with this focus, one must be aware of how it includes and involves them and their experiences. Entrepreneurship exists in our everyday lives and the present and future is organised in stories and conversations; which Hjorth and Steyaert (2004) suggest is the primary form of knowledge used in everyday practice.

So the focus of this thesis becomes relevant, studying as it does how entrepreneurship is constructed and operationalised in school settings. However, when entrepreneurship is no longer limited to the business sector, it needs to be understood in ways that go beyond its economic or ‘business-like’ sense (Gibb, 2005, p. 46). Moreover, Steyaert and Katz (2004), Leffler (2006; 2012) and Mühlenbock (2004) argue from different perspectives that, when placed in other parts of society, there are potential risks in using economic rhetoric and views since these can undermine the possibilities, implementations and legitimacy of entrepreneurship. This will be discussed more in the next section.
3.3 Entrepreneurship in a school setting

This section focuses on the statements in previous research on what teachers say and do (including terminology and content) regarding entrepreneurship in education. This thesis covers insights from preschool to university; however, the search for relevant prior research shows there to be more research at university level than at lower educational levels. This has also been noted by Byrne, Fayolle and Toutain (2014); they state that existing studies of entrepreneurship education have primarily been conducted at higher-level educational institutions. There are a few contributions at the upper secondary level. Examples include Otterborg (2011) who, in her thesis, studied upper secondary school students’ different perceptions of entrepreneurial learning. Also Svedberg (2007), who studied entrepreneurship in two upper secondary school programmes. This work showed perceived discernible signs of better results and more interesting education. However, at the same time Svedberg points out the risk of trivialising schoolwork when it is handed over to the students. Moreover, Lindster Norberg (2016) focuses on this level and examines how working with entrepreneurship in school education fosters future citizens; her findings show that the focus lies in directing students towards becoming entrepreneurial rather than democratic citizens. According to Gorman et al. (1997), there are even fewer studies focusing on the primary or lower secondary school contexts. Still, there are some more recent contributions from Sjøvoll and Pedersen (2014) who focus on school leaders at primary and lower secondary schools and Moberg (2014) who instead focuses on pupils and the influence of entrepreneurship education on their level of school engagement and entrepreneurial intentions. He, in turn, builds on research by Peterman and Kennedy (2003) who also studied changes in student’s perception of starting a business after they had attended an enterprise education programme. They showed that this affected both the desirability and feasibility of starting a company. Closer to the research focus of this thesis is research by Lindström (2013). This examines preschool teachers’ perception of what their enrolled children learn and how they learn it, using theories of entrepreneurship education and citizenship education. Overall however, as Leffler (2014) states, the research into enterprise learning is considered to be in its early stages. Also, Fayolle (2013) suggests a number of issues that need to be addressed regarding entrepreneurship education: researchers should reflect on practice and investigate what teachers are talking about and what actually takes place in regard to entrepreneurship education.

With the appearance of entrepreneurship more broadly in schools, as said previously new challenges and questions emerge, complexity increases and questions of meaning, legitimacy, language, culture, content and implementation arise (cf. Steyaert & Katz, 2004; Mühlenbock, 2004; Leffler, 2006; 2012; Berglund, 2013). In the rest of this section, this thesis will focus on two tensions within entrepreneurship education. Firstly, the ongoing discussion on
definitions and terminology and secondly the related discussion on what con-
stitutes essential content and how it should be taught.

Thus, firstly, according to previous research there are competing discourses
on entrepreneurship education. Initially, entrepreneurship education ad-
ressed knowledge that was based on a narrow definition of entrepreneurship.
Gibb (2002) includes a focus on business development, startup activities and
value-creation, from an economic angle. Under this narrow definition, Jones
and Iredale (2010) also place the primary emphasis of entrepreneurship edu-
cation on learning how to start a company, plan a business venture and apply
entrepreneurial skills and knowledge in a business context. However, there are
two competing discourses within entrepreneurship education. Gibb (1993;
2002) broke new ground by introducing the concept of enterprise education as
a means of moving away from the narrow economic definition of entrepre-
neurship and the entrepreneur. His focus was on the development of generic
skills, but his starting point was one of developing small businesses. In con-
trast to the above narrow definition, Jones and Iredale (2010) state that the
primary focus of enterprise education is active learning and enterprise peda-
gogy, targeting the development of personal skills to fit a variety of contexts.
Still, their perception of enterprise education has streaks of business-related
entrepreneurship, such as learning how a small business works. There are
other pedagogical researchers such as Leffler (2014) and Falk-Lundqvist,
Hallberg, Leffler and Svedberg (2014) who loosen the links to business entre-
preneurship even further by emphasising pedagogical perspectives and viewing
this as a learning approach.

These two discourses are not black and white and there are still more sim-
ilar and different ways of making the definition. According to Erkkilä (2000),
the British system distinguishes between entrepreneurship education and en-
terprise education by stating that entrepreneurship education refers more di-
rectly to small business management and not necessarily to people becoming
entrepreneurs. The goal of enterprise education, on the other hand, is to de-
velop enterprising behaviour and skills that can be used also outside the busi-
ness environment.

Another, similar distinction between entrepreneurship and enterprise edu-
cation is provided by Komulainen et al. (2011), but using a different terminol-
ogy. They distinguish between internal and external entrepreneurship educa-
tion. External entrepreneurship is about enhancing the knowledge and skills
of the people who want to set up their own businesses. Internal entrepreneur-
ship is defined as a flexibility, initiative, creativity and independent action
combined with cooperative skills and strong motivation.

Other researchers speak of entrepreneurship in education as ‘pedagogical
entrepreneurship’. For instance, Dal, Elo, Leffler, Svedberg and Westerberg
(2016), who state in their literature review from Finland, Sweden and Iceland
that they have chosen this term in order to, in their study, harmonise, and focus
upon, the broader definition. However, a recent study from Haara, Jenssen,
Fossøy and Ødegård (2016) shows this to be an even newer label lying within
the same area as enterprise discourse or internal entrepreneurship. This differ-
etiation seems like an attempt to emphasise the pedagogical aspects of entre-
preneurship as a part of school development and as a reference to the specific
setting in which it is introduced.

Whichever label (or labels) wins out, teachers’ views on and attitudes to-
wards entrepreneurship in their day-to-day work still affects definitions, im-
plementation and legitimacy. Research has shown that teachers prefer a
broader definition of entrepreneurship, as in enterprising or internal entrepre-
neurship; they are more reluctant to use business entrepreneurship (cf. Back-
ström-Widjeskog, 2008; Komulainen et al., 2011; Korhonen et al., 2012; Falk-
Lundqvist et al., 2014). According to them, its inherent business connotations
create obstacles. Komulainen et al. (2011) reinforce this idea by stating that
teachers see the promotion of external entrepreneurship as conflicting with the
values of basic education and that it is therefore largely rejected as the aim of
schooling. By contrast, a broader definition seems to help open the way to the
introduction of entrepreneurship. Another possible reason for this reluctance
is traditional images of entrepreneurship. Several researchers, such as Ber-
or Gill (2014) identify these as a challenge. In context of this thesis, in which
the school environment is guided by values such as democracy and equality,
this creates certain difficulties since entrepreneurship norms are largely in-
spired by ideals connected to the white middle class and middle-aged men in
particular. Furthermore, there is an inbuilt neoliberalist connection that has led
to entrepreneurs being regarded as individualistic heroes, or even as capitalists
greedily exploiting other people. This may place obstacles in the way of im-
plementing entrepreneurship. Mühlenbock (2004) therefore proposes a focus
on entrepreneurship as a collective form which, according to her, is better tol-
erated. Anderson et al. (2009) investigated constructs of entrepreneurship
among high school students, parents, teachers and local support agencies in
six European countries. According to their findings, challenges are posed by
conflicting social constructions in which the entrepreneur is perceived as ei-
ther a winner, victim or outsider. As Anderson et al. (2009) argue, these im-
ages need to be considered when discussing and introducing entrepreneurship
into the school setting.

Secondly, the discussion on what the essential content of entrepreneurship
education is and how it should be taught brings us to the second tension. Fayolle and Gailly (2008) claim that since the meaning of entrepreneurship
lacks consensus, there must be various definitions guiding entrepreneurship
education and that this, in turn, affects content. However, they and Neergaard,
Tanggaard, Krueger and Robinson (2012) express there is no problem pro-
vided the definition has been deliberately selected and considered as part of
designing an educational programme and choosing the methods which best fit
the entrepreneurship course. For example, the purpose of the education and
whether it is based on a broad or narrow definition of entrepreneurship affects the content and pedagogy.

Beginning with the purpose of entrepreneurship education, there are several classifications upon which to build. In Gibb’s (1999) classification, the aim may be to understand entrepreneurship, become an entrepreneur or become entrepreneurial. Another classification proposed by Jamieson (1984) and later picked up by Henry et al. (2005) discusses this in terms of about, for and in entrepreneurship. The first category is about awareness; it aims to teach students about aspects of starting and running a business from a theoretical perspective. For entrepreneurship is more practical; it aims to prepare students to become future entrepreneurs, often by preparing business plans and how-to schemes. The last category, in entrepreneurship, refers to training established entrepreneurs. There is also a development where in is exchanged with through, indicating an activity. However, this can be interpreted as either conducting business, as suggested by Johansen and Schanke (2013), or as pedagogical methods as Kyrö (2008) does.

Both Hytti and O’Gorman (2004) and Pittaway and Edwards (2012) show there is previous research analysing the content and structures of entrepreneurship education programmes. However, as both Solomon (2007) and O’Connor (2013) point out, there is no uniformity in either content or approach. To simplify matters, this section in the chapter on content is based on the earlier discussion of the narrower and broader definitions of (or discourse on) entrepreneurship.

Discussing content in relation to entrepreneurship education (or external entrepreneurship) is mainly supported by insights and research from entrepreneurship education that focuses on business. According to Pittaway and Edwards (2012), an overwhelming majority of business and management schools are still centred on more traditional methods and content on learning about entrepreneurship. But whatever their aims, there is a wide range of themes and skills suggested within this stream of research focusing on business. Kuratko (2005) proposes learning about risk and Timmons et al. (1987) suggest opportunity recognition. Vesper and McMullan (1988) recommend sources of venture capital and Gartner, Bird and Starr (1992) knowledge of business entry. Vesper and McMullan (1988), add that an entrepreneurship education must involve development of skills in negotiation, leadership, new product development, creative thinking and exposure to technological innovation. Hisrich and Peters (1998) and Henry et al. (2005), argue that necessary learning can be categorised as: technical skills, business management and personal entrepreneurial skills. Hisrich and Peters (1998) state that these skills are what differentiates a manager from an entrepreneur and that they should include inner control, innovative thinking and risk-taking as well as being change-oriented, persistent and having visionary leadership.

Additionally, according to Gibb (2002), the question of creating economic value is diminished when the concept is transferred to the school environment,
although Johannisson et al. (1997) claim that the definition and attributes of entrepreneurship become more business-like as one progresses through the school system. Moreover, Stevenson and Jarillo (1990) state that accepting entrepreneurship as a process also has implications for content and teaching. They suggest that students would need to handle process management and learn to be active, participative and learn how to learn. Neck and Greene (2011) challenge the process perspective by proposing that entrepreneurship should be deemed a method, since the term ‘process’ assumes known inputs and outputs and is, in their opinion, predictable. This means that it incorporates many techniques or skills, which students are helped to understand and use.

As stated however, entrepreneurial education has increasingly changed focus from ‘pure’ entrepreneurship to emphasising the importance of preparing students for their future working lives, whether self-employed or as employees, with innovation and change as ingredients (Kyrö & Carrier, 2005). The notion of this enterprise discourse (or if the internal/pedagogical entrepreneurship label is preferred) is that those involved in entrepreneurial activities will grow as people, gain certain competencies and become entrepreneurial themselves (Otterborg, 2011). According to Fayolle and Gailly (2008) and Jones and Iredale (2010), this shift means a transfer towards enterprise education with a focus on developing entrepreneurial skills, attitudes and personal qualities. Already Gibb’s perspective (2002) supports this and wants students to learn how to overcome failure and become critical and independent thinkers. Boyd and Vozikis (1994) stress self-efficacy, defined as a person’s belief in his or her potential to conduct an assignment. Kyrö and Carrier (2005) and Komulainen et al. (2011) suggest that the necessary practical abilities to have is those who make a person innovative, flexible, co-operative and competitive. Accordingly, teaching methods need to involve problem-solving, vocational skills, cooperation, creativity and risk-taking, opportunity recognition and opportunity creation. Otterborg (2011) also emphasises initiative and becoming brave; breaking patterns and resisting the collective action. Berglund and Holmgren (2008) criticise what they interpret as a unreflective emphasis on certain characteristics, and that concentrating on some at the same time mean at the expense on others. Yet, there has been scant research into practising social capabilities or generic skills and the mechanisms by which enterprising competencies can be developed (Dweck, 2012; Tynjälä, Klemola, Kostiainen & Rasku-Puttonen, 2016).

Mueller (2012) argues that since entrepreneurship is complex, socially-created and fluid, it must be considered in its specific cultural and social context. This creates special conditions and challenges when it comes to teaching and entails new and/or unique pedagogies (Solomon, 2007; Anderson & Jack, 2008; Fayolle & Gailly, 2008; Mueller, 2012). In studying the literature on entrepreneurship education, some approaches and working methods stand out more. Samwel Mwasalwiba’s (2010) literature review shows that the most
commonly used methods in entrepreneurship education are lectures, case studies and group discussions. Even so, progressive teaching methods within enterprise education are growing. However, Seikkula-Leino et al. (2015) suggest there is still need for improvement. In their study, teachers actively use quite a lot of pedagogical methods and models: experiential learning, problem-based learning and encouraging students to be self-directed and take responsibility. These may be seen as in keeping with entrepreneurship education. Another more recent study is that of Tiernan (2016). He states that he tests experience-based learning in different ways, including group activities in which students are challenged to become more creative and innovative. These activities entail forms of problem solving, reflecting on case studies, tackling problems, identifying opportunities and developing, rating and presenting ideas. According to Tiernan’s experienced-based assessment, the students said these working methods made them understand how it feels to be enterprising, they feel more able to think creatively and tackle problems. They stated that they would be more likely to embed entrepreneurship and enterprise education into their own learning in the future.

Timmons and Stevenson (1984) and Henry et al. (2005) describe learning entrepreneurship as an ongoing, lifelong experience and that the best way to learn entrepreneurship is through a mixture of formal education and experience. The idea of mixing theory and practice (rooted in Dewey’s (1916) progressivism and the experiential learning approach by Kolb (1984)), is predominant in both entrepreneurship and enterprise education. However, there is a discussion on how to create this practice within education; a practice which, according to Fayolle (2013) and Seikkula-Leino et al. (2015), many teachers and students lack. This means active teachers face a big challenge since they, as the ones responsible for teaching entrepreneurship, both lack this practical experience and formal education in entrepreneurship.

By contrast to the emphasis on practice, earlier research from Fiet (2001a) argues for an increase in the theoretical content of entrepreneurship education. However, although Anderson and Jack (2008) agree that we need a theoretical basis for entrepreneurial teaching, this is because it helps us understand about entrepreneurship so that we can understand the how. But the process ‘how’ still needs to be connected to real-world experience. This is also emphasised in Otterborg’s (2011) definition of entrepreneurial learning in education; it highlights experienced-based learning tasks through interaction between school and the business world.

One idea of how to overcome the challenge of how to include practice is presented by Mueller (2012). She suggests that students can learn through experience knowledge, as opposed to entrepreneurs who construct knowledge through experience practice. Experience knowledge is an iterative process in which knowledge is experienced through social exchange and discussions with peers and teachers, as well as interaction with the world beyond the class-
room and by reflecting independently and critically on one’s learning. Surlemont (2007) offers another solution, stating that the most common and most successful entrepreneurial pedagogical method in schools is to cooperate with the school environment in a project that includes real problems and challenges. This is partly problem-based learning, but expanded so as to give students greater flexibility and meaningfulness whilst gaining greater commitment from them. One of Surlemont’s (2007) findings is that when these school projects create a value outside the school, they also increase the sense of meaning and pride for the pupil on a personal level, thereby enhancing motivation. Surlemont goes on to state that success factors include a strong sense of ownership, teamwork, initiatives that support experiential learning and reflection over one’s own learning. Working together in projects is also considered effective in newer research from example Ruskovaara and Pihkala (2013). Though, Johannisson et al. (1997) had already earlier argued for the importance of schools interacting with society in relation to entrepreneurship, because it helps teachers find new forms of learning and contextual spaces, from and within which to learn.

Conversely, working in cross-cultural projects might not be quite such a simple task. The results of Svedberg’s (2007) study of the Swedish upper-secondary school shows that there were practical problems regarding cooperation between school and the enterprise environments. For example, students gave up when faced with problems. Ruskovaara and Pihkala (2013) also claim that since this way of working takes up more time and resources, there is a risk that teachers will go back to traditional practices such as classroom discussions and that they will resort to other ready-made materials. Lackéus, Lundqvist and Middleton Williams (2016) have tried to bridge the traditional progressive education rift by suggesting an educational philosophy that goes beyond ‘learning-through’ and add ‘learning-through-creating-value-for-others’.

Furthermore, in relation to the future inclusion of entrepreneurship in education, research by Ruskovara and Pihkala (2015) and Haara et al. (2016) shows that teachers who receive supplementary training in entrepreneurship include more of it in their teaching. Thus, for the sake of the future progression of entrepreneurship, those in teacher training programmes should also be included in discussions on the terminology and content of entrepreneurship education. According to Haara et al. (2016), trainee teachers ought to encounter the entrepreneurship perspective and be allowed to interpret, experiment with and reflect on such an approach to teaching and learning. Today, however, not all teacher training includes any entrepreneurship – broad or narrow in perspective. Seikkula-Leino, Ruskovaara, Hannula and Saarivirta (2012) claim this is because entrepreneurship is still a controversial concept in higher education and that when included in higher education curricula, it takes place more on paper than in reality. Thus, as Leffler and Svedberg (2013) describe, enthusiastic individuals have more impact on the focus than strategic decisions.
made by institutions. Mäkimurto-Koivumaa and Belt (2016) strengthen this outlook, stating that there are uncertainties and pointing out that the scientific literature seems to lack descriptions of how to integrate entrepreneurship education into non-business school curricula.

3.3.1 Learning in entrepreneurship education

When discussing entrepreneurship education in its broader sense and in the school setting, there are relationships to theories of learning. This section does not claim to be an exhaustive explanation of learning theories related to entrepreneurship education. Rather, the research presented here has been selected based on learning theories often cited in literature on entrepreneurship and learning (cf. Seikkula-Leino, 2011; Falk-Lundqvist et al., 2014). These seem to have much in common with learning entrepreneurship in a school setting and include the progressivism described by Dewey (1916) experiential learning theory described by Kolb (1984), thoughts by Vygotskij (1978) and in Hattie’s (2009) visible learning. A brief overview is given below.

To begin with, a contribution from learning theory has been derived from Dewey (1916) and his thoughts on allowing school children to gain experience, nowadays often called learning by doing. Dewey (1997) criticised the education of his time. Dewey (1938) claimed that if education is to achieve its aims for society and the individual, it must be anchored in reality. He wanted students to work on hands-on projects and exercise problem-solving. The school should provoke their curiosity and critical thinking and foster active learning. He was considered progressive and, according to Beckman and Barry (2007), Dewey further stated that learning is an ongoing reconstruction of knowledge that connects new experiences with earlier ones in a continuous learning process. These ideas and learning by doing are very much alive in the discussion on entrepreneurship in education. Another researcher, Kolb (1984), with his theory of experiential learning is also commonly referred to in relation to entrepreneurship education (see e.g. Timmons & Stevenson, 1984; Henry et al., 2005; Cope, 2005; Politis, 2005). Kolb (1984) defines experiential learning as a process in which experience turns into knowledge in an iterative learning process comprising four steps: experiencing, reflecting, thinking and acting. These steps are relevant in a learning-centred processual perspective of entrepreneurship.

Selander (2008) states that Vygotskij presents a paradigm emphasising the importance of language and is interested in the social activities between students. Vygotsky’s (1978) perspective is that of socio-cultural learning, in which the organism is part of its social context with the relationship to others influencing learning. One of his important contributions is the zone of proximal development. This means an individual learns more when they are with other people than when they are alone. The zone of proximal development is
the difference between what a person can achieve by themselves as opposed to learning by being with other people. Vygotskij (1978) differentiates between an actual and potential level of development and believes a child’s teaching should be based upon its potential. Vygotskij (1978) further states that we have inborn biological prerequisites but is critical of a mechanical view of humans in relation to their social surroundings and thus reluctant to a behaviourist view of learning (Lindqvist, 1999). Vygotskij (1978) argues that personal experience should constitute a basis of the learning situation and must not be underestimated. According to him, the natural driving force of children’s behaviour is their interest. Learning should therefore build on that. In this thesis’ perspective of social constructionism, there is no interest in discussing innate biological prerequisites. However, other aspects of Vygotskij (1978) work on learning in collaboration and interaction, plus the importance of personal experiences and building on a person’s interest are all significant to the discussion on entrepreneurship and enterprise education.

Säljö (2000) also takes a socio-cultural perspective on learning and, in keeping with Vygotskij (1978), underlines the importance of communication. Säljö (2000) also discusses learning through social practices. In relation to this, Gohakle (1995) suggests that collaborative learning enhances individual interest as well as critical thinking and that the method is good for problem-solving practices. Learning with others (pupils, peers and/or mentors) and seeking knowledge and help from the school’s surrounding community are also parts of entrepreneurship education as suggested by such researchers as Surlemont (2007) and Mueller (2012), who create a link to these theories on learning. Furthermore, as stated earlier these skills of communication and collaboration are (according to Kyrö and Carrier (2005) and Komulainen et al. (2011)) included in the broader definition of entrepreneurship. The related progressive teaching methods are building on active participation, initiative and strong motivation.

According to Gärdenfors (2010), motivation and understanding are both central to effective learning and are underestimated in formal learning. He claims that formal learning is often driven by external motivations such as grades, whereas informal learning derives from inner motivation such as an interest and curiosity in something. Gärdenfors (2010) further states that inner motivation increases with understanding. In Hattie’s words (2009; 2013), motivation comes from meeting the students’ real-life world. This forms a part of his ideas of visible learning. The focus is on the classroom, in which the best visible teaching and learning takes place when focusing on the goal (achieving learning), giving and receiving feedback and when students and teachers are passionate and active. The greatest effect is achieved when students become their own teachers. In their article, Fayolle and Gailly (2008, p. 569) quote Humboldt who said in 1810 that ‘the teacher is not there for the sake of the student; both teacher and student are there for the sake of learning’. This quote still seems relevant today and is embedded in Hattie’s (2009; 2013) ideas.
3.4 Strategy

A third area of research which forms the frame of reference for this thesis is strategy. To refer back, one of the research questions in this thesis is particularly concerned with: how an entrepreneurship strategy is operationalised in a school setting, investigating how a public strategy develops in practice and investigating the correlation between strategy content and processes in practice.

As stated by Mulgan (2009), the discussions on strategy and entrepreneurship are predominant in public as well as private organisations. But since private and public entities differ in many respects, having various goals, structures and challenges, it is worthwhile to investigate them in relation to their own prerequisites and contexts. Until recently, according to Sundin and Tillmar (2008), Luke et al. (2011) and Höglund (2015), traditional strategic management research studies focused on private companies, theoretical perspectives and the macro level. Accordingly, they bypass relevant areas such as the public sector, practice-based approaches, micro-level studies and qualitative features.

The process of creating and operationalising strategies may differ between private and public organisations. Strategies within public organisations are often delivered by governments or top-level management in public authorities. As Bernier and Hafsi (2007) and Mulgan (2009) point out, in contrast to private companies the public sector is viewed as risk-averse, bureaucratic, formal and administrative, as well as democratic and trustworthy. Ford and Zussman (1997) argue that the public sector has other challenges because its value system and complex relationships with citizens raise higher expectations and demands from them than consumers do in the private sector. The public sector faces different constraints such as public opinion and high levels of scrutiny. Thus, there may be high expectations (from citizens and political management) that a set strategy will be implemented correctly, without delay and with the intended content.

Poister (2010) states that it has never been more important to study strategy and strategic management in the public sector. The role of public organisations in society is changing and financial and social pressures are growing. This means that the expectations of media and citizens for value and performance are increasing. According to Bryson, Berry and Yang (2010) and Poister (2010), this puts pressure on public bodies to think and act strategically and, according to Windrum (2008) and Özcan and Reichsten (2009), entrepreneurially. Focusing on public performance, several researchers single out strategic management as the most important factor (e.g. Andrews, Boyne, Law & Walker, 2009; Walker et al., 2010).

Infusing such business concepts as a strategy and entrepreneurship into the public sector may be seen as part of New Public Management development
(Hood, 1991; 1995), in which concepts and working methods from the private sector are transferred to and implemented within the public sector. The transfer is problematic, as public and private bodies build on goals and aims that are sometimes contradictory. As noted by such researchers as Ferlie and Onnagaro (2015) and Höglund (2015), the goal of private organisations is growth and profit, whereas public ones focuses on equality, public service and so on. Mulgan (2009) problematises the fact that public organisations’ goals are complex and ambiguous, even sometimes contradictory. Jarzabkowski and Fenton (2006) argue that this is because public organisations occupy pluralistic contexts with conflicting stakeholder expectations. Johanson (2009), on the other hand, would de-emphasise the gap between private companies and the public sector’s characteristics and emphasises strategy as driven by purpose, directions and goals; all equally important in the private and public sectors.

Morales et al. (2014, p. 423) argue that public sector employees are also expected to be innovative and entrepreneurial is part of a ‘third wave of neoliberal governmentality’ of state privatisation, following the waves of deregulation and New Public Management. This third wave includes a development in which members of central governments and public servants must increasingly think and act like business entrepreneurs.

These traditionally business-related concepts of strategy and entrepreneurship have thus entered public administrative practice (Ferlie, Ashburner, Fitz-Gerald & Pettigrew, 1996; Hood, 1991). In keeping with this, there are researchers within fields such as strategic management or new public management who are studying public entrepreneurship (e.g. Hood, 1991; Ferlie et al., 1996; Klein et al., 2010; De Vries & Nemec, 2013; Bernier, 2014). Andrews and Van de Walle (2013) and Rosenberg Hansen and Ferlie (2014) all emphasise the importance of still further studies of entrepreneurship in the public sector, as barely any research studies have so far been conducted within this area. However, Drumaux and Goethals (2007) and Luke et al. (2011) are some exceptions.

Against this background, there has also recently been growing interest in studying strategy and strategic thinking in the public sector. This view is shared by scholars such as Boyne and Walker (2010) Andrews and Van de Walle (2013) and Rosenberg Hansen and Ferlie (2014). Several studies explore the application of strategic management in public organisations (cf. Kotteen, 1997; Drumaux & Goethals, 2007; Düren, 2010; Rosenberg Hansen, 2011; Favoreu, Carassus & Maurel, 2015). However, Bryson et al. (2010) also explicitly ask for more practice-orientated approaches in future. According to Höglund (2015), very few people have so far looked into actually applying these principles through strategising activities. Jarzabkowski, Balgoun and Seidl (2007), Johnson, Langley, Melin and Whittington (2007) and Höglund (2015) are also explicit about a lack of understanding of how daily activities
are conducted by practitioners, what strategising involves and how it relates to and affects strategic outcomes in the public sector.

3.4.1 Strategising, content and process

The research field of strategy is diverse and incorporates various perspectives. Whittington (1996) maps different strategy perspectives, including the process and practice perspectives, as well as newer thoughts on strategising, that are relevant to this thesis. These will be elaborated on below.

Traditionally, management discipline has treated strategy as a property, in other words something a company has (Mintzberg, 1994). This view is based on strategy-making as a rational process in which the management and board plan and decide upon a strategic direction which is then implemented in their organisation. According to Whittington (1996), the processual perspective of strategy developed in the 1980s, with well-known early contributions from Pettigrew (1987) and Johnson (1987) studying how organisations discover their need for strategic change and then get the work done. Over time, another perspective developed focusing on strategy as practice. Whittington (1996) claims this builds on the process view and is focused upon management practice; investigating how managers ‘do’ strategy. This perspective is concerned with the work of strategising, which Whittington (1996) means include all meetings, administration and number-crunching involved in the development and implementation of a strategy. Thus, strategising initially seems to have been studied more from a higher level of abstraction and unit of analysis, focusing on the organisation and/or senior management.

However, with the passage of time strategy research has also become more interested in how actions and activities among employees other than top-management affect the content and process of a strategy. This rather new research orientation, discussing strategy as practice, was initiated by Johnson, Melin and Whittington (2003) and further elaborated on by researchers such as Whittington (2006), Jarzabkowski et al. (2007), Floyd, Cornelissen, Wright and Delios (2011) and Spee and Jarzabkowski (2011). These researchers state that strategy is something people do. They argue that since traditional strategic management research is still concerned with macro-levels of analysis, they are losing track of human beings and their activities. From the perspective of Johnson et al. (2003; 2007), strategising must be understood as activity-based; a practice conducted by practitioners. Taking an activity-based view of strategy focuses on the detailed processes and the myriad daily activities that add up to that strategy, thus adding a micro-perspective. As pointed out by Jarzabkowski et al. (2007), focusing on strategising means studying what it involves and how this shapes strategy.

Thus, human action and interaction are central to strategising. Value lies in management as well as in strengthening the importance of employees in all positions throughout the organisation. As emphasised by Johnson et al.
(2003), Jarzabkowski et al. (2007) and Spee and Jarzabkowski (2011), activity is considered strategic insofar as it is consequential to outcomes, directions and competitive advantages; even if these consequences are not intended by the strategy. Thus, strategy work, strategic thinking and activities affecting the content of a strategy also take place elsewhere in the organisation. This highlights the importance of studying groups of employees other than senior management. According to Jarzabkowski (2005), because strategising includes actions, interactions and negotiations between multiple actors and the situated practices they draw upon to accomplish their activity, a broader view is needed of who is a strategist. In this context, Jarzabkowski et al. (2007) add that the outcomes of the strategy-as-practice research needs to be related to activities, or flows of activity, which have outcomes consequential to the direction and/or survival of the group or organisation. The fact that the employees’ actions and interactions, interpretations and negotiations have impact is further acknowledged by Vaara and Whittington (2012) and Sminia and de Rond (2012). In the latter’s research into private organisations and firms, implementation of strategy results in reformulation as well as modifications of strategy content. From this perspective, strategising is ongoing and unavoidable. This means practitioners on a micro-level, by their daily activities, impact upon the implementation and outcome of a strategy. As Mulgan (2009, p. 143) states, ‘policies aren’t the same as parcels’. Competent employees are mostly unwilling to be reduced to just a tool for leaders (who (perhaps) know less than they do).

Thus, as in the focus of this thesis, practitioners and what they do in their everyday practice, is of interest. Agency, as in the possibility to act, is embodied by practitioners. Therefore, as expressed by Whittington (2006, p. 10), from this strategy perspective, practitioners are obvious units of analysis. ‘They shape strategic activity through who they are, how they act and what practices they draw upon in that action’. This enthusiasm of active practitioners, or employees within an organisation, who create strategic choices and consequences in their daily activities in organisations, is also shared by Mulgan (2009), Johnson et al. (2003), Spee and Jarzabkowski (2011), Vaara and Whittington (2012) and Höglund (2015).

We now turn to the relationship between strategising and the concepts of content and process. According to Tsoukas (2010) and Sminia and de Rond (2012), the discussion on strategy-as-practice can be seen as a natural heir to Pettigrew’s (1987) pioneering work of the ‘Pettigrew triangle’. Based on a longitudinal real-time processual study of a company, Pettigrew (1987) proposes research into change, or firm transformation (in which strategy is a management tool). This can include dimensions of context, content and process; content being the objectives and goals (the ‘what’ question), process being implemented (the ‘how’ question) and the context of the external and internal environment (the ‘where’ question). Pettigrew (1987) himself finds the how
Johnson et al. (2007) discuss strategy content and strategy process. They suggest how these relate and how to bridge the macro level (institutional and organisational) and micro level (the lower levels of people’s activities) by using these concepts. This complements the mainstream strategy field that focuses on the organisational level and opens up a potentially rich vein of research questions, including investigation of the occasional disconnect between intended strategy, systems that put them into action and people’s activities that affect it. This focus is also relevant to this thesis.

As Walker et al. (2010) describe, researchers, especially those relating organisational strategy to performance, have traditionally distinguished strategy processes (as in strategy-making, focusing on how an organisation’s goals and actions are selected) and strategy content (the outcome of strategy-making). Moreover, according to Andrews et al. (2009), in studying the public sector strategy research has typically focused on either strategy formulation or strategy content. Lê and Jarzabkowski (2015) state that the implementation of a strategy includes both formulation of the strategy content as well as effecting it. They suggest human dynamics (relating to the interaction of task and process conflicts) as an explanatory mechanism of how content emerges. As described earlier in this section, this is reinforced by the ideas of Sminia and de Rond (2012) who state that the implementation of strategy results in modifications and reformulation of strategy content. This implies that strategy process is an ongoing phenomenon which continues after the strategy content has been formulated and launched.

In summary, this thesis has been inspired by the human-centred and activity-based view of strategising, as expressed by Jarzabkowski and Fenton (2006, p. 632). In their view, strategising refers to ‘[…] those planning, resource allocation, monitoring and control practices and processes thorough which strategy is enacted’. As such, there is a shared interest in strategising as conducted among, and by, individuals in their everyday social practices at all levels. However, this thesis does not draw on the sociological viewpoint or take a full strategy-as-practice perspective. Its focus is rather upon strategising processes and their relationship to strategic content. In other words, the relationship between content and process.

3.5 Governmentality and the enterprising self

Firstly, there is a need to explain the bridge between strategy and governmentality in this frame of reference. In investigating the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009), strategy is viewed as a governance programme. This programme is regarded as a way
to steer or influence citizens at an early age towards becoming more enterprising individuals. Thus, the discussions on strategy in this thesis are related to notions of governmentality and, more specifically, the concepts of programme and technology, as well as previous research on the enterprising self.

Governmentality is a term coined by Foucault in the late 1970s and has recently received increased attention (Bragg, 2007). According to Foucault (1991; 1994) governmentality is a perception of what people are and how they are governed. He claims governing does not originate solely from, or belong to, the state but rather lies within a broad range of technologies of government. Over time, people have been steered towards ‘regimes of truth’ which, according to Foucault (1980), are the outcome of scientific discourses, knowledge and techniques entangled with practice; for example, the education system and political and economic ideologies. Lindster Norberg (2016) suggests that one such truth regime today regarding entrepreneurship in education is that schools should foster active, responsible entrepreneurs.

Foucault (1991) discusses how citizens are governed through technologies of power and technologies of the self. Thus, governmentality is about the numerous ways in which our conduct is governed, by governments, ourselves and others and, in Dahlstedt and Tesfahuney’s words (2010), ‘made governable’. Dahlstedt and Hertzberg (2012, p. 244) describe the distinction of Foucault’s technologies in that ‘while technologies of power determine the conduct of individuals and submit them to certain ends of domination’, technologies of the self instead is about how people self-formulate and produce and mould themselves as citizens. According to Dean (1999), these do not rule each other out as much as interlace. Another way of describing this is that governmentality is related to both government and state politics, but also includes a wide range of different tools of control, one of which is the control of the self. Governmentality thus becomes a way for governments to try to produce the citizen best suited to fulfil their own policies. In Braggs’ (2007, p. 345) words, governmentality could be described as a method of governing that encourages ‘action of the self, by the self’, rather than through formal institutions of the state.

Dahlstedt and Hertzberg (2012) further state that the broad repertoire of technologies of government operate throughout the entire social field, crossing boundaries, between such things as public and private, political and commercial and citizen and consumer. They also state that technologies of the self have, more recently, become prominent in schools and refer to Hultqvist and Petersson (2000) as an example; they describe how steadily more attention has been paid to the importance of motivating students, enhancing self-confidence and taking initiative. In this thesis, this is perceived as relating to the development of the entrepreneurship strategy in education, due to its focus on developing entrepreneurial competencies among pupils.
According to Rose (1999), studying political power from a governmental-ity perspective includes looking at what the political powers wanted to happen, what the background and goals were and studying what strategies and what different technologies were deployed. This has bearing on this thesis, which is partly concerned with how the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Governments Offices of Sweden, 2009) has been operationalised through the technologies of public apparatus.

Further, within the discussion on entrepreneurship as a societal phenomenon, there is a small but growing research field highlighting the importance of studying entrepreneurship in its wider context of political and programmatic discourse (see e.g. Dahlstedt & Hertzberg, 2012; Korhonen et al., 2012; Gill, 2014). It is relevant in this context to mention the concepts of programme and technology, which are based on the discursive ideas of Miller and Rose (1990) and built upon Foucauldian traditions. This thesis examines the operationalisation of the Strategy which is therefore regarded as a governmental programme. According to Rose and Miller (1992), programmes are seen as systematic discursive frameworks within which policies and government objectives are specified. They describe programmes as prescriptive as well as analytic and seek to link day-to-day work (in schools, for instance) with broader political objectives and rationales. Therefore, a programme such as the Swedish Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009), can (consistent with thoughts of Miller and Rose (1990) and Rose and Miller (1992)) be understood as a certain framework for action, outlining how to achieve ideal ends. Miller (2001) furthermore describes technology as the tool used to make programmes operable in practice; they help realise the aims of the programme. The concept of technology refers to a particular method of analysing the activity of governing through governmentality; one that pays great attention to the actual tool required by various authorities to achieve what they think is desirable (Miller & Rose, 1990). Technologies become concrete ways of developing these programmes. According to Bührmann (2005), there has been a tendency in previous research to concentrate on the programmatic level, thus neglecting the technologies used in practice. This is problematic since Miller and Rose (1990) state that programmatic ideas must be practical. Therefore, they need to be translated and implemented in local organisational contexts to make them work in the day-to-day working reality. Therefore this thesis, as previously described in the Methods section, investigates a specific technology; a competence development initiative provided by the Swedish National Agency for Education.

3.5.1 Enterprising self

The ideas of the enterprising self are built on research on governmentality. As stated above, governing is not solely carried out by the state but also through individuals’ self-governing, as influenced or steered by the government. This
relates to the critical discussion on the creation of the enterprising self, by such scholars as Rose (1992) and Peters (2001). The literature on the enterprising self is linked to the kind of society we aim for and how the individual’s responsibility is stated in relation to the government. The view of the enterprising citizen emerged under neo-liberalistic leadership such as that of Thatcher and Reagan but has today been incorporated into other political beliefs as well. Rose (1996, p. 41) argues that we now live in an ‘advanced liberal’ society, in which governments seek to govern through the regulated choices of citizens, i.e. through conduct of conduct. Dean (1999) suggests this idea is based on a societal need to create entrepreneurial citizens.

As proposed by Dahlstedt and Hertzberg (2012), entrepreneurial education can be perceived as a particular form of governmentality in which students are connected to market rationalities and are fostered according to it. According to Popkewitz and Brennan (1997), subjects within society will be shaped by the current regimes of truth mentioned above, by self-regulating to try and fit into the prevailing norm. According to Rose (1992; 1999), to achieve productive steering, this governance works through different techniques that are supposed to make individuals free but responsible subjects. As Dahlstedt and Hertzberg (2012) claim, in today’s society the school is an important context in which this moulding occurs. Rose (1992) states that enterprising citizens are people who, through self-government and personal development, flourish into individuals with energy and initiative and who look upon their lives as a project, making an adventure of it. In political rhetoric, enterprising selves (Rose, 1992, p. 142) are seen not as ‘subjects with duties and obligations’, but rather as individuals with rights and freedoms who make choices wisely and responsibly. In a culture of freedom, they are able to maximise their choices, happiness and self-fulfilment and thus focus on realising their potential and dreams. To do this, they need to develop enterprising skills such as becoming active, creative, responsible, communicative and opportunity-seeking. Equipped with these competencies they are supposed to contribute to the rise of a successful nation, in terms of prosperity and growth. Thus, du Gay (1991) suggests that the enterprising self could be described as someone who wants to make an enterprise out of their life. Brunila and Siivonen (2014) write that only through being an enterprising self are we able to become lifelong learners who actively contribute to the market economy. As a lifelong learners, adults become entrepreneurs who choose education based on their individual needs and on where they want to arrive in life (Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013). Similarly, Bührmann (2005) argues that the enterprising self is defined by the steering of action, feeling, thinking and willingness based on an orientation toward such criteria as economic efficiency and entrepreneurial calculation. As such du Gay, Salaman and Rees (1996/2005) describe the subject of enterprise becomes a repetition of the traditional ‘economic man’.

Ainsworth and Hardy (2008) state that becoming an enterprising self is thus presented as something positive: being considered an important contributor to
society, a happy person acting as a free spirit, fulfilling their dreams. It is further argued that this is attainable by all. But du Gay (1995) also points out the risk of marginalisation and exclusion of people who are actually unable or reluctant to behave in this entrepreneurial way. Also, as Vandenbroeck (2007) points out, taking this perspective means that aspects of the responsibility of being employable and committed to life-long learning are transferred to the individual. This perspective on the individual emphasises and puts pressure on them to be successful and relevant. Berglund (2013) adds yet another potential risk: when the purpose of cultivating enterprising subjects is included in a school setting, when students are constantly being encouraged to do better, do more and continuously strive to become their best, it might risk creating a sense of insufficiency and incompetence among these young people.
4 Findings and analysis

This chapter presents the findings and analysis. First, the appended papers are summarised. The five sections summarise each appended paper in turn, with their respective findings and relevance to this thesis. Then, the chapter presents the analysis of the findings, which are compared and elaborated on in relation to the theoretical backdrop and frame of reference. The two research questions form the basis for the analysis, and therefore the analysis is presented under two subheadings linked to these. The first subsection is constructs of entrepreneurship in a school setting, and the second is how entrepreneurship strategy is operationalised in the school setting.

4.1 Summary of appended papers

This section includes a summary of the appended papers. Each study is briefly described, before its findings and relevance to the thesis are presented. However, for a more comprehensive and description and understanding of the studies A-E, used as empirics in the papers, and the methods, please see the Methodology chapter. Papers 1–5 are included in full in the appendix.

An overview of the five papers is provided below in Table 2, with the titles, author(s) and statuses of the papers. The role of this author in each paper is also noted. This has certainly not been an easy task. However, it is intended as an attempt to describe my role and work and indicate my independence and progression.
Table 2. Summary of appended papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Thesis authors role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Is what’s good for business good for society? Entrepreneurship in a school setting.</td>
<td>Axelsson, K., Höglund, L. &amp; Mårtensson, M.</td>
<td>Accepted for publication in 2017 book chapter to be published by Edward Elgar under the series ‘Frontiers in European Entrepreneurship Research’. Paper came from a second peer-reviewed selection of the best papers from the RENT(^{10}) Conference in 2015. Revised from previous version of paper “Entrepreneurship in a School Setting –</td>
<td>Co-author. Focusing on empirical material (sole collector), analysis of empirics, transcriptions, method section, theory of entrepreneurship and theoretical analysis in relation to this, plus conclusions. Another co-writer was mainly responsible for sections on discourse. Wrote approximately half of the paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^8\) ICEIRD stands for the International Conference for Entrepreneurship, Innovation, and Regional Development.
\(^{10}\) RENT stands for a conference entitled Research in Entrepreneurship and Small Business.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Thesis authors role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5 | Entrepreneurship in Teacher Education - Conceptualization, Design & Learning outcomes. | Axelsson, K. & Westerberg, M. | Presented at the 2016 RENT XXX, Antwerp, Belgium 18–19 Nov. | Main author. Initiator, sole collector of empirical material, transcription and choice of general analytical model. Responsible for all analyses once analytical model was set, wrote majority of paper. Help from co-author mainly with discussions of the analytical model, and as a sounding board for preliminary analysis plus minor writings on parts of the text. |

---

11. ECSB is short for the European Council for Small Business and Entrepreneurship.
4.1.1 Paper 1: Introducing Entrepreneurship in a School Setting – Entrepreneurial Learning as the Entrance Ticket

There is increasing interest from the political sphere and public bodies to inspire and influence citizens to become more entrepreneurial. One way of achieving this is by developing educational initiatives. As a result, entrepreneurship education is booming. Thus, entrepreneurship has moved into public settings beyond the traditional business context. The paper positions itself within the ongoing research discussions regarding entrepreneurship as a broader societal phenomenon (cf. Steyaert & Hjorth, 2003; Steyaert & Katz, 2004; Hjorth, 2012; Berglund et al., 2012)

This paper focuses its investigation on what happens when entrepreneurship is constructed in a school setting. By focusing on the educational grades 6–9 (ages approx. 12–16), the aim is to contribute insights from a much less well-researched context; entrepreneurship in the secondary school. It also answers requests for further research into entrepreneurship on levels other than the university, as expressed by such scholars as. Gorman et al. (1997), Komulainen et al. (2011), Mueller (2012), Fayolle (2013) and Leffler (2014).

The research in study A constitutes the empirical data for this paper. A document study, observations, participative meetings and nine semi-structured interviews with teachers were carried out in 2012. These allowed the study to help understand how entrepreneurship is constructed among teachers in their day-to-day work. The paper focuses on what teachers talk about and do, when entrepreneurship is introduced and developed in their work.

4.1.1.1 Findings

The findings indicate a change in terminology from entrepreneurship to entrepreneurial learning (EL). The teachers found the task of teaching entrepreneurship unclear and so re-interpreted it. They claimed that they did this because of EL’s formal status as part of the curriculum. However, EL is not mentioned in the curriculum, but entrepreneurship is.

Furthermore, there has been a change in practice. Traditional teaching has become more progressive. The empirics show that elements included in entrepreneurial learning are: projects grounded in real life, collaboration with the surrounding community and practicing of entrepreneurial skills.

Additionally, the teachers state that their work with entrepreneurial learning (as they perceive it) in this context, has resulted in enhanced motivation of pupils. They claim unanimously that motivation has increased due to the focus on EL. According to them, this was because the EL learning situations started with pupils’ interests, were meaningful, reflective, participative and democratic. However, the teachers also stated that their work with EL had developed them into a changed perspective on their teaching and learning.
They said it had affected them; changing the way they worked and their attitudes. This had led to in-house discussions and further development of ideas on pedagogy and didactics.

In the paper, these findings were summarised in a conceptual model of entrepreneurship in the compulsory school, grades 6–9. Although a novel proposal based on new, explorative, empirical research, it provides food for thought and for discussion. It does, however, need to be further elaborated on and refined in future research.

![Figure 4. A conceptual model of entrepreneurship in lower secondary school.](image)

### 4.1.1.2 Relevance to this thesis:

The theoretical contribution of the paper lies within the literature on societal entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education. It provides a conceptual model of entrepreneurship education at lower secondary school, and attempts to clarify and enrich the discussion on defining entrepreneurship in a school setting.

The paper and its findings help answer the research questions of the thesis since it develops an understanding of what teachers are doing with entrepreneurship in the school setting: what they talk about, how they describe their work with entrepreneurship and its content. This is particularly helpful in answering research question 1 (How is entrepreneurship constructed in the school setting?). It also supports the aim of this thesis to increase knowledge of, and insights into, how a business concept – entrepreneurship – is operationalised and constructed in a public school context.

### 4.1.2 Paper 2: Entrepreneurial Learning in Education; Preschool as a Take-Off for the Entrepreneurial Self

According to Lindström (2013) and Peterman and Kennedy (2003), childhood is the ideal stage for influencing positive attitudes towards entrepreneurship. Furthermore, preschool constitutes the beginning of the state-determined
‘common thread’ embodied in the Swedish Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009). This makes the preschool setting of particular interest when investigating whether, and how, this theme catches on. Moreover, the subsequent changes introduced into the Swedish national curriculum will potentially have widespread effect on younger children.

Study B aimed to continue building on the experiences of study A, but added a different educational context. Its purpose, therefore, was to further investigate entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning (as an empirical concept found in study A), but in the preschool context. It could then be investigated whether there were any overlaps, similarities or disparities between different school settings, by still focusing on preschool teachers’ practical experiences, constructs and understanding.

Study B forms the empirical basis of this paper. This study investigates what preschool teachers perceive as entrepreneurial learning in a preschool. Five critical incident questionnaires and an in-depth interview were conducted using the stimulated recall method.

4.1.2.1 Findings

The empirical findings suggest that, according to preschool teachers, entrepreneurial learning has developed their educational discussions in preschool. They also stated that their work with entrepreneurial learning affected the children’s entrepreneurial skills in that they for instance exercised and improved their decision-making, creativity and cooperative skills. The children also became more enterprising. These findings overlap with previous insights into entrepreneurial skills from study A.

Furthermore, in analysing the material to determine what supports or hinders a positive entrepreneurial learning situation, four main themes emerged regarding what supports it: ongoing reflection, active participation, a meaningful learning situation and a tolerant atmosphere. One possible criticism might be that these themes could be deemed to overlap, or be equivalent to, many terms already used in early childhood research (cf. Dewey, 1916; Vygotsky, 1978; Schön, 1991; Hattie, 2009). However, according to the empirical findings (such as the preschool teachers’ perspective), the differences they see are: (i) their focus on entrepreneurial learning made these things actually happen in their day-to-day activities; (ii) the combination of these themes paved the way for a holistic perspective; (iii) it constitutes a helpful new concept which explains and develops their profession. Regarding the common thread, the findings suggest there is still work to be done; there were no obvious signs of discussions on progression or how to relate and connect to the next step(s) in the educational system.
4.1.2.2 Relevance to this thesis

The theoretical contribution to this thesis of this paper, as in paper 1, lies within the field of societal entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education. Paper 2 and its findings are particularly helpful in answering research question 1 (How is entrepreneurship constructed in the school setting?) as the paper contributes to a knowledge and understanding of what happens when actually introducing entrepreneurship in a public preschool setting. The constructs of entrepreneurship in this context are translated into entrepreneurial learning, and there are findings concerning its content. The four supporting themes: ongoing reflection, active participation, a meaningful learning situation and a tolerant atmosphere, add insights to, and make comparisons possible, in relation to the tentative conceptual model in paper 1. It also, provides insights into the search for a common thread, since preschool is suggested as the starting point of it.

4.1.3 Paper 3: Is what’s good for business good for society?
Entrepreneurship in a school setting.

Using governmentality and the concepts of programme and technology (Miller & Rose, 1990; Rose & Miller, 1992; Miller, 2001), Paper 3 discusses the introduction of the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009). This is set in relation to the operationalisation process of the Swedish National Agency for Education. The strategy in this paper is viewed as the programme whilst the competence development initiative provided by the Swedish National Agency for Education and covering the period 2009-2014, is viewed as the technology. The initiative, or technology, focuses on enhancing interest and understanding about entrepreneurship in education. According to Bührmann (2005), previous research has tended to focus on the programmatic level, thus leaving out technologies used in practice; how programmatic initiatives are made operable in practice, for example. But programmes need to be implemented in local contexts; they need to be translated and constructed to make them work for real in the day-to-day activities of organisations (Miller & Rose, 1990). Accordingly, Paper 3 contributes to an understanding of how entrepreneurship initiatives are made operable in the school setting.

The research from study C forms the empirical material for this paper. The empirics consist of a text analysis of 84 documents, a document study and participative meetings. A guiding principle for the research is that the strategy in focus is based upon three main ideas: a) starting businesses should be as natural as being employed, b) practicing entrepreneurial skills is a necessity and c) entrepreneurship should be a common thread throughout the educational system.
4.1.3.1 Findings

Firstly, it is obvious that the focus of the strategy (or programme) is entrepreneurship and creating business and economic value. Thus, the content of the strategy is the use of traditional entrepreneurship concepts and language. Secondly, the wider aspects of entrepreneurship, including the public sector or society at large, are not as visible in the strategy. These aspects are presented as subordinate clauses; something secondary to the goal of creating business entrepreneurs. Thirdly, there is a focus on entrepreneurial competencies chosen with the entrepreneur as a role-model and with the purpose of creating more entrepreneurs. Again though, there are some references to these skills being used also in other broader contexts, however, they are few.

As described above, the findings of Paper 3 are built upon empirics from study C. The paper argues that the entrepreneurship and enterprising discourses are prevalent at the start of the competence development initiative. At this point, the programme was consistent with technology. However, rather quickly (essentially from 2012 onward) a third, broader discourse emerged: the entrepreneurial approach. The programme, with its initial business focus and entrepreneurship discourse, was challenged. This new, entrepreneurial approach developed and expanded in scope and space, spreading from its initial school setting to everyday life, including aspects of life-long learning, cooperation with society, working life, spare time and democratic values; essentially meaning the whole of life.

Thus, this paper argues that the schools did not fully accept the programme’s intentions, but challenged those, transforming subordinate clauses in the programme into main clauses. As such, by the technology stretched the purpose of the programme. This can be understood as obstruction or as teachers being entrepreneurial themselves; widening the discourse to better fit their own view of the assignment, based on the strategy and curricula. Furthermore, the paper discusses possible (un)intended consequences of the new, broader entrepreneurial approach and identifies three tensions between more traditional interpretations of entrepreneurship and the emerging entrepreneurial approach.

4.1.3.2 Relevance to this thesis

This study of the initiative covers the period from 2009 to 2014, which helps understand the development process and operationalisation over time of entrepreneurship in a public context. It reveals that entrepreneurship had been discussed latterly in terms of an entrepreneurial approach. It further helped add to the understanding of the constructs of entrepreneurship in a school setting. This helped answer research question 1 (How is entrepreneurship constructed in the school setting?). More insights became available since, throughout the process, this study included many more schools from preschool to adult education than the previous studies, A and B.
This study also gave insights on how the Swedish National Agency for Education implements its assignment to support schools undertaking this new task. In other words, how the politically-launched strategy is (or is not) operationalised through the public apparatus. Herein lies a comparison to, and correlation with, the intentions of the programme (the strategy) launched by politicians and what actually takes place when a technology (competence development initiative) is launched and operationalised by state authorities such as the Swedish National Agency for Education. This helped answer research question 2 (How is entrepreneurship strategy operationalised in the school setting?).

Thus, the paper helps answer both the thesis research questions; how entrepreneurship is constructed in schools and how entrepreneurship strategy is operationalised in a school setting through the competence development initiative.

4.1.4 Paper 4: Strategizing in the Public Sector. Findings from Implementing a Strategy of Entrepreneurship in Education.

Discussions on strategy and entrepreneurship are receiving increased attention within the public sector. Even so, until recently, according to Sundin and Tillmar, (2008), Luke et al. (2011) and Höglund (2015), traditional strategic management research has bypassed the public sector in the same way as practice-based approaches and micro-level studies. To be explicit, there is a lack of understanding of how daily activities are carried out by practitioners, what strategising involves and how this affects and relates to strategic outcomes in the public sector (cf. Jarzabkowski et al., 2007; Johnson et al., 2007; Höglund, 2015).

This purpose of Paper 4 is to advance the understanding of strategising and how it unfolds in the public sector. The focus of the paper is on the Swedish public Strategy of Entrepreneurship in Education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) and how it develops in practice. The research from studies C and D constitute the empirical material for this paper and include: a text analysis of 84 documents; a document study and participative meetings; 18 semi-structured interviews and 15 digital questionnaires.

Aided by the concepts of content and process (Pettigrew, 1987; Johnson et al., 2007) and their interrelationship, the study investigates how entrepreneurship is operationalised in the school setting and how day-to-day activities and constructs in the non-management levels change the outcome of strategy in practice; demonstrating practical strategising.
4.1.4.1 Findings

The strategy content is based on the same three main ideas as used in Paper 3, which in this paper represent the content: 1) that starting businesses will be as natural as being employed, 2) the necessity of practicing entrepreneurial skills and 3) that entrepreneurship will be a common thread throughout the educational system. Using teachers and headmasters (who also are educated teachers) as units of analysis, the findings strengthen the knowledge on public strategising at a micro-level. They show that in their day-to-day actions, interactions, interpretations and negotiations, practitioners change, remake and even partially neglect the main ideas of the strategy content, thus transforming its practical outcome.

Furthermore, Paper 4 makes a theoretical contribution to the field of strategic management in the public sector and strategising research by displaying the practitioners’ four central practices; ones which are important in implementing strategy in the public sector. These four linked practices are: 1) the importance of contextual adjustment to public preconditions, 2) reconstruction of the strategy to one’s owns conditions in practice, 3) including and relating to surrounding practices in the process, and 4) public sector strategising as an incremental process. These contextual findings can open up further discussions on strategising in the public sector; in many respects an uncharted research area so far.

Additionally, this paper offers empirical insights necessary for practitioners, politicians and senior management in the public sector. It enhances the knowledge of how governmental entrepreneurship initiatives are implemented and operationalised in public settings. Thus, this work could help decision-makers and other stakeholders reflect upon strategy work and strategising, adding clarity to future strategy undertakings.

4.1.4.2 Relevance of the thesis:

Overall, Paper 4 enhances an understanding of how this governmental (public) entrepreneurship initiative (the strategy) is operationalised in public settings. Thus, it mainly helps answer the second research question (How is entrepreneurship strategy operationalised in the school setting?).

Choosing this research focus was to me a natural development as, during the research journey, some findings of studies A and B had revealed the teachers’ constructs of entrepreneurship in their school setting. Aided by study C, which investigates the competence development initiative from the Swedish National Agency for Education, it became visible that in the school setting teachers had stretched the intentions of the strategy. They had reformulated and changed the content of the strategy, further paving the way for possible (un)intended consequences. A next step was therefore to deeply study the steering documents more deeply, view their content and compare this to what was actually happening in the school setting. One insight was that there were
discrepancies; focusing on entrepreneurship as a business concept did not maintain in practice. This therefore became the starting point for a search to try and understand this development.

Thus, the findings in this paper (identifying expressions of strategising in the public sector) were relevant in helping develop an understanding of why the publicly launched entrepreneurship strategy had, to some extent, failed. It did not maintain a consistency between the strategy as written and what actually happened in practice. Thus, in this educational setting, strategising had helped explain how teachers affected the outcome of the strategy and how this had been possible.

4.1.5 Paper 5: Entrepreneurship in Teacher Education - Conceptualisation, Design and Learning outcomes.

Currently, there are some novel initiatives in Sweden are aiming for an introduction of entrepreneurship in teacher training programmes at higher education institutes. The purpose of Paper 5 is to shed light on one of these early attempts. This is of interest since a focus on trainee teachers is necessary for future progression of entrepreneurship. These are future professional teachers and will go on to create constructs of entrepreneurship and fill (or not fill) their future work with entrepreneurship content, possibly affected by the strategy and curriculum during their teaching practice. This is also important because as Fayolle (2013) claims, we still lack knowledge on key educational and didactic issues relating to entrepreneurship education, such as at teacher education programmes at HEIs. As research by Mäkimurto-Koivumaa and Belt (2016) states, this knowledge is very scarce when it comes to non-business education at university level. Thus the teacher education programmes becomes relevant.

The paper was based on study E, which includes four classroom observations, written inquiries from students (with a total of 63 answers), two focus group interviews with students and two semi-structured interviews with teachers. The paper was guided by the following research questions: ‘How is entrepreneurship conceptualised in teacher education programmes?’ , ‘How is the education designed in terms of pedagogy and didactics?’ and ‘What are the main learning outcomes that the education strives for?’

Fayolle and Gailly’s (2008) teaching model framework is used as an analytic lens through which to help provide the necessary understanding of entrepreneurship education in relation to these pedagogical and didactical questions. In turn, the framework is affected and guided by five interrelated questions, following a specific order: why (objectives and goals); for whom (targets and audiences); for which results (evaluations, assessments); what (content and theories) and how (methods and pedagogies).
4.1.5.1 Findings

The paper enhances the knowledge of how entrepreneurship is introduced in teacher education programmes, helping researchers and practitioners understand the conceptualisation, design in terms of pedagogy and didactics, as well as principal learning outcomes. It therefore also enhances understanding of teachers’ and students’ constructs of entrepreneurship. Thus, it contributes to the research field of entrepreneurship education, and to the knowledge of how entrepreneurship education is operationalised and perceived in this special non-business context, from both a teacher and student perspective.

The findings show how entrepreneurship as taught in teacher training is riddled with tensions. These are related to the overall mission, target groups, pedagogy, content and assessments. However, there seem to be viable future paths which might mitigate these tensions and perhaps open different opportunities for entrepreneurship education within the realm of teacher training.

4.1.5.2 Relevance to this thesis:

In keeping with the aim of this thesis, it is relevant to study not only what is currently happening among practising teachers, but also what is happening within teacher training programmes. These students are future teachers and they will affect the development of entrepreneurship in their work. Accordingly this gives them an opportunity which currently practising teachers do not have: learning about and understanding entrepreneurship during their teacher training programme. This depends on whether different universities include entrepreneurship training and how they do it. Thus, to come full circle, the constructs of active teachers at university teacher training level, as well as students in this programme, are also of interest.

This should not to be optional since universities in Sweden are public bodies, and answers directly to the Ministry of Education and Research. They are therefore bound to implement and teach the steering documents, such as the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education, as defined by politicians. Paper 5 helped understand whether and how this was being put into practice, the possible challenges of this work and possible viable pathways to overcome them. Accordingly, this paper mainly contributes knowledge and insights into research question 1 (How is entrepreneurship constructed in the school setting?).

Now, in the two forthcoming sections 4.2 and 4.3, an analysis of the findings in this thesis is presented. Since, the two research questions form the basis for the analysis, it is presented under two subheadings linked to these. The first subsection is ‘the constructs of entrepreneurship in a school setting’, and the second is ‘how entrepreneurship strategy is operationalised in the school setting’.
4.2 The constructs of entrepreneurship in a school setting.

The analysis in this section focus on the first research question; how entrepreneurship is constructed in a school setting, from the teachers’ perspectives. The understanding of the constructs is given under three thematic subsections: firstly, *a change in terminology and practice of entrepreneurship in the school setting*; secondly, *an entrepreneurial approach challenging the previous entrepreneurship and enterprising discourses*; thirdly, *the search for a common thread*. All relate to constructs of entrepreneurship in a school setting. While the first theme considers the label and content, the second analyses to determine for what purpose. The third provides thoughts on a possible progression of knowledge and links between educational levels.

4.2.1 A change in terminology and practice of entrepreneurship in the school setting

The analysis shows that the discussion among teachers and preschool teachers regarding entrepreneurship is still ongoing. It covers whether the concept entrepreneurship it is present, as well as its content and label within education. Previous research presented this as a dichotomy, or tension, between a) the narrower, business-like perceptions of entrepreneurship education focusing on company creation and growth (cf. Gibb, 2002; Lackéus, 2013) and b) a broader, enterprising perspective. This perspective includes aspects of personal development and achieving enterprising behaviour and using skills including creativity, flexibility, initiative, courage and co-operation (Erkkilä, 2000; Kyrö & Carrier, 2005; Komulainen et al., 2011; Falk-Lundkvist et al., 2014; Leffler, 2014).

Both perspectives are mainly aligned with the view of entrepreneurship as a process, as conveyed by entrepreneurship researchers such as Stevenson and Jarillo (1990), Shane and Venkataraman (2000) and Sarasvathy (2001). Also, as Drucker (1985) and Carrier (2005) present it, as something that can be taught and learned. Both perspectives also discuss entrepreneurship education as related to entrepreneurial, or generic, skills that are meant to be enhanced by training. However, according to Solomon (2007) and Fayolle and Gailly (2008), there is little unanimity regarding how to teach these entrepreneurial skills and which ones to practice, especially since this depends on their purpose. This can be either learning to become an entrepreneur (cf. Timmons et al., 1987; Minniti & Bygrave, 2001), or becoming an enterprising individual (cf. Carrier & Kyrö, 2005; Falk-Lundkvist et al., 2014; Tynjälä et al., 2016).

Initially, the research in this thesis was guided by a search for *entrepreneurship* in school and preschool settings. However, what I found was a focus on something else. By analysing the empirical findings, it became clear that
the discussion on terminology and content is still ongoing, albeit not as a choice between the broader or narrower definitions of entrepreneurship. According to the empirics included in this research, this dualistic battle has been won by the broader approach, especially if earlier education at preschool and elementary school is taken into consideration. This does strengthen previous research describing the same development as by Korhonen et al. (2012), Komulainen et al. (2011) and Falk-Lundkvist et al. (2014).

Even more striking, though, is that even when looking for entrepreneurship in the school setting, the empirical studies reveal the occurrence of yet another practical concept: entrepreneurial learning. Studies A, B, C and D all indicate this change in terminology. Thus, entrepreneurship has obtained yet another companion – learning – and added it to its name. Just as recorded in previous research, where entrepreneurship developed and intertwined with other concepts, such as social entrepreneurship (e.g. Zahra et al., 2014) or ecological entrepreneurship (e.g. Marsden & Smith, 2005), what is now being discussed among preschool, compulsory school and upper secondary school teachers is entrepreneurial learning. However, this creates some confusion in relation to prior research. When earlier researchers referred to the theoretical concept of entrepreneurial learning, they meant how a business entrepreneur learns in his or her (often small or medium sized and/or start-up) company and their entrepreneurial processes in that setting. This has been examined by Deakins and Freil (1998), Minniti and Bygrave (2001), Cope and Watts (2000), Rae (2000), Cope (2005) and Politis (2005). However, in the Swedish educational context, entrepreneurial learning is understood as meaning something else. The point will be revisited below.

Another discernible confusion in the empirical material which concerns the entrepreneurial learning, is whether to acknowledge it as an end or as a means. Is the goal to make pupils entrepreneurial-learning individuals, or is entrepreneurial learning used to teach them to master the best possible way to learn? Teachers sometimes alternate between these notions when discussing and referring to entrepreneurial learning.

However, this analysis suggests that entrepreneurial learning is more of a method, a classroom teaching method that creates a learning situation; it is therefore a means. The teachers in studies A, B and D described what they did in their classroom and how they did it. In this context, with entrepreneurial learning, it is noticeable that traditional teaching (as in lectures or perceiving pupils as passive recipients of knowledge) has become a more progressive form of education and thus effected a change of practice. This seems to align with thoughts from such scholars as Anderson and Jack (2008), Fayolle and Gailly (2008) and Mueller (2012), who all suggest that entrepreneurship must be considered in its specific cultural and social context. Therefore, when introduced into a new educational setting, it creates special conditions and challenges in regard to teaching, which in turn calls for new and/or unique teaching methods. The empirical material in this thesis indicates that this work i.e.
teachers trying to develop their teaching through entrepreneurial learning, is ongoing, and this change is described below.

The empirics (first found in study A and later supported by study D) show that an entrepreneurial learning situation at lower secondary school level includes the following elements: (i) real-life connected projects, (ii) collaboration with the surrounding community and (iii) practicing entrepreneurial skills. These elements also appear in the preschools in studies B and D. When the preschool is added in, the elements of entrepreneurial learning are described with age-appropriate content. For instance, ‘real-life projects’ relate to the pupils’ present life-world and surroundings; the playground or nearby woods. Community collaboration, meanwhile, consists of simpler cooperative activities or study visits.

Teachers working with these cross-cultural projects between school subjects and external partners described them as positive and rewarding. However, as noted by Svedberg (2007), from an upper secondary school setting, this way of working was sometimes perceived as difficult by some of the respondents in this thesis. Both Svedberg (2007) and Ruskovaara and Pihkala (2013) point out that these kind of working methods is hampered by a need of more time and resources. This creates a risk of teachers going back to ‘business as usual’.

In both the preschool and school contexts the teachers state that they work with children’s and young people’s entrepreneurial skills, adding that it enhances self-esteem, decision-making, enterprising behaviour, cooperative skills and creativity.

Further analysing the entrepreneurial learning situations from studies A and B reveals that this learning method is described as starting with children’s and pupil’s interests and being meaningful, reflective, participative, open and democratic. In study B, the preschool teachers give a clearer description of what supports a positive entrepreneurial learning situation; aspects which in the analysis are given as four main themes: ongoing reflection, active participation, a meaningful learning situation and a tolerant atmosphere.

In some respects, these themes and ways of working may be criticised for not contributing with something new. Some of it might be included in much of the previous educational research relating to early childhood and adolescence and are therefore not exclusive to entrepreneurial learning. Indeed, it could be considered to overlap or be equal to educational research on such topics as the reflective practitioner (Schön, 1991), learning by doing and progressivism (Dewey, 1916), visible learning (Hattie, 2009), socio-cultural theory and the proximal development process (Vygotsky, 1978). However, according to the preschool and compulsory school teachers in the empirics of this thesis, what is different is that (i) the focus on entrepreneurial learning made these things actually happen in their day-to-day activities, (ii) that the
combination of these themes paved the way for a holistic perspective and furthermore (iii) constitutes a helpful new concept which explains and develops their profession.

Additionally, the preschool and compulsory school teachers felt that working with entrepreneurial learning led to results for both teachers and children/pupils. According to them, it has resulted in enhanced motivation for the children and pupils, as well as altered the teachers’ own perspective on teaching and learning. To begin with the children and pupils; the preschool teachers and teachers unanimously claimed that the children and pupils’ motivation increased due to the focus on/work with entrepreneurial learning. The reason for the enhanced motivation due to entrepreneurial learning was described as being threefold. Firstly, since it began with the life-world, questions, interest and knowledge of the children/pupils, thus it was personally rewarding to the individual learner. Secondly, it was perceived as fun as it involved more active and varied lessons and activities. Thirdly, the learning and its results were at least connected to someone other than themselves; the tasks were real, not fictive, and were carried out in interaction with the surrounding community; for instance the local municipality, or an organisation or company. One can associate the thoughts on personal connection and interest to Gärdenfors’ (2010) discussion of the importance of inner motivation which, according to him, is underestimated in education. It also relates to research from Lackéus (2016) who suggests that value-creating teaching, emphasising collaborating, or creating value for someone outside the school world, can enhance pupils and students’ motivation. However, here one need to be careful not only promoting external motivation. Based on this analysis, it can be argued that within entrepreneurial learning (as expressed by the teachers informing this empirical research), an inner incentive based on one’s own interests, alongside learning in relation to something other than oneself, creates meaningfulness and motivation. However, they are not perceived as fruitful without each other.

Working with entrepreneurial learning was also perceived as affecting the preschool and compulsory school teachers themselves. They noticed it paved the way for pedagogical discussions and peer-learning, changed how they worked in practice, and affected their attitudes and thoughts on teaching and didactics. They described they had become bolder but also more benevolent and accepting; inclined towards trying new things and allowing themselves to make mistakes.

Different parts of what was described above as entrepreneurial learning in a school setting have been discussed in previous research. Looking at previous research, the elements of collaboration with the surrounding community have previously been addressed by such researchers as Johannisson et al. (1997) and Surlemont (2007). Moreover, the discussion within the school context about entrepreneurial skills was previously noted by researchers such as
Leffler (2006), Komulainen et al. (2011) and Otterborg (2011), but not in relation to an emerging conceptual model of the method of entrepreneurial learning; as will be presented later in this section.

There have also been a previous definition of entrepreneurial learning in an upper secondary school setting presented by Otterborg (2011, p. 174) who defines entrepreneurial learning as a learning approach, in which ‘...students will develop experience-based learning tasks through interaction between school and the business world’.

What this thesis and its findings can contribute with is strengthening the understanding that the concept of entrepreneurial learning also exists on other levels of education, with particular insights from the preschool and elementary school contexts. However, in contrast to previous research, this thesis highlights the teachers’ perceptions of entrepreneurial learning as a method rather than a learning approach and is, moreover, broadened and not restricted to business. The relationship of the concept of entrepreneurial learning to a learning approach will be further developed in this chapter. On the basis of the findings however, still another contribution will be described first; a tentative conceptual model of entrepreneurial learning in the school setting.

The insights from empirical studies A and B was first summarised in a tentative conceptual model of entrepreneurial learning in a school setting. This describes the perceived content and prerequisites for achieving a fruitful entrepreneurial learning situation among the preschool and school teachers included in the study. An embryo of the model was presented in Paper I. However, it is built upon and strengthened by findings from Paper II. In conducting Study D, and to some extent Study C, it was then possible to cross-analyse some of these findings. The model includes the three interrelated parts mentioned above: real-life projects, collaboration with the surrounding community (including both private enterprises and public organisations) and practising entrepreneurial skills. It also shows the teachers’ perceived effects of working with entrepreneurial learning: an increase in pupils’ motivation and a changed perspective on teaching and learning among teachers. If adding the tentative findings of the preschool study (which is also in keeping with findings described in Paper I), the four prerequisites for conducting a supportive entrepreneurial learning situation could be viewed as constituting a platform or supportive framework, one which permeates the working method. Accordingly, this model (albeit for analytical reasons depicted as boxes and arrows and not to be confused with a real-world situation) offers a preliminary definition of entrepreneurial learning in the school setting, which can be used as food for thoughts, to react to and reflect upon. However, the model does need to be further developed and elaborated upon.
4.2.2 An entrepreneurial approach challenging the previous entrepreneurship and enterprising discourses?

Alongside the above discussion of preschool and compulsory school teachers describing constructs of the concept of entrepreneurial learning, the analysis also reveals the empirical existence of a discussion about an entrepreneurial approach. This can be related to the tension in the school setting between the discourses of ‘entrepreneurship’ and ‘enterprising’, as discussed among scholars from different research perspectives, such as: economics, cf. Gibb (2002), or education, cf. Leffler (2009) or Komulainen et al. (2011). However, in contrast to this dichotomy, this thesis’ empirical studies show (primarily in Study C, but also in D and E) that from around 2012 this broader third discourse – the entrepreneurial approach – emerges. Hence, the studies show the very existence of the entrepreneurial approach but also how it develops over time. This is because the empirics and findings from Study C can be analysed using a development process perspective from 2009 to 2014. This reveals that the entrepreneurship discourse in the school setting has metamorphosed from entrepreneurship in a business sense in 2009 via (almost simultaneously) an enterprising discourse and on to the entrepreneurial approach from 2012.

Moreover, Study C shows that this approach develops entrepreneurship in education in both scope and space. It grew from an initial interpretation of entrepreneurship as an isolated activity within some aspects of schooling (as a subject or ingredient in education for example) via an enterprising approach focusing on working with entrepreneurial skills and personal development in more subjects and interdisciplinary projects and then on to an even broader,
all-encompassing approach. This entrepreneurial approach has been discussed and described as embracing the whole school, even the entire educational system and that it goes on to include the surrounding community. It also becomes woven into the individual’s daily life. It is supposed to be useful during schooling, spare-time and working-life, and so practically around the clock.

Furthermore, achieving an entrepreneurial approach seems to have become the aim of entrepreneurship in the school setting. Within this new discourse, the respondents in Study C emphasise that, in this context, entrepreneurship is about acquiring an entrepreneurial learning approach. They go on to describe it as something accessible and necessary for all children and pupils and all teachers. Their goal is to make it a natural ingredient of the daily school milieu and it is deemed positive for everyone in society. Critical perspectives and hesitancy are rare. Thus, entrepreneurship have spread considerably, having taken something of a giant leap from the confined school setting to incorporate the individual’s everyday life around the clock, including such things as lifelong learning, cooperation with society, and democratic values.

This analysis argues that the emerging entrepreneurial approach can be viewed as related to notions of societal entrepreneurship as discussed by such researchers as Hjorth and Steyaert (2004), Berglund et al. (2012), Hjorth (2012) and Höglund (2015). They suggest entrepreneurship is a societal phenomenon affecting our daily lives. The point in making this link is firstly that entrepreneurship by its introduction in the school setting as such is in a new public context. It thus develops and becomes incorporated into settings other than the traditional business context. But, secondly, that with the development of the entrepreneurial approach, as being perceived as useful everywhere and all the time, entrepreneurship has shown signs of spreading to even more societal contexts than the school setting studied here. Therefore, as argued by Steyaert and Hjorth (2003), entrepreneurship can no longer be claimed to be one entrepreneurship but is instead many, and aided by teachers and others, these new constructs of entrepreneurship have been created in the Swedish school setting.

The broadening of entrepreneurship into the entrepreneurial approach in the empirical material can also be related to research by other scholars. For instance, since coming to view entrepreneurial approach as useful (for whatever occasion or purpose) the teachers, although not directly referencing to it, seem to acknowledge Sarasvathy and Ventkatamaran’s (2011) conceptualisation of entrepreneurship as a general method of human development. Also, the preschool teachers and teachers in their practice, as in research from Hannon (2013), stated that pupils and students developed behaviours, skills and attitudes that could be applied in many societal contexts. As an example, teachers in Study A, as well as Studies C, D, and E, discussed the need for an entrepreneurial approach to prepare pupils and students for life after education; at work, future studies and so on. With the focus on developing pupils’ and students’ entrepreneurial approach the preschool teachers and teachers in the
studies in this thesis also confirmed (and as interpreted here seemed to share) the need, suggested by for instance Johannisson (2010) for enterprising people in every part and aspect of society. The teachers are thus, as highlighted also in Jones and Iredale’s research (2010), increasing the importance of people who can cope with the today’s fast changing and uncertain world.

Developing their teaching towards the aim of helping pupils achieve an entrepreneurial approach (rather than becoming business entrepreneurs) seems better accepted and in tune with the teachers’ own views of their duty and role as educators. This becomes apparent in the empirical material. Prior research from scholars such as Berglund and Holmgren (2006; 2008), Neck and Greene (2011), Leffler (2012) and Gill (2014), has likewise shown that viewing an entrepreneurs as individualistic winners who greedily take advantage of other people may impede the implementation of entrepreneurship in schools. Thus, according to Mühlenbock (2004), it is better to teach entrepreneurship as a collective form as this is more likely to be tolerated. Research by scholars such as Backström-Widjeskog (2008), Komulainen et al. (2011) and Korhonen et al. (2012), support this view. They claim that teachers are more reluctant to teach entrepreneurship with a business focus and prefer to take an approach with milder connotations ones which focus on learning, competences and individual development.

However, discussing a focus aimed at getting pupils to develop an entrepreneurial approach can also be analysed in light of the theories of governmentality and the creation of enterprising selves (Foucault, 1991; Rose, 1992; Peters, 2001). Foucault (1991) argued that governance does not solely originate from, or belong to, state apparatuses. Rather, governance is made up of a broad repertoire of technologies of government operating throughout the entire social field. Thus, governmentality becomes a way for governments to try and produce the citizen best suited to fulfil its own policies. In other words, as claimed by Bragg (2007), governmentality could be described as a method of governance that encourages action of the self, by the self.

By placing entrepreneurship in the midst of education, through the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009), and the subsequent changes in the national curricula (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2010; 2011a; 2012; 2013), the Swedish government (if applying the notions of governmentality to the empirical material) seems to be trying to produce what it perceives as the necessary citizen of today: future entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial citizens.

Ideas on enterprising citizens have been discussed and critically illuminated previously by Rose (1992). That work describes them as people who, through personal development, are supposed to become individuals with energy and initiative, looking upon their lives as a project and making it into a venture. In a culture of freedom and acting with responsibility and control, they are able to maximise their choices, happiness and self-fulfilment, thereby
focusing on realising their potential and dreams. To do so, they need to develop enterprising skills such as becoming active, creative, responsible, communicative and opportunity-seeking. Thus, through the work of governing technologies, citizens are steered towards producing and reproducing themselves in the direction targeted by the current government. If these ideas are compared to the actions of the Swedish government in 2009, when an entrepreneurship strategy in education was launched, further including the teachers constructs of entrepreneurship in education as an entrepreneurial approach, this thesis would argue that there are signs of what Rose (1992) and Peters (2001) describe as an ongoing direction of governance towards creating future citizens with entrepreneurial mindsets.

As stated by Dahlstedt and Herzberg (2012), entrepreneurship education can be perceived as a particular form of governmentality and schools therefore become important contexts in which this moulding of people can take place. When analysing the empiric material in this thesis, and with support of Rose (1992) and Peters’ (2001) research on the enterprising self, similar thoughts and ways of reasoning become visible in all Studies A-E. There is an obvious, but often unreflected, work towards this aim of gaining an entrepreneurial approach, in order to make young people focus on becoming useful in every aspect of life. The teachers often say that pupils should become the best they can for their future; follow their passions and dreams, achieve life goals, be drivers in life, and so on. Furthermore, they state that pupils need to develop entrepreneurial skills such as becoming independent, self-confident, creative and responsible and that they should come up with ideas and see possibilities. The approach, moreover, is based on the premise that everyone is invited and all are included; so no one is supposed to be left behind.

The empirics thus strengthen previous research (Rose, 1992; Peters, 2001; Ainsworth & Hardy, 2008) in that becoming an enterprising self is presented as positive and obtainable for all, and is described as becoming an important contributor to economy and society and at the same time being a happy, free spirit, fulfilling one’s dreams. The teachers in the empirics often emphasis the pupils and students own responsibility. However, du Gay (1995) points out the risk of marginalisation and exclusion of people who are actually unable or reluctant to behave in this entrepreneurial way. Furthermore, as Vandenbroeck (2007) reveals, taking the perspective of the enterprising self, aspects of the responsibility of being employable and committed to life-long learning are transferred to the individual. The same risks could be said to apply to the entrepreneurial approach shown in this thesis. This approach emphasises the individual and puts a lot of pressure on them to be successful and relevant, driving and continuously improving. This is probably not, as I have interpreted them, in the interest of the teachers included in this thesis, or in line with their view of their assignment. However, in their descriptions, they only focus enthusiastically on the positive and rewarding side of things. But as Berglund (2013) criticises, continuously being encouraged to do better, always striving
to become one’s best, may risk creating a sense of inadequacy and incompetence among young people.

By extension, enterprising selves equipped with entrepreneurial competencies are supposed to contribute to the rise of a successful nation in terms of prosperity and growth (Rose, 1992; Peters, 2001). As Bührmann (2005) claims, their actions are being steered towards such criteria as economic efficiency. Thus, the thoughts on the enterprising self have economic links. As Brunila and Siivonen (2014) state, the idea is that through being enterprising selves citizens are able to become lifelong learners who actively contribute to the market economy. Therefore, as pointed out by du Gay et al. (1996/2005), these enterprising subjects are a repetition of the traditional economic man.

For the purpose of this analysis, the above description of the enterprising self, as suggested by e.g. Rose (1992) and Peters (2001) will be labelled hereinafter as the ‘enterprising self 1.0’. This leads to the core rationale of this passage. If acknowledging that the entrepreneurial approach could be interpreted as an expression of societal entrepreneurship embedded in daily activities, then perhaps there is a need to develop a definition of the ‘enterprising self 2.0’. This is because this newer entrepreneurial approach is not exclusively for business or economic purposes. By contrast, being a citizen with an entrepreneurial approach, as constructed among the preschool and compulsory school teachers included in this thesis, does not necessarily mean focusing on being useful and creating growth (as in Rose’s description (1992)), contributing to the market economy (as claimed by Brunila and Siivonen (2014)), or being economically efficient (as discussed by Bührmann, 2005). The entrepreneurial approach encompasses everybody, everywhere, all the time. It is related to higher goals and values for society and the individual. In the empirics, the approach is even deemed necessary in order to develop democratic values in society at large. In addition, the societal challenges which the newer edition of the enterprising self should solve are not always economic. Moreover, even current business entrepreneurship ideas and companies too sometimes include societal and social entrepreneurship aims along with other goals and purposes (including not-for-profits). Thus, enterprising selves as a solely economic subject becomes obsolete.

But there is a challenge in the concurrent written strategy (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) which pushes in an economic direction, if not clarifying the aspects of the entrepreneurial approach. There is a need to discuss the approach in the light of societal entrepreneurship, with the possible inclusion of an altered perception of which enterprising self to aim for. Otherwise, there is a risk that the teachers will become victims of their own pursuit. In their ambition to avoid or diminish the economic links to entrepreneurship by widening the discourse and, perhaps unknowingly incorporating multiple aspects (as described in the above sections and also discussed in the related economic discussion of the enterprising self (Rose, 1992; Peter, 2001)), they simultaneously risk further strengthening and acknowledge the idea, in Dean’s (1999)
or Rose’s (1996) words, of the economic purpose of the enterprising self. Thus, if the teachers wish to broaden the entrepreneurship discourse into an entrepreneurial approach, they must be careful not to come full circle and once again end up at the core of an economic and market-oriented, neo-liberalistic interpretation of entrepreneurship.

4.2.3 The search for a common thread

A search for the constructs of entrepreneurship in the school setting reveals one empirical finding concerning the common thread of entrepreneurship throughout education in the strategy document (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009). This third thematic subsection in the analysis therefore concerns this notion. This thesis argues that that the links and progression of knowledge and skills between educational levels must be developed if reach the aim of an entrepreneurial approach by working with entrepreneurial learning method(s).

The idea of a common thread may be perceived as consistent with viewing entrepreneurship as a process, as do Low and MacMillian (1988), Bygrave (1989), Stevenson and Jarillo (1990), Shane and Venkataraman (2000), Rae and Carswell, (2000) and Cope (2005). This common thread thus implies a need for links and progression of entrepreneurship within and between educational stages.

However, analyses of all the empirical studies (A–E) show practically no signs of this work actually taking place. To begin with, it is apparent that there is scant knowledge of the common thread of entrepreneurship among the respondents. Consequently, hardly any actual effort is being made to try and achieve it. The text analysis of the educational organisers in Study C shows some examples in which they state the necessity of creating and developing this common thread, but not how to do it. From the in-depth interview in Study B, the interview subject stated that she knew they needed to do this but that it had not yet happened. Furthermore, few teachers interviewed in Study D stated that they were aware of the goal as part of the written strategy, or more generally that they had heard of the common thread (as an intended development of entrepreneurship through all stages of education). However, as already stated, this is not distinct. Some stated generally that they had heard of it or recognised it, but they were not at all sure.

Moreover, there are hardly no examples from either of the studies in regard to actually working together between the educational stages of the school system. This does not appear to be any ongoing work. No progression has been developed as to what to focus on at each level. When asked, the respondents described the common thread as not working, invisible and that the dialogue between educational stages was non-existent. Furthermore, it was not clear that teachers were even discussing (within their own level of education) the content of entrepreneurship (or entrepreneurial learning), what skills to focus
on and which skills were practiced in what subject or within what practical training element. Thus, the analysis of this thesis agrees with Leffler and Svedberg (2013), that there is a risk of enthusiastic individuals having more impact on the focus than strategic decisions made by the management or institutes.

By way of example, providing a quotation from one of the respondents from Study D:

I do not practice this enterprising thing so much. They can do that in the other subjects.

Thus, the expectation that other teachers are practicing things (even if you are not), seems taken for granted even if the dialogue and communication about who-does-what is non-existent. This unspoken, implicit, unresolved discussion on the progression of entrepreneurship seems to somewhat contradict educational theories and ideas in which pupils’ learning draws on socio-cultural learning from peers and teachers (Vygotsky, 1978) and visible teaching and learning (Hattie, 2009; 2013) which helps them see where they currently are in their learning curve and make for the next step. One exception is provided by Study A, since at the time for the study the school was involved in a specific project with participant teachers from the compulsory school, grades 6-9. Here, among these teachers there were attempts to discuss these things among the participants.

Since entrepreneurship now enters schools, teachers and other staff involved must, as noted by scholars such as Steyaert and Katz (2004), Mühlenbock, (2004), Leffler (2006; 2012) and Berglund (2013), deal with issues of legitimacy, content and meaning. As found both in previous research, by for instance Komulainen et al. (2011) and Korhonen et al. (2012), and in the empiricals of this thesis, there is still uncertainty among teachers about what to do and how to do it. The previous findings discussed in this chapter and other questions and research relating to it, therefore need active discussion by the preschool and school staff, covering entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial learning and the entrepreneurial approach.

This thesis does not argue for a necessity, or even a possibility, to define or agree upon a specific definition of entrepreneurship in education that is common for all preschools and schools. However, to realise the idea of a common thread of entrepreneurship in education, it is necessary to open discussions and dialogue among, and between, educational levels regarding their interpretations and constructs. But generally, it seems as if many of the teachers proceed as they see fit, with little collaborative exchange or peer learning between the educational levels. This uneven distribution of knowledge to pupils in, for and about entrepreneurship (Jamieson, 1984; Henry et al., 2005) - or in this
context perhaps better described as 'through' the pedagogical methods of entrepreneurship (Kyrö, 2008) - as well as the lack of discussions on the common thread, is troublesome in light of the Swedish goal of reaching every pupil and the right to an equal education. There is a possibility this may change since, as empirical Study E shows, if entrepreneurship courses are being slowly introduced in the teacher training programme, there is a possibility that future teachers may become aware of the idea of the common thread and are given an opportunity to discuss its implications.

To sum up, the analysis suggests there is still much work to be done regarding the common thread; there were no obvious signs of discussions on progress, or how to relate/connect to the next step(s) of the education system.

4.3 How entrepreneurship strategy is operationalised in the school setting

The empirics also provides findings related to the second research question of how this governmental (public) entrepreneurship initiative – the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) – is operationalised in a school setting. It offers insight into how the entrepreneurship strategy develops and is being introduced in practice and investigates the practical correlation between strategy content and processes. The analysis in this section is divided into two thematic subsections: a) the relationship between strategy and what happens in the school practice, and b) heading where? The question of hope or despair.

Since this part of the analysis is closely linked to the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009), here is a brief recap of the three main ideas of the strategy: (1) that starting businesses will be as natural as being employed, (2) the necessity of practicing entrepreneurial skills and (3) that entrepreneurship will be a common thread throughout the educational system.

4.3.1 The relationship between strategy and what happens in the school practice

Taking off from the analysis in the previous section, the findings showed the preschool and school teachers’ constructs of entrepreneurship in their settings. It showed the presence of concepts other than entrepreneurship, including entrepreneurial learning and the entrepreneurial approach. It also redirected and broadened the work in education, moving away from business entrepreneurship. This gave rise to another question: how is this possible? But also, how can the discrepancy be understood? These are analysed below within two subsections.
The first part of the analysis in this section focusing on research question 2; ‘How is entrepreneurship strategy operationalised in the school setting?’ is considering the relation of the strategy and what happens in practice. This thesis argues that the previously discussed change, or construct, of an entrepreneurial approach was facilitated by stretching the aim and content of the written strategy.

Paper 3, building on empirical Study C, investigated this, aided by the concepts programme and technology as discussed by Miller and Rose (1990) and Rose and Miller (1992). This research states that a programme may be understood as a certain rationale, a certain framework of action suggesting how the ideal ends may be achieved. Technology is perceived as a tool used to make a programme operable in practice (Miller, 2001). In this research, the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) is viewed as such a programmatic initiative. To be able to investigate how this programme is made operable in practice, one of the Swedish National Agency for Education’s technologies (a competence development initiative) was chosen and investigated. This initiative, or technology, aimed at helping teachers develop their knowledge, understanding and practical use of entrepreneurship at work. This is a necessary development since, as Miller and Rose (1990) claim, these programmatic ideas must be practical. To make them work in real life, in the day-to-day activities of organisations, they need to be translated and implemented in local organisational contexts.

As already pointed out, empirical Study C provided the opportunity to follow a development over a period of time, suggesting the emergence of an entrepreneurial approach from around 2012. To recap, over time this approach developed from a focus on business entrepreneurship in 2009 and via an enterprising approach from until 2011.

In the light of the concepts of programme and technology, the analysis shows that, at the start of the period 2009-2011, the entrepreneurship and enterprising discourses were prevalent. Thus at this point the programme was (mainly) consistent with the technology. Rather quickly however (chiefly from 2012 when the broader third approach emerged), the programme was challenged.

As discussed more thoroughly previously in this chapter the approach expanded entrepreneurship in scope and space, spreading from the initial school setting to day-to-day life, including aspects of life-long learning, cooperation with society, working-life, public settings, spare time and democratic values; effectively the whole life. As argued here, this entrepreneurial approach is not as consistent with the programme, as discussed earlier in this thesis. Firstly, from the analysis it is distinct that the focus of the written strategy (or programme) is business entrepreneurship and creating companies and economic value. The content of the strategy uses traditional entrepreneurship concepts and language. Secondly, the wider aspects of entrepreneurship, including such things as the public sector or society at large, are not as visible. These aspects
are presented in the programme as subordinate clauses, expressed as something secondary to the goal of creating business entrepreneurs. Thirdly, there are writings in the strategy of entrepreneurial competencies. In a few paragraphs, these are described as important in a broader context. However, these writings are few and the entrepreneurial competencies are chosen with the traditional entrepreneur as a role-model. To further illustrate this, the pictures in the strategy also express an image of an entrepreneurship connected to craft and manufacturing, to merchandise and to a buy-and-sell perspective.

Therefore, this expansion to a day-to-day life, round-the-clock entrepreneurial approach is not found in the programme, but is frequently found in the technology. Accordingly, through the respondents in Study C, it would be possible to state that teachers (with their broader entrepreneurial approach) seem to take the strategy further. Teachers remake the aim as well as the content in comparison with the way it is written in the programme (and as intended by politicians). They stretch and surpass its initial ideas and content. Thus, the empirics show that they chose to highlight subordinated clauses and marginal parts of the programme. They no longer draw upon the main statements of the programme; instead, the subordinate clauses have become the main clauses.

Considering this, it could be argued that the schools did not fully accept the intentions of the programme and instead challenged and transformed them. Aided by technology, the teachers stretched the purpose of the programme. This can be understood in many different ways: as pure obstruction, or as teachers themselves being entrepreneurial in widening the discourse to better fit their own view of the assignment, based on the strategy and curricula.

This second part of the analysis in this section on how entrepreneurship is operationalised in the school setting, concerns the intriguing question of how this stretch can be understood. Hence, the search took off by studying the steering documents in more depth, to see what was written in the documents and compare this with what happens in practice in schools.

The deeper analysis was developed with the aid of the empirical Studies C and D, the theoretical concept of strategising (e.g. Johnson et al., 2003; 2007; Whittington, 2006; Jarzabkowski et al., 2007; Spee & Jarzabkowski, 2011), content and process (e.g. Pettigrew, 1987; Johnson et al., 2007; Sminia & de Rond, 2012) and their relationship.

From the perspective of Johnson et al. (2003; 2007), strategising is understood as activity-based; a practice conducted by practitioners. Taking an activity-based view of strategy focuses on the detailed processes and myriad daily activities that add up to strategy; it thus adds a micro-perspective. Levels other than top-management thus become interesting, as the research in this thesis focuses on teachers in their work. Jarzabkowksi et al. (2007) claim the focus is on studying what strategising involves and how it shapes strategy. According to Pettigrew (1987), content is understood as being the objectives
and goals, (the ‘what’ question) and process as being implementation, (the ‘how’ question).

Johnson et al. (2007) discuss strategy content and strategy process further. They suggest how these relate and how they can help bridge the macro level (institutional and organisational) and micro level, as in the lower levels of employed people’s activities. Traditionally (and especially among those relating organisational strategy to performance) strategy processes, as in making the strategy, focuses on how an organisation’s goals and actions are selected and separated from the strategy content, i.e. the outcome of strategy-making (Walker et al., 2010). This is also supported by Andrews et al. (2009) who claim that strategy research has typically focused on either strategy formulation or strategy content.

Lê and Jarzabkowski (2015) state that the implementation of a strategy includes both formulating the strategy content and effectuating it. They suggest that human dynamics, as related to the interaction of task and process conflicts, are explanatory mechanisms of how the content emerges. Other recent studies from companies also show that implementing strategy results in modifications to and reformulating of strategy content (e.g. Sminia & de Rond, 2012; Vaara & Whittington, 2012). This implies that the strategy process continues after the content of strategy has been drafted and launched.

Using this as an analytical lens to investigate the findings of the empirical Studies C and D, (but also partially of Study A and B) it can be argued that the introduction of entrepreneurship in education shows expressions of strategising. It thus reinforces the above findings on strategising as a recurrent activity, as pointed out by researchers as Johnson et al. (2003; 2007), Jarzabkowski et al., (2007) and Spee and Jarzabkowski (2011). However, the findings in this thesis add a micro-level perspective from a public setting to this research. This will be further described below.

Initially, it is necessary to establish what is here considered to be the content and process. In this thesis, and for the purposes of the analysis, the Swedish public Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) constitutes the content. For reasons of clarity and simplification, the content in the analysis has been divided and expressed as the strategy’s three main ideas. Inspired by ideas and theories of strategising, the empirical Studies C and D, supported by Study A and B, are to be considered attempts to get close to practitioners and their day-to-day activities on a micro-level. The focus is on the process inasmuch as it investigates how teachers develop the strategy in their context and how this has influenced the practical content and outcome. Comparing the content of the strategy with what happens among teachers in a school setting allows the argument that expressions of strategising are present. The findings indicate that the practitioners in the process (in their day-to-day actions, interactions, interpretations and negotiations) change, remake and even partially neglect the main ideas of the strategy content. They thus transform the outcome of the strategy in practice.
The first of the three main ideas (and perhaps the overarching one) in the strategy states that self-employment is to become as natural as being an employee. However, turning to the empirical material this focus is not as clear. Rather, over time entrepreneurship develops into the above discussed entrepreneurial approach, with other characteristics and content. Turning to the second main idea of the strategy (practising entrepreneurial skills), there are also discrepancies between the content of the launched strategy and what happens in practice. In strategy as well as practice there is a focus on practicing entrepreneurial skills. However, there are differences between which skills are targeted and for what purpose. As mentioned above, in the strategy the business entrepreneurs serve as the role model and there is an emphasis on the need for more entrepreneurs. Conversely, within the empirical material, the teachers actively alter this focus during the course of their activities, instead emphasising the need to practice much broader skills and for a broader purpose. Their enumeration of important skills to practice include: pupils practicing flexibility, creativity, independence, self-esteem and self-confidence as well as exercising being open, active, participative, communicative and taking initiative. Other important skills are motivation, drive and teamwork skills. There is also a practical difference in purpose, in that the above-mentioned 24/7 entrepreneurial approach is useful in studies, work and personal life and not (according to strategy) focusing on starting new companies. Turning to the third main idea of the strategy, the governmental idea for entrepreneurship to be a common thread throughout the educational system, implies links between and a progression of entrepreneurship within the educational stages. But here is also a discrepancy. When investigating this in the school setting, the material shows practically no signs of this actually taking place.

Inspired by the thoughts on strategising as presented in research by scholars as Johnson et al. (2003; 2007), Whittington (2006), Jarzabkowski et al., (2007), Spee and Jarzabkowski (2011), and further based on the findings of a comparison of content and process described above, the argument is therefore that the operationalisation of entrepreneurship in the schools shows expressions of strategising.

In contrast to traditional strategic management research in which studies are focused upon private companies, theoretical perspectives and the macro-level the empirical studies, this thesis attempts to add what the focus bypasses. In the words of researchers such as Sundin and Tillmar (2008), Luke et al. (2011) and Höglund (2015), this would be the public sector, practice-based approaches and micro-level studies. Additionally the thesis shows expressions of strategising among teachers in their practice in the public school sector.

These findings also support recent research by scholars such as Sminia and de Rond (2012) and Vaara and Whittington (2012), who argue that strategy content is being reformulated or modified throughout the entire implementation process. In contrast to these researchers, this research investigates the public setting. However, the analysis comes to the same conclusion, that also
in the public school setting strategising occurs, which effects the practical out-
working of the strategy.

To summarise the analysis of this section – how entrepreneurship is opera-
tionalised in the school setting by using the concepts of programme and tech-
nology (Miller & Rose, 1990; Rose & Miller, 1992), focusing on investigating 
correspondence between strategy content and strategy processes in practice 
(e.g. Pettigrew, 1987; Johnson et al., 2007), and inspired by strategising (e.g. 
Johnson et al., 2003; 2007; Whittington, 2006; Jarzabkowski et al., 2007; Spee 
& Jarzabkowski, 2011) – the following is suggested:

Entrepreneurship in the school setting, as written in the entrepreneurship 
strategy (or programme), (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009), develops 
into an entrepreneurial approach aided by a technology (a competence-devel-
one initiative). In practice, the focus on entrepreneurship as a business 
concept did not withhold its content and position. Thus, it can be argued that 
the teachers are stretching the intentions and content of the strategy i.e. pro-
gramme, by such means as highlighting subordinate clauses and de-emphasising 
the main clauses.

This development (the stretch) can be understood by using previous research 
on strategising and the concepts content and process and their relationship. 
The investigation into how entrepreneurship is operationalised in the public 
school setting shows expressions of strategising. Comparing strategy content 
and strategy process reveals a discrepancy. Daily activities, negotiations and 
interpretations among teachers change the outcome of strategy in practice. 
Thus, during the operationalisation of the strategy, teachers change and even 
partially neglect parts of the main ideas in favour of others. In this educational 
setting, strategising helped to understand how teachers affect the practical out-
working of the strategy.

4.3.2 Heading where? The question of hope or despair

Other insights into how entrepreneurship is operationalised in the school set-
ting are provided by investigating the teacher training programme at higher 
education institutes (HEIs). The analysis has hitherto focused on active teach-
ers. However, to come full circle, the teacher training programme ought to be 
analysed as well. Current teachers are supposed to accept, learn about and 
work with entrepreneurship in their teaching. But this is not a simple task. 
Research from such researchers as Mühlenbock (2004), Komulainen et al. 
(2011), Mueller (2012) and Leffler (2014), suggests that teachers struggle with 
issues of terminology and legitimacy. As expressed by Fayolle (2013) and 
Seikkula-Leino et al. (2015), there are additional challenges during the oper-
ationalisation since most of the active teachers responsible for teaching entrepreneurship have no formal training or practical experience in entrepreneurship. Furthermore, research from Ruskovara and Pihkala (2015) as well as Haara et al. (2016) claims that teachers with supplementary training in entrepreneurship include more of it in their teaching. Thus, for future progression and operationalisation of entrepreneurship, a call is made for a focus on trainee teachers as well. But how are these things dealt with by teachers in teacher training programmes? What are the perceptions of students on the teacher training programme?

To begin with, as noted in Study E in this thesis, vague formal goals and steering documents within HEIs nurture teacher guerrilla tactics in introducing to the teacher training programme. For example, individual teachers drafting their own aims, goals and content. In a survey from Leffler and Svedberg (2013) is shown that there are currently few HEIs addressing entrepreneurship in teacher training programmes in Sweden. Entrepreneurship is still a controversial concept in higher education, and Seikkula-Leino et al. (2012) suggest that when included in the higher education curricula, it is more of a paper product than a reality. Where it is present it is thus reliant upon enthusiastic individuals rather than the action of strategic decisions by the institutes (Leffler & Svedberg, 2013). In study E this becomes apparent since teachers are formulating own goals, content etc.

From the analysis of Study E, it is obvious that the teacher training programme being investigated here also aims at helping students developing an entrepreneurial approach, just as teachers in the empirical Studies C and D. The teachers are all for the idea of entrepreneurial skills being necessary to all parts of society, including non-business and non-profit contexts, whilst also acknowledging that working with entrepreneurship in education has underlying economic ties. However, in actual learning situations the business link is weak, theoretical references to traditional entrepreneurship theory are few and teachers instead try to link it to similar concepts in education literature. However, according to the teachers, the reason for this is not a reluctance to narrow the concept of entrepreneurship, as suggested in previous research, including Komulainen et al. (2011) and Korhonen et al. (2012). Rather, they use this as a way to catch students’ interest by linking it closely to educational aspects. Teachers also state that they are afraid an emphasis on business might create resistance among student teachers. This notion is based on their knowledge of the findings in the above research which states that teachers are reluctant, as well direct experience of meeting and training with practising teachers. However, Study E suggests this may be at least partly based on a misconception. The vast majority of the students in Study E expressed a positive attitude towards entrepreneurship as a business concept being included in the curricula and taught at school. Thus, these students’ initial values towards business are positive and they see no major conflict in having entrepreneurship in the school setting.
The university education in Study E is based on progressive teaching methods aimed at allowing students to be active, practical and reflective. The teachers talk about the importance of practicing entrepreneurial skills, the importance of including the surrounding community in education, and relating education to the real-life world beyond school. They mostly refer to entrepreneurship as entrepreneurial learning and a learning approach. There are exercises designed to let the students try new things and develop new ideas individually and together. The teachers state that they try to challenge students on how to act and think entrepreneurially. This means that this kind of education is designed more for learning through entrepreneurship (as discussed by Kyrö (2008)) rather than on/in/about/for entrepreneurship (Jamieson, 1984; Henry et al., 2005). All in all, this makes sense as the teacher’s goal of learning through entrepreneurship is not to help students become entrepreneurs, but to become entrepreneurial. However, this does not always go down too well among students. Some students are provoked by the progressive teaching methods. There are comments from the students such as ‘this is not for me, I’m a knowledge guy’ and some of them refer to the lessons as ‘play’. This might be understood from the fact that many of the students, were trained by traditional teaching methods during their own schooling and that, for them, this constitutes the norm.

This analysis argues that teacher training programmes also differentiate themselves in some respects from teaching entrepreneurship in, say, business education, which is being studied by e.g. Pittaway and Edwards (2012). This thesis argues that this is because entrepreneurship training in teacher training programmes includes a duality as to who the entrepreneurship training has been created for. At first glance, the target group seems obvious. The primary target group is students in the teacher training programme. However, entrepreneurship education in teacher training programmes is much more complex. Firstly, during their training, it is not only the attending students who are the focus. A parallel and ongoing discussion relates to how the entrepreneurship training will also affect and be taught to future pupils of the students. Thus, entrepreneurship education constantly relates to two levels. Also, from the findings in Study E, goals which the teachers have drafted themselves (and not part of the course syllabus) are aimed at achieving a changed mind-set among the students and their personal development. Within this principal goal, the focus is upon the students themselves and their transformation. This is based on the teachers’ ontological perspective. Their conviction is - to be able to teach entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning - students must first try, practice and learn for themselves. The students’ individual growth is part of the training. In this regard, entrepreneurship implicitly introduces a transformative view of learning. As such, the entrepreneurship training focuses on trying to transform the transformer.
The analysis indicates both hope and despair for the operationalisation of entrepreneurship in education, if the development is related to the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009). The matter is not (yet) on the HEIs’ agenda in formal documents, but there are ‘guerrilla’ teachers actively promoting it. Depending on where entrepreneurship in education is heading, staying within this broader entrepreneurial approach, or returning partially or fully to its traditional business foundations as in the written strategy (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009), there are openings in either direction. Teachers are working towards disseminating an entrepreneurial approach. They are not negative towards the business connection, but less certain about whether it attracts or scares away students. As suggested, this may be based upon a misconception, at least in the case of trainee teachers in empirical Study E, since they showed positive signals towards the inclusion of business entrepreneurship. Thus, to sum up, even if previous research suggests there are current tensions among active teachers regarding entrepreneurship (e.g. Komulainen et al., 2011; Korhonen et al., 2012; Falk-Lundqvist et al., 2014) the analysis in this thesis, by contrast, is that this need not necessarily be the case in future.
5 Discussion and conclusion

This final chapter revisits and discusses the aim and research questions and draws some overarching conclusions. Moreover, some possible implications on a comprehensive overriding level are considered and discussed. One section propose the research’s contribution to research and practice. Finally, the quality and limitations of the work are described and future research suggested.

5.1 Revisiting and discussing the aim and research questions

Directly or indirectly, the launch in Sweden of the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education in 2009 (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) and changes to the national curricula for different levels of education in 2010 – 2012 (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2010; 2011a; 2012; 2013), encompass all levels of public education. According to Byrne et al. (2014), existing research into entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education was primarily conducted at the higher-level educational institutions (e.g. Mueller, 2012; Seikkula-Leino et al., 2015; Pittaway & Edwards, 2012; Mäkimurto-Koivumaa & Belt, 2016). Lesser attention is given to the inclusion in other educational settings. However, there are some contributions from scholars such as Anderson et al. (2009), Otterborg (2011) and Lindster Norberg (2016), all of whom address the upper secondary level, and from research by such scholars as Frank et al. (2005), Komulainen et al. (2011), Korhonen et al. (2012) and Leffler (2014), whose studies include the comprehensive school level.

The development of entrepreneurship in Swedish education (introduced via the above strategy and changes in the national curriculum), only dates back a few years. The journey to operationalise and understand entrepreneurship in this broader school setting has just begun. This creates the basis for new challenges and questions to be addressed and understood. In practice, current and future teachers are already affected by the introduction of this new concept in their everyday work. This development could be seen as part of the discus-
sions between scholars on societal entrepreneurship, in which entrepreneurship is no longer related exclusively to business, but is instead a societal phenomenon embedded in our day-to-day lives (cf. Steyaert & Hjorth, 2003; Steyaert & Katz, 2004; Hjorth, 2012; Berglund et al., 2012). At the same time, a fundamental assumption of this thesis is that the business linkages of the concept of entrepreneurship are present and cannot be neglected. As previous research by scholars such as Mühlenbock (2004), Backström-Widjeskog (2008), Leffler (2009), Komulainen et al. (2011), Korhonen et al. (2012) and Berglund (2013) has noted, these business links cause tensions among teachers regarding labelling, images, content and legitimacy.

For these reasons, instead of avoiding or de-emphasising these economic roots (which are described in research by Gibb (2002), Neck and Greene (2011) and Landström et al. (2012)), the intention in this thesis has been to address and investigate entrepreneurship as well as its possible constructs and investigate how the entrepreneurship strategy is operationalised in the public school setting. Thus, the overall aim is: to increase knowledge of and insight into how a business concept – entrepreneurship – is operationalised and constructed in a public context. As such the aim of this thesis include an interest in, and sustained focus upon, entrepreneurship as a traditional business concept. But additionally, how entrepreneurship forms part of a development through which it is operationalised in societal contexts other than business ones i.e. as a societal phenomenon (e.g. Steyaert & Hjorth, 2003; Steyaert & Katz, 2004; Berglund et al., 2012).

The empirical context for the thesis is the public school setting. In regard to the aim, the objective was to explore, document and analyse how entrepreneurship is operationalised in Swedish public schools, through a search for what happens when entrepreneurship is operationalised, its constructs and how the process evolves. Furthermore, the thesis tries to cover the whole educational system from teachers’ perspectives – what they talk about and do when working with entrepreneurship in their educational settings. How the entrepreneurship strategy develops and is operationalised in the educational practice has been investigated also by studying: the steering documents, a stimulus initiative from the Swedish National Agency for Education and by comparing strategy content with strategy process in practice.

Two interrelated research questions were presented. In the remainder of this section, there will be a brief presentation of the findings relating to these questions. This represents my answer to the research questions. For a more thorough description of the findings, please see Chapter 4.

The first question was ‘*How is entrepreneurship constructed in the school setting?*’ Focus is therefore on what happens in practice and it helps build an understanding of teachers’ current constructs of the entrepreneurship concept; what they talk about and actually do regarding entrepreneurship in their work. The studies A-B, C-D, covered teachers’ perspectives on entrepreneurship in
their specific school settings (from pre-school to university) and, specifically through Study C, over a period of time.

Describing the findings helps clarify their contribution. Firstly, from the empirical studies it was possible to perceive that the preschool teachers and teachers generally avoided talking about entrepreneurship as a business-related concept, referring instead to entrepreneurship as entrepreneurial learning. There are exceptions, mainly from the upper secondary school. As Johansson et al. noticed as early as 1997, entrepreneurship became more business-oriented the further up it was in the educational system. From the studies in the thesis, the teachers seem unfamiliar, and at times even uncomfortable, with the entrepreneurship concept. This strengthens similar findings in previous research by such researchers as Mühlenbock (2004), Komulainen et al. (2011) and Neck and Greene (2011). Moreover, research from Neck & Greene (2011), Leffler (2012) and Gill (2014) suggests that some of the reasons for this reluctance include teachers’ perceived association of entrepreneurship with individualism, greediness, competition or stereotypes; positioning the entrepreneur as a white middle-aged man.

Perhaps the teachers add the word ‘learning’ to entrepreneurship with the intention of bringing entrepreneurship closer to their own practical setting (education and learning). However, this can be misleading to other sections of society, because among the general public, entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning is still linked with business. This confusion is also applicable to research, since entrepreneurial learning traditionally is yet another form of business-related entrepreneurship, concerned with how business entrepreneurs learn within small and medium-sized companies (see for instance Deakins & Freel, 1998; Minniti & Bygrave, 2001; Cope & Watts, 2000; Rae, 2000; Cope, 2005; Politis, 2005). However, as I have come to understand entrepreneurial learning from my studies within the public school setting, it relates to the methods used within education when teaching entrepreneurship (in accordance with the teachers’ interpretation).

Secondly, a tentative conceptual model of entrepreneurial learning was formulated based on the findings of this thesis. This is built mainly on what Swedish compulsory school teachers and preschool teachers brought to the empirical studies in this thesis, what they believe to be the key content, prerequisites for creating a supportive entrepreneurial learning situation and perceived effects of working with it. Although researchers have discussed some aspects of different labels and content of entrepreneurship in schools (e.g. Leffler, 2009; Komulainen et al., 2011; Korhonen et al., 2012), this model can help deepen the understanding of entrepreneurial learning. It adds to Otterborg’s (2011) research which includes a definition of entrepreneurial learning from the upper secondary level setting by including other educational settings. Another difference to Otterborgs (2011) definition is that in this conceptual model broadens, also including the society. Taking a social constructionism approach, no single specific model can possibly answer everyone’s needs; the
content and constructs must be developed in the specific context. The purpose of presenting this tentative conceptual model of entrepreneurial learning is more for reflection purposes; food for thought. The model is based upon findings from discussions of labels and content in different school settings. It can contribute to local discussions on school practice; whether staff agree with the proposal in this thesis to view entrepreneurial learning as a method and what they consider to be important content and pedagogy. It can also be helpful in future development work, if the aim is to fulfil the main ideas of the strategy and form, from what my research has indicated, the hitherto undeveloped common thread throughout the education system. In that case, the educational levels need to (at least on an overarching level) agree what to focus on at which level and how this entrepreneurship content will be linked so as to create a progression.

Thirdly, the findings of my research also show that, among teachers, the entrepreneurial learning method is linked to a perceived purpose, or mission, involving entrepreneurship in the school setting. This is formulated as a way of working (with entrepreneurial learning) that will help pupils achieve an entrepreneurial approach. Preschool teachers and teachers express the approach is intended to be useful during education, afterwards as lifelong learners and in their future careers and day-to-day lives. It therefore goes beyond the school environment and becomes embedded in people’s lives. As an approach, it is not just a casual tool for occasional use; it is a 24/7 life approach. It goes to the very core of a person’s development as a human being. This is more in keeping with Sarasvathy and Ventkatamaran’s (2011) research, in which they conceptualise entrepreneurship as a general method of human development.

Through this development, I argue that the two competing discourses of entrepreneurship within the school context - the entrepreneurship and the enterprising discourses, as discussed previously, as proposed and discussed by such scholars as Gibb (2002), Erkkilä (2000), Leffler (2009) and Komulainen et al. (2011) -, are challenged and superseded by this another, even broader entrepreneurial approach. This approach as the two predecessors also relates to learning and education, but has an even broader content and purpose.

The preschool teachers and teachers in my studies seemed to agree, even advocate, the importance of helping pupils become entrepreneurial people equipped with certain entrepreneurial skills to make them fulfilled and useful future citizens. However, inspired by notions of societal entrepreneurship and adding the findings of this thesis (that teachers want to use entrepreneurial learning methods to teach their students an entrepreneurial approach for much broader purposes than business and national economic growth, such as personal fulfilment and democratic development), I suggest there is a need to discuss and perhaps develop a definition of the ‘enterprising self 2.0’. The societal challenges which this newer edition of the enterprising self should solve are not always (or not always entirely) economic. Even with today’s
business concepts and companies, societal and social entrepreneurship coexist with other goals and purposes, even non-profit ones. In this context, the enterprising self as a solely economic subject is thus obsolete.

From a theoretical perspective, these findings could be seen as contributing to the discussion on societal entrepreneurship, as made by such scholars as Hjorth and Steyaert, (2004), Johannisson (2010), Berglund et al. (2012) and Hjorth (2012). The findings may add knowledge to what happens when entrepreneurship enters new societal contexts, in this thesis specifically from the public school setting. Moreover, based on the above findings, I argue that this drives a need to revitalise the discussion on enterprising selves as introduced by Rose (1992) and Peters (2001). The literature on the enterprising self is linked to the kind of society we are aiming for and how individual responsibility is stated in relation to the government. In Dean’s (1999) words, the idea is based on a need to create entrepreneurial citizens. These enterprising selves could be described as people who want to make an enterprise out of their lives (du Gay, 1991). Even so, as described by Bührmann (2005) and Brunila and Siivonen (2014), their main purpose is to become useful to the national economic interests. By extension, even if making an enterprise of their lives and being happy whilst doing so, the enterprising selves equipped with entrepreneurial competencies will contribute to the rise of a successful nation in terms of prosperity and growth. But with a broader view of the enterprising self, and for what purposes he or she is driven by, a revitalised discussion could be justified.

To summarise this section, based on the empirical findings on how entrepreneurship is constructed in the school setting, it seems the teachers do not make extensive use of the business concept of entrepreneurship. They construct a newer concept instead: entrepreneurial learning. I have identified this as a working method, including certain content and prerequisites for conducting a supportive entrepreneurial learning situation. This is perceived as to enhance pupils’ motivation and develop teachers’ teaching methods. The purpose of working in this way is to help pupils adopt an entrepreneurial approach which by the preschool teachers and teachers is considered necessary to their future lives; constantly, wherever they may be.

The second research question was ‘How is entrepreneurship strategy operationalised in the school setting?’ To answer this, firstly I studied the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) and the subsequent inclusion of entrepreneurship in the various national curricula. I also studied the operationalisation process by investigating a governmental technology (or activity) that was used to help implement the strategy (or programme); comparing the correlation between strategy content and strategy processes in practice. Therefore, this thesis contributes with insights
on how the entrepreneurship strategy develops and is being operationalised in the school setting.

The empirical studies in this thesis revealed a discrepancy between strategy and school practice among teachers involved in my studies. The Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009), here considered a program, is in this thesis viewed as consisting of three main ideas: (1) self-employment must become as natural as becoming an employee, (2) the importance of practicing entrepreneurial skills, and (3) entrepreneurship should be a common thread throughout the education system. The empirical studies showed that the teachers with the help of a technology (a competence development initiative) altered this incorporated content in their day-to-day work.

The teachers were stretching the intentions of the strategy and altering the content by reducing the focus on the main clause: a focus on self-employment. Instead, they highlighted other subordinate clauses that they deemed more appropriate, given their view of their role and assignment. This involved reducing the emphasis on business entrepreneurship in favour of a much broader perspective; the entrepreneurial approach. Moreover, the skills being taught were chosen to suit this approach, with the emphasis more on broader skills for a broader purpose. In both strategy and practice the focus has been on practicing entrepreneurial skills. In the written strategy however, the business entrepreneurs serve as the role models for what necessary practical skills to gain. The by the government stressed common thread, has not been developed. As such, I argue, the teachers seems to change the practical outcome of the strategy.

Secondly, aided by the concepts of strategy content and process (Petigrew, 1987; Johnson et al. (2007) and their relationship, I argue that a way of understanding this development can be achieved by using research on strategising (see e.g. Johnson et al., 2003; Whittington, 2006; Jarzabkowski et al., 2007; Spee & Jarzabkowski, 2011). This is an activity-based view of strategy, focusing on humans and what they do. Strategy is viewed as something that is developed in everyday actions, interactions and negotiations at all levels of an organisation and not just among senior management activities.

From a theoretical perspective, my empirical findings thus contribute to the research on strategising in the public sector. A number of studies explore the application of strategic management in public organisations (see e.g. Koteen, 1997; Drumaux & Goethals, 2007; Düren, 2010; Rosenberg Hansen, 2011; Favoreu et al., 2015). They even explicitly suggest future practice-orientated approaches to public strategic management (Bryson et al., 2010). However, according to Höglund (2015), to date there have been very few studies on how this is actually applied in strategising activities. Thus, this research makes an explicit contribution by highlighting the lack of understanding (indicated by such scholars as Jarzabkowski et al. (2007), Johnson et al. (2007), and
Höglund (2015)) as to what strategising involves and how day-to-day activities, interpretations and constructs among practitioners affect and relate to strategic outcomes in practice in the public sector.

In the defence of qualified teachers (and as described by Fayoylle (2013) and Seikkula-Leino et al. (2015)), those responsible for teaching entrepreneurship do not generally have any formal training in, or practical experience of, entrepreneurship. The Swedish National Agency for Education’s competence development activity, mainly discussed in empirical Study C, is a way to address this challenge. The need is urgent, but due to financial constraints, additional duties and changes to their public service agreement (cf. Ministry of Education, 2013), the Agency’s efforts (if politicians are sincere about including entrepreneurship in education) are by no means adequate.

Additionally, for the future progression of entrepreneurship (whether this means continuing on the current path chosen by teachers or a return to the intentions as written in the strategy), a focus on the students in teacher training programmes is called for. In Sweden though, a development where entrepreneurship is included here is still in its early stages. Although more than 20 HEIs offer teacher training, a recent survey by Leffler and Svedberg (2013) showed that most had neither activities nor planned activities linked to entrepreneurship in their teacher training programmes. Still, empirical Study E in this thesis investigates one of the few novel initiatives in Sweden that does. An interesting finding in Study E is that, in their teaching, those on the teacher training programme had been influenced by past research from scholars such as Backström-Widjeskog (2008), Komulainen et al. (2011), Korhonen et al. (2012), Falk Lundqvist et al. (2014) and Leffler (2014). In their research challenges with business entrepreneurship are suggested, and it is proposed that teachers are reluctant to, or dislike, business entrepreneurship. The teachers in Study E therefore also avoid the business connotations so as not to create unnecessary obstacles in relating to their students. However, the findings of this thesis suggest that this might be based on a misunderstanding. According to the findings of Study E, the majority of trainee teachers are positive towards business entrepreneurship and do not perceive teaching entrepreneurship as strange or discordant with education and their role as educators. Thus, the teachers may be needlessly bypassing the business concept of entrepreneurship. Moreover, by focusing on the broader aspects of entrepreneurship (as in entrepreneurial learning methods and attaining an entrepreneurial approach), they reinforce the preconceptions of qualified teachers. This means they are hindering the opportunity to reclaim the intentions of the strategy as written (if this is the desired change of direction). Thus, if politicians want to change this development, trainee teachers need to be approached and equipped for it.

To summarise the findings in relation to research question 2, it has been suggested that, aided by a technology (a competence development initiative) from
the Swedish National Agency for Education, teachers are changing and stretching the intentions of the programme (the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009)). A way of understanding this development has been developed which involves comparing strategy content and strategy process. The findings show signs of strategising among teachers in the public school setting.

5.2 Discussing possible implications on an overarching level

In the previous section, I discussed the findings in relation to the research questions. This section (although still related to the research questions) considers the development of entrepreneurship in the school setting from a more comprehensive perspective related to the aim. In this thesis, an overarching viewpoint is that whilst the launch of the strategy affects qualified teachers and pupils in schools, it also means that the government (by placing a strategy of entrepreneurship in a public educational context) has introduced a traditional business concept into a non-business context.

Based on the findings of this thesis, such an informed governmental project affects teachers as well as students in their everyday teaching and learning environments and, in the long term, possibly also their everyday lives, if one considers what has been written about societal entrepreneurship (e.g. Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004; Johannisson, 2010; Berglund et al., 2012; Hjorth, 2012).

The emphasis below will be on some aspects from this development, which are highlighted on both the individual (micro) and societal (macro) levels. These are packaged as two subsections suggesting tensions or perhaps unintended consequences of the development: 1) consequences of introducing a business concept into a public context on a societal level and 2) individual choice versus massive inclusion.

5.2.1 Consequences of introducing a business concept into a public context on a societal level

In recent years, the public, cross-party political and media view of the entrepreneur seems to have changed from one of a greedy egotist preying on others to someone hailed as an important creative contributor to (and in) society, perhaps even as a hero or saviour, who solves a long list of societal challenges. This opens the way to a more positive attitude towards matters of entrepreneurship being included in other societal contexts such as education. Simulta-
neously, entrepreneurship in education has exploded (Kuratko, 2005; Johansen & Shanke, 2013). In this thesis, this development has been viewed as embedded in the discussion on the development of societal entrepreneurship (Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004; Johannisson, 2010; Berglund et al., 2012; Hjorth, 2012; Höglund, 2015) and has been interpreted as entrepreneurship that appears in new and different public contexts. The introduction of entrepreneurship into public organisations has also been discussed among scholars within the field of New Public Management (e.g. Ferlie et al., 1996; Hood, 1991). In order to streamline and enhance efficiency and performance whilst reduce costs, the public arena has looked towards the private sector for solutions. Thus traditional business-like concepts, such as strategy and entrepreneurship have entered the public administration context. Since it is a rather new development, Andrews and Van de Walle (2013), and Rosenberg Hansen and Ferlie (2016) emphasise the importance of more research into entrepreneurship in the public sector. As they observe, hardly any studies have been conducted within this area. However, there are a few studies by Drumaux and Goethals (2007) and Luke et al. (2011).

This ongoing evolution in which society is also expected to be innovative and entrepreneurial, is what Morales et al. (2014) describe as the ‘third wave’ of neoliberal governmentality of state privatisation, following the first two waves of deregulation and New Public Management. This third wave includes a development in which members of central governments and civil servants are increasingly allowed to think and act like business entrepreneurs. Since the Swedish school system is politically governed and funded by public taxes, the context is here considered public. I will therefore mainly discuss two aspects which might produce tensions or unintended consequences when entrepreneurship is introduced in a public context. One lies in the nature of public administration and the other concerns the role of the teacher as a public employee. These are related and intertwined.

Let us first reflect on a possible tension in relation to the role of the teachers as public employees. As the analysis of the studies in Chapter 4 suggests, what has happened in practice differs from what was intended in the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Governmental Offices of Sweden, 2009), such as focusing on entrepreneurial learning in order to develop an entrepreneurial approach, rather than on the business concept of entrepreneurship.

It would be easy to level criticism at teachers for not following their instructions. However, taking a social constructionism perspective - as well as the way in which I have come to view the development of entrepreneurship in schools -, this can be understood as teachers being entrepreneurial themselves. Their constructs and behaviour are in line with the entrepreneurial working methods they use in their teaching, and the entrepreneurial approach for which
they are aiming. Furthermore, as understood with the aid of research on strategising (see e.g. Johnson et al., 2003; Whittington, 2006; Jarzabkowski et al., 2007; Floyd et al., 2011; Spee & Jarzabkowski, 2011), the teachers changed the content of the strategy and seemed to have felt empowered and free to do as they wished. They deemed this to be appropriate based on their own view of the task and consistent with their assignment as teachers. Thus, the empirics show that the teachers do not accept being reduced to objects, or ‘agents’ to use Mulgan’s (2009) term. Rather, it shows they are behaving as active subjects who rely on having experience, knowledge and opinions of their own. This is important since, as this thesis shows, what they construct and what they do affects the operationalisation of entrepreneurship in relation to the strategy. Furthermore, regarding what is written in the curricula, a concern voiced in Sharma and Anderson’s (2007) research states that teachers strongly affect how, and to what extent, the curriculum is implemented.

From one point of view, this cannot be criticised. If teachers are supposed to be entrepreneurial employees, they probably will. When transferring and selling a privately originated concept (such as entrepreneurship) in a public context, things will happen and, since this concerns humans and not machines, one cannot possibly pinpoint the exact outcome with any accuracy. Thus, when implementing the entrepreneurial drive in the public school setting, the development as described in the empirical findings in Chapter 4, can take place. One could also argue that, as claimed by Fayolle (2013) and Seikkula-Leino et al. (2015), with the great majority of teachers lacking formal education or practical experience in entrepreneurship, what else can they do but develop a content and purpose which comes naturally to them. Furthermore, at the heart of entrepreneurship education lies a transformative, progressive approach which encourages a system of trial-and-error learning and teaching (e.g. Dewey, 1916; Kolb, 1984; Hattie, 2009; 2013). The pupils’ transformation in acquiring an entrepreneurial approach includes entrepreneurial learning in which they mix theoretical insight with practical attempts. The individual’s growth is part of their education and the aim is personal development and, using Dweck’s (2012) phraseology, to ‘change the individual’s mindset’. However, this transformation is not exclusive to the pupils. As found in the empirical studies in this thesis, many of the teachers also perceived they have changed, both as individuals and in their professional lives. Thus, entrepreneurship education in the school environment seems to be about transforming the transformer (as in both teachers and pupils) in their future lives and actions. Again, who can complain about this? In this regard we get what we asked for: an entrepreneurial development by entrepreneurial employees.

However, in relation to the public workplace, questions arise at the same time regarding boundaries and degrees of freedom. For instance, how entrepreneurial can a civil servant be? The question is whether teachers, as public employees, can do whatever they want. Starting with this line of thought, we begin with the possible consequences of strategising (see e.g. Johnson et al.,
2003; Whittington, 2006; Jarzabkowski et al. 2007; Floyd et al., 2011; Spee & Jarzabkowski, 2011) in relation to a politically-driven launched strategy. When public sector employees are strategising, they are in fact changing the ideas, content and practical outcome of the strategy (which the findings and analysis of studies in this thesis also show). What do different stakeholders think of that? Is it OK with politicians? Does this please the people who vote for a particular political party; whose ideas and ideologies in turn underpin the strategy’s content? Is it not likely that these voters’ expectations are that civil servants should deliver according to the electorate’s wishes?

The development described in this thesis, that entrepreneurship is evolving into something else, supports the idea of Morales et al. (2014) that public servants today should act and think as entrepreneurs. But it also presents certain challenges within this Swedish publicly public sector. There is a built-in tension between entrepreneurial behaviour and public sector bureaucracy. Many public organisations today say they want to hire enterprising and innovative people. In their job advertisements, instead of highlighting bureaucratic skills and proper, predictable work, they say they want to hire people who ‘think outside the box’. In other words, employees with different expectations regarding levels of freedom and manoeuvrability are entering the public sector. Nevertheless, this is building a tension within public sector entities between the entrepreneurial and the bureaucratic view. Having civil servants behave entrepreneurially as well as actively strategising is somewhat contradictory to bureaucracy and the implementation of politically generated laws, regulations and strategies in the public sector. Immaturity and inexperience in handling this contradiction can cause uncertainty (Mulgan, 2009). At the same time, since researchers are suggesting that the existence of strategising is inevitable and not optional (e.g. Johnson et al., 2003; Whittington, 2006; Jarzabkowski et al., 2007), this needs to be factored in by politicians and the governmental apparatus responsible for introducing and operationalising national strategies. Moreover, it presents a challenge to the senior management level who believe they are making and governing the strategy; what becomes of a strategising perspective and their actual role in this kind of work?

This thesis does not offer a formula to solve this challenge. Even so, one insight from the findings in this thesis is that, if there is a wish for the practical content to come closer to the intentions as written, then strategising in public contexts must first be acknowledged. Furthermore, management needs to understand that strategising means that strategy work is an ongoing process and not a single-use quick fix that affects the outline and operationalisation process. Thus a cautious suggestion for the future is to take a bottom-up perspective and include rank and file employees in drafting new strategies. New ways must also be found to follow up the process more thoroughly and stay closer to human actions and interactions during the process. Based on the findings of
the empirical studies, teachers are requesting more entrepreneurship education, both with a broader and narrower, business perspective. This means they are given possibilities to discuss the strategy with management and colleagues, looking at what it means in school practice. Lastly, we need to remember that change takes time, and governments as well as management need to be persistent and patient.

This discussion on the role of teachers as public employees relates to the second tension that lies in the nature of Swedish public administration, since strategising is assigning the individual employee more power over the organisation’s long-term development. When public sector employees are strategising, it is possible these practitioners in the prolongation will ultimately change the nature of how the Swedish public sector works. Some of the common values which supposedly inform public organisations include the principle of equal treatment, democracy and transparency. Again, the average citizen probably assumes that what is going on within public authorities and public bodies is what has been stated in official strategies and mandates, and that these can be retrieved and read by any citizen under the principle of public access to official records. However, bearing in mind what we know about strategising and the development towards making public employees more entrepreneurial and innovative, is this behaviour consistent with public administration values? It can be argued that it is not that much of a problem when publicly employed teachers do something other than what was originally intended regarding entrepreneurship in the school setting. On the other hand, what happens, for instance, to the right to equal education? Also, what happens to thinking beyond the issue of entrepreneurship in education? What happens if we transfer this way of reasoning into other public contexts, such as healthcare or social services, bearing in mind such things as legal certainty or objectivity? At this point, some of the characteristics of entrepreneurial behaviour, driven by introducing a business concept in a public context, may not sit too well with traditional public sector characteristics.

5.2.2 Individual choice versus massive inclusion.

The teachers interviewed in the empirical studies in this thesis were almost exclusively positive towards entrepreneurial learning and the entrepreneurial approach. There were almost no signs of discussions or reflections on the potential risks, or of the less fortunate aspects. I found this surprising.

It could be argued that working with entrepreneurial learning to build an entrepreneurial approach has similarities with notions of the enterprising self (Rose, 1992; Peters, 2001) and the political needs of entrepreneurial citizens (Dean, 1999; Johannisson, 2010). For instance, there are similarities to the view of enterprising selves as self-responsible, accepting responsibility for
oneself and one’s actions (du Gay et al., 1996/2005) whilst also being enterprising, flexible, active and so on (Rose, 1992). But ultimately, the underlying expectation is still that the enterprising self, content in its own self-guidance, will contribute to the rise of a successful, prosperous and fruitful nation whilst making its own life into a venture (e.g. Rose, 1992; Peters, 2001). As proposed by Dahlstedt and Hertzberg (2012), entrepreneurial education can thus be viewed as a particular form of governmentality in which students are connected to market rationalities and should be fostered in accordance with this. The current regimes of truth, as discussed by Popkewitz and Brennan (1997), lead pupils in the school setting to self-regulate to try to fit into the prevailing norm. Therefore, as Dahlstedt and Hertzberg (2012) claim, in today’s society, the school is an important context in which this moulding takes place.

As suggested by scholars such as Kyrö and Carrier (2005) and Komulainen et al. (2011), in entrepreneurship education, focusing on pedagogical aspects means exercising the necessary skills to make pupils become innovative, flexible, co-operative and competitive. In doing so, the teaching methods need to involve problem-solving, vocational skills, cooperation, creativity and risk-taking, opportunity recognition and opportunity creation. Otterborg (2011) also emphasises initiative and becoming brave, breaking patterns and resisting collective action. However, as this thesis’ empirical findings show, the economic links and goals are de-emphasised and the focus is instead on creating citizens who have an entrepreneurial approach. The teachers’ perception of the purpose of an entrepreneurial approach is not about becoming an economic contributor, but becoming a driving, lifelong learner with an adaptable attitude and actively contributing to society at large and in non-business contexts and democratic development. It should also be used in every aspect of life including studies, working life and private life. From the empirical material, such as empirical Studies A, C and D, there are what I perceive to be uncritical expressions of expectations on the part of teachers that all pupils should be responsible for instance to ‘develop their best self for the future’. On the one hand, this is described by teachers as an opportunity; an opportunity for pupils to build their self-esteem and confidence so that they can follow their own paths and dreams. Conversely, there are no reflections or considerations about whether this approach fits all pupils. Achieving an entrepreneurial approach is thus presented as positive and obtainable for everyone in the same way, which is described by Ainsworth and Hardy (2008), as the discussion on becoming an enterprising self. Further, since the entrepreneurial approach seems so all embracing, it seems almost unavoidable and overwhelming as far as the individual is concerned.

Against this background, this raises two main tensions, and many subsequent questions. Firstly, what if the pupils’ dreams and wishes are not heading in the same direction as society’s needs, in this case what the strategy and in
some respects, the national curriculum are pushing? Can one contrast the talent hunt and fostering of useful citizens with personal development, ‘free’ dreams and self-fulfilment? If so, then which of the two views – the individual’s dreams or the societal needs of enterprising people – are actually the overriding concern? Is it possible to refuse? As indicated, even if teachers try to loosen the link to business, if (which probably is the case within government and politics) it is still related to an underlying economic motif then there is a built-in tension in the individual freedom of choice and the market economic forces in today’s society.

This tension further enhances du Gay’s (1995) discussion of the risk of marginalisation and exclusion; of people not actually able or willing to behave in this entrepreneurial way. Certainly, entrepreneurial learning and the entrepreneurial approach stimulate active participation among pupils when they have an opportunity to influence their work; this may be seen as a tool of participation and democracy. At the same time, the main ideas in the entrepreneurial approach entail, just as the thoughts on enterprising selves, a substantial transfer of responsibility to the individual (see e.g. du Gay et al., 1996/2005; Korhonen et al., 2012; Brunila & Siivonen, 2014). They need to become successful, driven, active, resourceful and relevant since, as pointed out by Vandenbroeck (2007), they bear the responsibility of being employable and committed to life-long learning. The focus on being responsible also shines through in the empirical material from, say, Studies A, C and D. In the teachers’ descriptions of their task, they often refer to their role as fostering pupils to become responsible, both as learners and future citizens. However, the teachers’ focus on success and on becoming ones best for the future and keeping relevant, may be a risky path. As Berglund (2013) suggests, continuously being encouraged to do better and always striving to become one’s best, can create a negative sense of inadequacy and incompetence among pupils.

Secondly, another tension is related to the fact that the entrepreneurial approach, is supposed to include everybody - all teachers and pupils. In this respect, it challenges the traditional image of the entrepreneur and thereby what constitutes an entrepreneurial being. For instance, traditionally, entrepreneurship and being a successful entrepreneur is about ‘he winner takes all’; it is about individualism, commercialisation and competition which, in some respects, contrasts with Swedish public education as more inclusive, formed by ideals of equal education, collective forms of peer learning and where every child is to be helped to reach the educational goals.

I agree with Berglund (2013) and Gill (2014), that the prevailing image of an entrepreneur is still strongly connected to the middle or upper classes and in particular to white, middle-aged men. Drawing upon previous research on gender and entrepreneurship, Leffler (2012, p.37) states that ‘entrepreneurship is an extremely gender-impregnated construction’. Similarly, Korhonen et al. (2012) argue that previous research in entrepreneurship has shown that the ideal individual qualities and skills of an entrepreneur, such as being active,
competitive, independent and willing to take risks, has historically set an invisible norm which justified masculine, middle-class values as bases for entrepreneurship and thus excluded other values and other classes.

Since this development is so new, we cannot say how it will develop with the entrepreneurial approach. Teachers in the empirical studies within this research see a possibility that the new work procedures and teaching methods of entrepreneurial learning will open up the classroom in scope and scale. It offers many choices in how to learn and reveal what you have learnt which, according to the teachers, will suit more pupils. But how the entrepreneurial learning approach will develop in relation to issues such as gender, ethnicity or age is still a blank canvas. In-school practice and future research will reveal if this approach will fall into the same traditional pit and marginalise the same groups, or sections of groups, in the way that traditional entrepreneurship did, or whether it will help include additional groups which, over time, will challenge and change the traditional images.

5.3 Research contribution

Based on this author’s interest, the research premise and its conduct, this thesis aims to contribute to research as well as practice. The contribution of the research will thus be presented below as two subsections: scientific and practical contributions.

5.3.1 Scientific contribution

The overall aim of this research is to increase knowledge and gain insight into how a business concept – entrepreneurship – is introduced and constructed in a public context. This was approached by conducting five empirical studies investigating what happens in practice and by searching for the teachers’ constructs of entrepreneurship in the school setting and how an entrepreneurship strategy is operationalised (as described in the methods sections in Chapter 2 and in the findings and analysis in Chapter 4).

This thesis contributes to scientific discussions on societal entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship education and strategy and strategising in a public context.

I begin with discussing my research in relation to societal entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education. Given its empirical context and starting point, my research adds knowledge and insights on entrepreneurship as a societal phenomenon. It focuses upon and deepens the understanding of how entrepreneurship is constructed in the specific societal context of this thesis – the Swedish public school setting. My findings show that the teachers mostly avoid
the traditional concept of entrepreneurship, as originally related to business. Instead they refer to their work as ‘entrepreneurial learning’ (as argued in this thesis, it concerns the methods or pedagogical aspects used when teaching entrepreneurship). The teachers soften the business link by changing the concept entrepreneurship by adding the word ‘learning’. Also by filling entrepreneurial learning with content that is more in keeping with their view of their task and role as educators in general.

As I have come to understand them, the empirical findings also demonstrate that the purpose of working with entrepreneurial learning is to help pupils develop a life-long, all-encompassing entrepreneurial approach. Viewing entrepreneurship through his approach, which is to be useful and spreads and turns up in all sections of society and not exclusively in business, means it can be perceived as a societal phenomenon, similar to the research discussions within societal entrepreneurship, in which entrepreneurship has spread to the whole society (see e.g. Steyaert & Hjorth, 2003; Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004; Berglund et al., 2012; Hjorth, 2012; Höglund, 2015).

Accordingly, the entrepreneurial approach challenges the two prevailing discourses within entrepreneurship education – the entrepreneurship and enterprising discourses (cf. Leffler, 2009; Komulainen et al., 2011) – and becomes an even broader approach in purpose, scope and scale. Due to this development, I propose revisiting and discussing the concept of the enterprising self (cf. Rose, 1992; Peters, 2001) to investigate and develop a definition of the ‘enterprising self 2.0’; one better suited to the entrepreneurial approach and notions of societal entrepreneurship.

The research also contributes to the field of entrepreneurship education. Amongst other things, it responds to the need, as expressed by researchers such as Fayolle (2013), for still further insights into what teachers actually do when teaching entrepreneurship, an area in which according to Fayolle, we still lack knowledge on key educational and didactic issues. The contribution of this thesis has been made by conducting empirical research which seeks to clarify what has happened, on specific school levels and over time since the launch of the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education in 2009 (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009). Thus, a contribution lies in researching entrepreneurship education in levels of education other than, as claimed by Byrne et al. (2014), the well-researched university context. Accordingly, this thesis offers specific studies from preschool and comprehensive school levels.

This thesis also affords an opportunity to cover voices from the entire Swedish public educational spectrum, as it includes studies which run from preschool to adult education. Furthermore, there is a specific contribution in the development of a conceptual model of entrepreneurial learning in the school setting. An embryonic version of the model, built on the empirical Study A, was presented in paper 1, then extended and bolstered by findings from Study
B and C. In conducting Study D, it was also possible to cross-analyse some of these findings. The model needs further development and elaboration, but since a common definition of entrepreneurship on this level of education is lacking, the model offers a basis for future discussions in this context regarding labels and the content of entrepreneurship in public education.

Additionally, according to Pittaway and Edwards (2012), entrepreneurship education research at university level focuses mainly on business or engineering programmes. Thus, by its inclusion in this thesis (in response to a request by such scholars as Mäkimurto-Koivumaa and Belt (2016)) an empirical study and insights from the teacher training programme adds insights from a non-business university context.

By working on research question 2, investigating how entrepreneurship strategy is being operationalised in the school setting, the research also contributes to another prevalent research discussion on strategy and strategising, as discussed by such scholars as Johnson et al. (2003), Jarzabkowski et al. (2007), Johnson et al. (2007) and Höglund (2015). The research enhances the understanding of how strategy work actually develops through strategising activities. This thesis add to their insights on what strategising involves and how day-to-day activities, conducted by practitioners on a micro level, relate to strategy on a macro level, as well as how strategising affects strategic outcomes in the public sector practice. Accordingly, given the empirical context of the thesis, it contributes with qualitative empirical studies and micro-level perspectives from a public context; all approaches which - as claimed by researchers such as Sundin and Tillmar (2008), Luke et al. (2011) and Höglund (2015) - are not as researched within traditional strategic management research focusing on private companies, theoretical perspectives and the macro-level.

5.3.2 Practical contribution:
My hope is that this thesis will also contribute to the development and discussion of entrepreneurship within school practice. This approach is supported by the co-producing environment of the university, in which the Ph.D. studies are conducted. However, as presented in the Method chapter, the research does not make any generalisations, nor does it offer any universal recipes. Amongst active teachers, the findings can serve as food for thought and open up discussions on such aspects as their own constructs, labelling and content, as related to the Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) and curriculum (The Swedish National Agency for Education, 2010; 2011a; 2012; 2013). The tentative conceptual model may also serve as a helpful example to react to and reflect upon. The discrepancy found between strategy and practice might be discussed; how, and whether, it
needs any adjustment as to direction and content and how to develop the practically invisible common thread between the educational levels. Moreover, regarding entrepreneurship education, there is still work to be done developing it in teacher training programmes. A specific insight to consider is how teachers respond to the fact that trainee teachers, in contrast to qualified ones, seem more open to include the business aspects of entrepreneurship in their future profession.

Furthermore, I believe that teachers could benefit from the critical discussion on the tensions or potential unintended consequences for the individual. From my perspective and based on what was discovered in the empirics, this might balance the somewhat uncritical attitude towards entrepreneurial learning and the entrepreneurial approach. I hope teachers will be challenged and inspired by my thoughts on how they might contribute to altering the basic foundations of public administration. Hopefully, they will also begin reflecting on how business-originated concepts are entering their public workspace and weigh up the expected entrepreneurial and bureaucratic aspects of their roles as public employees.

The hope is that this research can also contribute knowledge to politicians, senior management and civil servants in the public apparatus. The findings provided through strategising can be fruitful in helping people choose how to do similar strategy work in the future. Furthermore, as with the teachers, the findings and discussion on possible tensions and unintended consequences for individuals and society are worth considering. These findings and discussions may awaken an interest and a need to address the challenges and implications that come with introducing business concepts in different public contexts. Hopefully, they may awake reflection upon the imposition of a contradictory role on civil servants and how to implement and balance the entrepreneurial and bureaucratic aspects of public administration.

5.4 Quality and limitations

Although my ambition was that the aim and objectives (guided by the research questions) were fulfilled through the research that was conducted, I am aware that aspects such as the research design and methodological choices do influence the findings and conclusions. This will be elaborated upon in this section.

To recap, the research process has been explorative since the research field of entrepreneurship and the focus of this research are considered new and emerging fields. According to Short et al. (2010) and Jones et al. (2011), this could be seen as problematic since there is a lack of coherence, clear definitions or common methods upon which to build. On the other hand, in my perspective, this opens the way to necessary further research.
In order to be transparent in describing the research in this thesis, I have tried to articulate such matters as methods in a way that allows the reader to follow the basis upon which this research was conducted. I chose to conduct qualitative research, finding support in such scholars as Short et al. (2010), who state that a specific strength of entrepreneurship research lies in the richness of insights in such qualitative empirics as interviews. Also, since taking a social constructionism approach, the emphasis is on human beings and their constructs in social interaction. This further suggests that the researchers’ role is to enhance our understanding of this interplay (Steyaert, 1997; Drakopoulou Dodd & Anderson, 2007). Also, as a researcher, I form a part of the social construction of the questions, interview situations, interpretations and findings (Arbnor & Bjerke, 1994; Norén, 1995; Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009). This affected the research questions, design and methods (for a more thorough description, please see the Method chapter).

However, some limitations of my work are also inherent in these choices. Time constraints and matters of funding defined which and how many interviews and focus groups it was possible to include. The quality of research might probably have been strengthened if it had been possible to include more empirical material. However in contrast to, say, quantitative research, this approach of this research is not directed at statistical analyses or generalisations. I acknowledge the field of entrepreneurship as multidisciplinary and contextually dependent and side with Steyaert and Hjorth (2003) who believe that entrepreneurship should no longer be described as one entrepreneurship but many in terms of focus, definitions and scope. Thus, the research in this thesis contributes instead to understanding and gaining insights into the constructs of the entrepreneurship concept when it is introduced into other societal contexts.

These limitations, and the social constructionism approach, can be said to affect the practical applicability of the research findings. For instance, the tentative conceptual model cannot be seen as a recipe. Instead however, as stated previously, it contributes food for thought for both future research and as material for future development and discussions in the school practice. My conviction is that the positive aspects gained from the qualitative approach in relation to the aim and research questions (such as being able to come close to the people, search for their point of view, their motives and constructs and try to gain different and substantial nuances) outweighed the shortcomings. Even so, I had to be aware and try to continuously reflect upon how my interaction with the respondent might affect the dialogue and answers. Also, in the interviews I had to take what they said in that moment at face value. They would not necessarily describe or state the same thing at another point in time due to potential biases such as a selective memory or what they might suddenly think of at that specific moment. Being human, they may exaggerate one event, outcome or interpretation as more significant than another.
Related to this is the fact that my own preunderstanding and experience in the field was both a strength, in that, through my previous working experience I had gained access to empirical settings and understood the context, and a liability, because I could not look into this from a totally unspoiled perspective. Furthermore, when it comes to people interacting, as in interviews or focus group interviews, it is not possible to be totally objective and disconnected. Besides, matters of pre-understanding, such as language, interpretations, body language and space influence the situation.

To fulfil the aim and answer the research questions, this research used a broad theoretical base and multiple qualitative research methods. The combination of methods included semi-structured interviews, in-depth interviews using the stimulated recall method, focus group interviews, participative meetings, observations, document studies, digital questionnaires, written inquiries, analysing texts and critical incident questionnaires. This meant I was not able to develop as much experience in each and every method; something which might have improved the work. However, at the same time, a combination of methods might provide better answers to the research questions. From a personal standpoint, I also wanted to take the opportunity to try different things, which has hopefully helped me to develop as a researcher. Still another possible aspect relating to quality is being able to follow a specific empirical school level for a longer period of time in order to gain longitudinal data. However, drawing on material from different settings made it possible for me to see where the empirics and its findings intersected and showed similarities and disparities, which is described as a strength by Silverman (2010). Furthermore, although I feel sufficient time had passed since the launch of the specific Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) to make the studies in this research relevant, studying entrepreneurship in the school setting may benefit from recurring and longitudinal studies in the future. Education is a major organisational apparatus; trying to change things from within and following up and understanding what happens will take time.

Furthermore, the empirical settings developed through the various opportunities which opened up during my doctoral studies and associated research developed in a kind of snowball effect. This is not to imply that I simply seized any opportunity. It means that the empirics included in this thesis were my choice and how I came into contact with them may have affected the findings. For instance some of the settings were, or have recently been, included in development projects or education in entrepreneurship or entrepreneurial learning. This may have affected their perception of entrepreneurship in the school setting.

The studies have not been replicated as different studies suited different purposes in an attempt to fulfil the overriding aim and research questions.
However, they have overlaps in focus and some questions in the semi-structured interviews were repeated in other studies, making it possible to strengthen and compare findings through the different studies.

Due to the aim of this thesis I chose to investigate public schools, thus excluding private or organisational school entities. This was because I wanted to look into how a business concept was introduced in a public context and thus try to make the research more explicit in this respect. This is by no means implying a lack of importance regarding the study of other school entities, such as private ones.

5.5 Future work

There are many aspects of entrepreneurship in a school setting which might be considered relevant for future work. As pointed out, the business concept of entrepreneurship is rather new in the public educational system as a whole.

To begin with, more research on the development of entrepreneurship in the compulsory school milieu is needed. As stated in the previous section, this development is ongoing and not so many years have passed since the launch of the strategy (Government Offices of Sweden, 2009) and the subsequent changes in the curriculum. Thus, it would be fruitful to keep studying the development to see how it evolves. Additionally, longitudinal studies would be helpful in the following the operationalisation aspect more thoroughly over time. They could help show whether this inclusion within the compulsory school system, as well as in optional upper secondary school and adult education, will be temporary and transient or whether it will develop. What other constructs of entrepreneurship can be found? Will any of the constructs suggested in this thesis prevail, or are they reshaping to include the traditional business concept entrepreneurship once more, or even diminish its incidence?

More studies on the teacher training programme are necessary in order to make a comparison and see whether the findings of Study E can be found, or contrasted with other university teacher training programmes. It might also be interesting to follow the students in teacher training programmes to see how they handle their claimed gained insights and knowledge in their future professions.

The proposed conceptual model on entrepreneurial learning needs to be further developed and elaborated upon. The model suggests some effects of working with entrepreneurial learning. However, they are based on how the teachers perceive them. In this regard it would be fruitful, through further research, to investigate and see whether other teachers agree on these effects and to further develop how to follow up and, if possible, measure the effects of working with entrepreneurial learning and/or entrepreneurship in education.

Aspects not included in this thesis are a specific focus on management, even if some of these aspects were initially included in some of the studies, as...
in principals and preschool managers, and their role in this development. Neither has this research included the thoughts of pupils, except at the university level. Much more work is needed within this direction, incorporating more perspectives and gaining more insights from other important stakeholders in the inclusion of entrepreneurship in education.

Future research could also shed light on another important aspect; how and whether the possible consequences on both individual and societal levels brought up in the discussion section will develop and be addressed. The process of including business concepts in public institutions needs more research to gain insight into such things as how to balance the entrepreneurial and bureaucratic aspects in public administration contexts. Also, on how the findings regarding strategising in the public sector might change the way in which strategy work is conducted in public organisations and what roles of employees and management then become.
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