

Niina Sallinen & Pasi Juvonen (eds.)

LAB Innovations Annual Review 2021

The Publication Series of LAB University of Applied Sciences, part 28



LAB University of
Applied Sciences

Niina Sallinen & Pasi Juvonen (eds.)

LAB Innovations
Annual Review 2021



The Publication Series of LAB University of Applied Sciences, part 28

Editor-in-chief: Henri Karppinen

Technical reviewer: Riikka Sinisalo

Layout: Mainostoimisto SST Oy

ISSN 2670-1928 (PDF)

ISBN 978-951-827-377-9 (PDF)

Lahti, 2021



Contents

About the Authors	8
Pasi Juvonen Foreword: promoting innovation in the time of the COVID-19 pandemic	10
EXPERIMENTAL DEVELOPMENT ECOSYSTEMS FOR INNOVATIONS	11
Annukka Heinonen, Kaisa Kurkela, Meri Pulkkinen & Lotta-Maria Sinervo Towards a higher-quality participatory budgeting process through evaluation	12
Liliane Pintelon, Teresa de la Cruz, Ullamari Tuominen, Taina Vuorela, Piret Tamme & Mohamed Ouasghiri Learning environment experiences in the HELP project: different modes of delivery enable a variation of activities	24
RENEWING AND EVOLVING ENTREPRENEURSHIP	37
Heidi Myyryläinen & Anna Pajari Perspectives to social impact - social enterprises benefit from communicating the social value they produce	38
Heidi Myyryläinen Developing future-oriented education on social entrepreneurship	47
BUSINESS DESIGN AND THICK VALUE	54
Mervi Koistinen, Katerina Medkova, Anna Svartström, Carita Tanskanen, Kaisa Tuominen & Marjut Villanen More sustainable consumption through cooperation and pilot experiments	55

Olga Bogdanova Developing customer-oriented business concepts and models in culture and tourism sectors	70
NEW RADICAL INITIATIVES	84
Heidi Myyryläinen, Taina Vuorela & Anna Pajari Social entrepreneurial competences in higher education	85

About the authors

Olga Bogdanova, MBA, works at LAB University of Applied Sciences as a project manager at the EDUCRO project.

Teresa de la Cruz, Ph.D., is Project Manager at Zaragoza Logistics Center (ZLC).

Annikka Heinonen, Master of Business Administration (MBA), is RDI Specialist at LAB University of Applied Sciences and acts as a project manager in the EmPaci – Empowering Participatory Budgeting in the Baltic Sea Region project.

Pasi Juvonen, D.Sc. (Tech.), is RDI Director of Innovation Commercialization focus area at LAB University of Applied Sciences.

Mervi Koistinen, BA (Design), is RDI Specialist at LAB university of Applied Sciences and works in Askel – Co-developing services for sustainable living project.

Kaisa Kurkela, M.Soc. Sc., is Doctoral Researcher at Tampere University and acts as a project researcher in the EmPaci – Empowering Participatory Budgeting in the Baltic Sea Region project.

Katerina Medkova, M.Sc. (Metallurgy), M.Sc. (Urban Sustainability), MIB (International Business Management), B.Sc. (Env. Tech), is RDI Specialist at LAB University of Applied Sciences and acts as a communication manager in CECl project.

Heidi Myryläinen, M.Sc. (Econ. & Bus. Adm.) is RDI Specialist at LAB University of Applied Sciences and acts as project manager in iSEE – innovating social Entrepreneurship Education and SEinHE – Developing Social Entrepreneurial Skills in Higher Education projects.

Mohamed Ouasghiri, M.Sc., is Senior Lecturer and Researcher of Healthcare Logistics at Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences.

Anna Pajari, MA, M.Sc. (Bus. Adm. & Econ.) is Senior Lecturer at LAB University of Applied Sciences. Her specialization area is Corporate Social Responsibility. She works as a specialist for the iSEE – innovating Social Entrepreneurship Education and SEinHE – Developing Social Entrepreneurial Skills in Higher Education projects.

Liliane Pintelon, M.Sc. (Chem. Eng.), Ph.D., is Full Professor at the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Centre for Industrial Management of KU Leuven.

Meri Pulkkinen, M.Adm.Sc., is Research Assistant at Tampere University working in the EmPaci - Empowering Participatory Budgeting in the Baltic Sea Region project.

Lotta-Maria Sinervo, Dr.Adm.Sc., is University Lecturer and a Principal Investigator in the EmPaci – Empowering Participatory Budgeting in the Baltic Sea Region project at Tampere University.

Anna Svartström, MA (Creative Sustainability), is RDI Specialist at LAB University of Applied Sciences and acts as project planner in CECl project.

Piret Tamme, is Head of Department and Leading Lecturer at Tallinn Health Care College.

Carita Tanskanen, is RDI Specialist at LAB University of Applied Sciences, and works as project manager in Askel – Co-developing services for sustainable living.

Kaisa Tuominen, BBA, is RDI Specialist at LAB University of Applied Sciences, and acts as project manager in Maallemuuttajat 2030 project.

Ullamari Tuominen, M.Sc. (Econ.), is Senior Lecturer of logistics at the Faculty of Business and Hospitality Management at LAB University of Applied Sciences.

Marjut Villanen, M. Soc. Sc. is RDI Specialist at LAB University of Applied Sciences. She works as project manager in CECl and KESTI projects.

Taina Vuorela, Ph.D. (International Business Communication), Senior Lecturer at LAB University of Applied Sciences (until July 31 2021). She co-managed the HELP project and worked as an expert to SEinHE project – Developing Social Entrepreneurial Skills in Higher Education.

Foreword

Pasi Juvonen

Promoting innovation in the time of the COVID-19 pandemic

You have decided to get acquainted with the LAB Innovations Annual Review 2021. What a great choice! This review provides a comprehensive overview of activities, results and lessons learned in LAB University of Applied Sciences' projects of the Commercialisation of Innovations focus area. The articles are divided into four themes of the focus area:

- Experimental development ecosystems for innovations
- Renewing and evolving entrepreneurship
- Business design and thick value
- New radical initiatives

Articles have been received with delight on all themes. The year 2021 has been exceptional in many ways. We have learned to work amid the pandemic and otherwise cope with COVID-19. There have been glimpses of what the post-pandemic era will look like. Vaccination coverage is approaching a level where society can be opened up and restrictions

removed. The way we work and interact is about to change again. What has emerged in many discussions is that we have now been accustomed to teleworking but what about in the future? It will remain to be seen to what extent we will return to face-to-face interaction and whether we will set higher expectations of it.

Heartfelt thanks to all the authors of the articles who made this publication possible. I would like to thank RDI Specialist Niina Salinen for editorial work and LUT Academic Library Information Specialist Riikka Sinisalo for the technical review of the publication.

Wishing you all rewarding reading experiences with the LAB Innovations Annual Review.

24 September 2021

Pasi Juvonen, RDI Director
The Commercialisation of Innovations

EXPERIMENTAL DEVELOPMENT ECOSYSTEMS FOR INNOVATIONS

**Annukka Heinonen, Kaisa Kurkela, Meri Pulkkinen
& Lotta-Maria Sinervo**

Towards a higher-quality participatory budgeting process through evaluation

EMPACI - EMPOWERING PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING IN THE BALTIC SEA REGION	
Project period	1.1.2019-31.12.2021
Funding	Interreg Baltic Sea Region
LAB's role	Partner
Project website	www.empaci.eu www.lab.fi/empaci

Abstract

Participatory budgeting (PB) has proven popular in the Baltic Sea Region, but municipalities are at different stages of utilising it. Many are contemplating taking it up or piloting for the first time while some are more advanced, having already knowledge through previous processes. Key issues that interest municipalities, citizens, and stakeholders alike in PB are the results, impacts and outcomes of the process. Evaluating the impact of participatory budgeting or participation in general is challenging. However, factors such as an efficient, transparent, and equal process are recognised in literature as crucial points in ensuring the high quality of PB and thus the overall impact. Thus, this article focuses on process evaluation and offers an evaluation framework synthesised by the Finnish EmPaci partners, LAB University of Applied Sciences and Tampere University, that was used in the Finnish PB pilots for EmPaci in Lahti and Riihimäki. Lahti was at the time running their first city-level PB and Riihimäki their second and both cities are committed to continuing PB rounds in the future.

The many faces of participatory budgeting in municipalities

Municipalities in Finland and in the Baltic Sea Region have taken to participatory budgeting PB in recent years – in, for example, Finland it can be described as somewhat of a fashion as PB initiatives of different scales are set up in various types of municipalities throughout Finland. Legislation in Finland obliges citizen participation as such from municipalities but leaves the decision-making power with them in respect to how it is implemented. Participatory budgeting is one way to set this up. (EmPaci 2020.) Municipal participatory budgeting is a multi-faceted and local process which can be seen from different viewpoints. As the municipalities' political, economic and social preconditions differ, there are various reasons and goals for PBs in different types of societies and situations they are facing. (Wampler et al. 2018.)

At its roots in Brazil in the 1980's, PB was a means to securing a community that was politically dishevelled by changes in the power dynamics of the government. The original goals of the first PB run in Porto Alegre, Brazil were to tackle the fundamental social, economic and environmental issues of a less democratic society by using citizen participation (Menegat 2020 in Häikiö & Salminen 2016). In Finland, and other democratic societies, participatory budgeting can be seen as a modern democratic tool to supplement the traditional democracy such as voting in elections. It gives citizens an opportunity to have their say in how municipal funds are spent, thus improving their habitat. (Ahonen & Rask 2019.) On the other hand, the focus and goal of Finnish PB is often on

improving active dialogue between citizens and municipalities and thus strengthening democracy and making society more transparent and equal.

There are also many different target groups for PB from citizens, NGOs, city officials and local politicians. The pursuit of equality is one key issue in PB as many supporters emphasise that all citizens should have equal opportunity to get their voices heard in PB regardless of age, gender, income or education or their level of political or other societal activism etc. There is debate on the effect the equality poses on the PB process as well as the outcomes. (Wampler et al. 2018.) It is also at the heart of the EmPaci project, where the elderly, the unemployed and the youth are seen as the so-called hard to reach groups who require special attention in setting up and running a process.

As the aims of PB vary, there are many ways in which to set up a PB process. In Finland, participatory budgeting is typically built around five core steps: A) gathering ideas from citizens, B) pre-checking them for viability, C) co-creating them with citizens to turn ideas into proposals, and D) letting the inhabitants choose by voting on their favourites E) to be finally implemented. (Ahonen & Rask 2019.)

As with any civic process, questions of importance, functionality and effectivity arise both from internal and external stakeholders such as municipalities, citizens and decision makers. Evaluation can provide answers to these questions. Ensuring the overall quality of the process is important, not only for practical reasons such as the resourcing aspect. It sets the tone for the method in general from

the crucial points of any public governance accountability, trust and transparency: can citizens trust this method and its effectiveness? Will it enhance their overall interest in participation? (Laulainen 2019; 19.) Wampler (2007 in Laulainen 2019) also points out that participatory budgeting should be seen as a process of learning, not just a project. This means that the process needs to entice continuous citizen participation. (Wampler 2007 in Laulainen 2019; 19–20.)

While prior research is limited in examples of evaluation of participatory budgeting process, an evaluation framework was synthesised to help the future development of the PB processes.

What is evaluation?

Evaluation can be described at its simplest as the act of determining the value of things. The field of evaluation is diverse and multifaceted, and it is full of different methods and approaches. This fact is mainly because evaluative acts are performed on so many fields of science and done so by respecting different scientific traditions. Other dissimilarities inside the field of evaluation are brought on by the evaluators' different motivations and intentions regarding the evaluation. Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman (2004, 56) emphasise that evaluation is nowadays as much as an art form as it is science with its different moving parts and varied approaches.

There are multiple different reasons to evaluate. Evaluation is more commonly used to measure and assess the results of public programmes and other actions, to assess the effectiveness of these programmes and their different processes, to gain informa-

tion regarding different problems, and to strengthen the operation of different institutions (Chelimsky 1997, 10). The reasoning behind the act of evaluation can be categorically divided into two main categories: development of the matter at hand (formative evaluation) or the need to make a practical decision regarding a function (summative evaluation). These practical decisions at hand at a summative evaluation can be, for example, the decision to buy or sell, or a decision regarding foreign trade. (Scriven 1991, 302.)

The logic of evaluation is very much based in its function in our societies. Both formative and summative evaluation are deeply rooted within practical operations, and this quality gives evaluation its distinctive position. Evaluation often seeks answers to real practical problems, so the reasoning behind the evaluation is most often practical as well. (Scriven 1991, 302.) One can also argue that formative and summative evaluation are more deeply connected with the researchers' own social and discursive position from which they approach the evaluation at hand. This way of analysing the logic of evaluation puts more emphasis on the role of the evaluator in mixing different evaluation and research methods and communicating with different stakeholders. (Jokinen 2017, 88.)

It can therefore be said that the role of the evaluator is varied and multi-layered. The role is to first and foremost produce an evaluation that provides different audiences useful and valid answers to varied problems (Rossi et al. 2004, 26). In many cases, however, the evaluator has multiple different roles to fulfil at the same time. The evaluator can face simultaneous demands of loyalty to different ac-

tors, which in turn naturally creates different tensions within the evaluation. (Weiss 1972, 8.) The role of the evaluator cannot, however, be downplayed, as evaluation is said to never be without the nuances brought on by the evaluator's own understanding of where the evaluation at hand sits in a societal and social context. This can be seen as a frame of values that affects all aspects of evaluation, all the way from planning to different practical solutions. (Jokinen 2017, 30.)

The role of the evaluator can be approached, for example, by analysing whether the evaluator is a part of the organisation under evaluation. An external evaluator may bring new viewpoints into the evaluation, but a so-called internal evaluator may understand the intricacies of the target of the evaluation much better. (Weiss 1972.) The roles of the evaluator may also be distinguished more thoroughly as the evaluator may, for example, be categorised as an inspector, researcher, judge or a facilitator of an evaluation. These roles bring out the nuances within the role of an evaluator. (Patton 1997.)

In the case of EmPaci, evaluation was done mainly to provide pilot municipalities current knowledge and deeper understanding of their processes to support their practical operations regarding PB in the future. Evaluation was conducted by an outside evaluator – the Finnish EmPaci partners at Tampere University and LAB University of Applied Sciences – while the organisations of the pilot municipalities Lahti and Riihimäki supported the process regarding data collection.

An overview of existing evaluation tools of participatory budgeting

Even though different initiatives of citizen participation have become even more popular in Finland and worldwide, the evaluation of participation has not developed with same intensity (see Falanga & Ferrao 2021). One major reason for this might be that evaluating democratic initiatives is not very straightforward nor simple. However, evaluation is a key factor in terms of accountability and transparency. Citizen participation requires evaluation that utilises multiple methods and data (see e.g., Falanga & Ferrao 2021.) In terms of impact of the evaluation it must be defined clearly what is meant by effectiveness and hoped outputs of the participatory process that is observed (see e.g., Falanga & Ferrao 2021).

Research on evaluating PB is scarce but there are some methods and tools that have been built available to evaluate PB and the process. The tools introduced here can all be used by those running a PB but help from experienced sources such as researchers can offer much needed practical support and a wider perspective. And, whether evaluation is conducted by an external or internal source, it is important to realise that the extent and quality of the data available is a key concern. To make an extensive evaluation, the data collection needs to be planned and executed effectively and reliably. For example, using an online idea registration or voting platform does not automatically mean that there is ample data available on those leaving ideas or voting to conduct a thorough evaluation for project developing purposes.

An early example is a self-evaluation toolkit set up by the University of Bradford and the PB Unit. It offers an extensive set of practical help to those planning or running a PB. The kit covers the process from process planning, evaluation planning, data gathering and analysis alongside tools. It also helps make the need for evaluation visible early on, which is important as sufficient data needs to be collected throughout the process to help secure the reliability of an evaluation. There are three levels of evaluation to choose from: minimum, medium and maximum. This is very beneficial as participatory budgeting is quite a resource-heavy tool for municipalities often struggling with limited financial and other resources. (University of Bradford & the PB Unit. 2009.)

A more recent take on the subject is by Participatory Budgeting Project, Public Agenda, and the North American Participatory Budgeting Research Board. It consists of 15 key metrics and specifications on how to use them. These metrics are divided into three main categories: 1) Impact on Civic and Political Life, 2) Impact on Inclusion and Equity and 3) Impact on Government. Each contains a set of questions to help gather data and analyse it. (Participatory Budgeting Project et. al. 2015a.) They also provide three templates: 1. Idea Collection Participant Survey Template 2. Voter Survey Template 3. Questionnaire for Evaluators and Implementers to help the evaluation process along. (Participatory Budgeting Project et. al. 2015b.)

One example is a model created in Finland by Rask and Ertiö (2019). "The co-creation radar – Yhteisluomisen tutka" can be used for evaluating different types of partici-

pation such as participatory budgeting processes or participation of an organisation. The tool is a synthesis of extensive research and contains 12 main indicators: four main topics (Results, Topics, Actors and Implementation) each also split into three subtopics. (Rask & Ertiö 2019; 10-11.) The chosen indicators offer an extensive view of the topic but also require a lot of data to be collected. From a user's – such as a citizen's – point of view, the visual result this tool provides makes it easier to interpret the results and make comparisons of different runs understandable.

Forming the PB evaluation framework for Finnish EmPaci pilots

In the EmPaci project, we have evaluated two PB processes in the pilot Cities of Lah-ti and Riihimäki. Information was gathered concerning the output of the process but also the process itself. The framework for the evaluation was built based on the data, which consisted of interviews, surveys and documents gathered along the length of the process. The perspectives of the framework can be found in the data. However, these viewpoints are present also in the theoretical discussion of citizen participation.

Successful citizen participation processes consider different viewpoints. Therefore, to evaluate a PB process extensively, the perspectives of organisations, citizens and local politicians need to be addressed. These perspectives were operationalised by questions of how they were expressed, experienced and interpreted in the data.

From an organisational perspective, we acknowledged the importance of strong leadership of PB processes. Managers are core ac-

CITIZEN PERSPECTIVE	PERSPECTIVE OF POLITICIANS	ORGANISATION-AL PERSPECTIVE
Management	Accessibility	Support
Ownership	Awareness	
Resources	Influence	
Organisational culture		
Transparency and interaction		
Operation of the process		
The rules concerning the process		

Image 1. An evaluation framework was set up around these three target groups and multiple viewpoints to offer an extensive view

tors when creating a culture that supports the idea of citizen participation (Tuurnas et. al 2019). They support these actions more practically, by creating channels and possibilities for participation and decontrolling the rules that hinder participation and creating possibilities for alternative channels of participation (Yang & Panday 2011). The role of managers can be described as that of sponsors, who are expected to enable participation processes by establishing policies and allocating resources for enhancing participation. Also, they have a role in communicating about participatory processes and they are

expected to “protect” participatory processes. (Bryson et. al. 2013). Leading the processes of PB includes also actors other than the formal management. PB requires active persons that lead the project forwards. Champions do have informal power, which is often gained through their competence and commitment. They are often eager to push the process forwards and aim to gain support from sponsors. (Bryson et. al 2013) This is observed in our framework from the viewpoint of ownership. The role of political leaders is observed in the evaluation from the viewpoint of political support.

None of the citizen participation initiatives could be done without resources. In addition to financial resources, allocated working hours, amount of personnel, expertise and ICT-tools can be regarded as focal resources when implementing PB (see e.g., Irvin & Stansbury 2004; Smith & McDonough 2001). From a wider perspective, organisational culture is connected to the success of citizen participation processes. As a wide participation project, PB affects different organisational divisions and units and therefore the everyday actions of civil servants. Therefore, it is crucial to pay attention for example to the shared values, motivation concerning participation in different levels of organisation (Jäntti et. al 2021; Denhardt & Denhardt 2000; Smith & McDonough 2001; Cuthill 2003)

Inclusiveness is the central ideal of democracy. Therefore, it is crucial to take a glance into the perspectives of citizens in evaluation. In this evaluation, citizen participation was looked at from the viewpoints of accessibility, awareness and feeling of influence. It is noted that easy-to-access and easy-to-use participation channels are often wished for by the citizens (Jäntti & Kurkela 2021). But also, to meet democratic expectations, citizen participation needs to be influential. The crucial element is that citizens are aware of their possibilities to influence (Arnstein 1969). Influence is not a simple issue to measure but can be observed from the viewpoint of citizens having a feeling of influence.

Transparency is a central value of open and democratic governance (see e.g., Kim & Lee 2019); here it is operationalised from the viewpoint of interaction, since successful interaction plays a role in operationalising this transparency.

The processes need to be planned and designed carefully. Aside from practicalities such as facilitating the process and collaboration (Torfing et. al. 2019), designing the attachment to organisational activities is in a key role and the ways to ensure that citizens do have real possibilities to influence as well as a realistic picture concerning the limits of these possibilities to influence. (Font et al. 2018; Fung 2006; Arnstein 1969; Irving & Stansbury 2004). Despite reasonably wide perspectives and data, it is worth noting that evaluation may have some blind points. For example, it might be difficult to observe especially from the viewpoints of citizens, feelings and own experiences, at least extensively. It is focal to address these blind points and the fact that extensive understanding about citizen participation processes, such as PB, and active citizenship can even be impossible.

Evaluation as a vital part of the PB process

The evaluation aims to provide knowledge and understanding on the process of participatory budgeting at a local level. Typically, the goal of participatory budgeting is to ensure participation of different groups of citizens. Without information on the participation of these different groups, it is not possible to assess whether the goal is achieved or not. Thus, evaluation can be a tool used in enhancing and developing the PB process from the perspectives of strengthening the participation of different groups of citizens. In the end, it becomes visible as questions of how and where to allocate resources, for instance in administration of the process, technology and communications.

Municipalities running PB seldom have the possibility to focus on evaluating the process by themselves although evaluation is recognised as a key element in the development of the process. The Finnish EmPaci pilots – the city of Lahti and the city of Riihimäki – were no exception. The developed framework and the evaluation process itself have provided the pilot municipalities with new knowledge and understanding, as well as highlighted some further points for development. All in all, there has been a positive outlook on process development in both municipalities, and also a will to collect and utilise information to further the process with citizens.

The Finnish EmPaci pilot cases from 2020 are now in the implementation phase. Simultaneously, the next round of participatory budgeting is in planning. Evaluation by Finnish EmPaci partners is conducted to support and provide knowledge and information for the planning of future rounds of participatory piloting at the local level.

As all EmPaci pilot partners complete their two rounds of PB and evaluate them in late 2021, a project-level framework for conducting PB evaluation will be set up. This will, in turn, provide other municipalities and stakeholders running or contemplating running PBs with practical guidance on how to set up an effective PB process, thus enabling overall quality. It will be made available for all on the project website alongside other tools. Some practical notions and tips from along the evaluations in the Finnish EmPaci pilots have been gathered here to help those setting up or running their PBs in the meantime.

General notions and tips for municipalities and findings based on the evaluations of Finnish EmPaci pilots:

1. Evaluation needs to be built into the process from the beginning. This will ensure that accurate data is available and enable comparing results from different PB runs within the city organisation if the same type of data is collected. Questions and data gathering need to be set up based on the research questions at hand – “what is it we need or want to know about the PB?”
2. By ensuring a systematic approach to evaluation of the extent of the entire PB process with efficient data gathering, more accurate information can be gathered. This gives a better understanding of the process, results and effectiveness. In doing so, data protection regulations need to be noted. Citizens want and need to know why the data is gathered, by whom it will be used and for what purpose. Some people may find it strange to give out personal information like age, gender, household income, education level or employment status unless they understand that by giving this information, they help ensure that the PB is more inclusive and open.
3. Viewpoints of different groups such as organisations, citizens and local politicians need to be considered to obtain a wide understanding.

4. Electronic tools and platforms make gathering different types of data such as background info or email addresses easy for citizens as well as organisations but the need for this needs to be noted and planned for in advance to make it possible and the data relevant for evaluation purposes. Overall, having access to the people that have taken part in a PB process later can be useful for other purposes such as co-creation and communicating about the implementation phase or upcoming PBs.
5. Evaluating a PB process uses up resources, whichever tool or framework is used. Are those resources available within the city organisation or is help needed? Could, for instance, local institutions such as universities and universities of applied sciences be utilised?
6. There needs to be a plan for communicating the results of the evaluation. What will the results of the analysis be used for, which target groups need information and how will this evaluation process be communicated to the target groups? It is imperative that citizens see a connection between the data they have provided, and the steps taken to improve the PB process.



References

- Ahonen, V. & Rask, M. 2019. Osallistuvan budjetoinnin mallit ja trendit Suomessa. [Cited 13 June 2021]. Available at: <https://www.kuntaliitto.fi/julkaisut/2019/1985-osallistuvan-budjetoinnin-mallit-ja-trendit-suomessa>
- Arnstein, S. R. 1969. A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. Vol. 35(4), 216-224.
- Bryson, J. M., Quick, K. S., Slotterback, C. S. & Crosby, B. C. 2013. Designing public participation processes. *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 73 (1), 23-34.
- Chelimsky, E. 1997. The Coming Transformations in Evaluation. In Chelimsky, E. & Shadish, W. (eds.) *Evaluation for the 21st century: a handbook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. 1-26.
- Cuthill, M. 2003. The contribution of human and social capital to building community well-being: A research agenda relating to citizen participation in local governance in Australia. *Urban Policy and Research*. Vol. 21 (4), 373-391.
- Denhardt, R. B. & Denhardt, J. V. 2000. The new public service: Serving rather than steering. *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 60 (6), 549-559.
- EmPaci. 2020. Participatory Budgeting in the BSR: Status Quo Analysis. [Cited 16 June 2021]. Available at: <http://www.empaci.eu/photo/Files/EmPaci%20GoA%202.1%20Status%20Quo%20Analysis%20final-18112020.pdf>
- Falanga, R. & Ferrão, J. 2021. The evaluation of citizen participation in policymaking: Insights from Portugal. *Evaluation and Program Planning*. Vol. 84 (1), 101895.
- Font, J., Graham S., Galais, C. & Alarcon, P. 2017. Cherry-picking participation: Explaining the fate of proposals from participatory processes. *European Journal of Political Research*. Vol. 57 (3), 615-636.
- Fung, A. 2006. Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 66, 66-75.
- Häikiö, L. & Salminen, J. 2016. Osallistuvan budjetoinnin oikeudenmukaisuus. *Janus – Sosiaalipolitiikan ja sosiaalityön tutkimuksen aikakauslehti*. Vol. 24 (4), 340-357. [Cited 29 Apr 2021]. Available at: <https://journal.fi/janus/article/view/60253>

Irvin, R. A., & Stansbury, J. 2004. Citizen participation in decision making: Is it worth the effort?. *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 64(1), 55–65.

Jokinen, E. 2017. *Näkökulmia arviointitutkimukseen: henkilöstö kuntauudistuksessa*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Jäntti, A., & Kurkela, K. 2021. How Municipalities Can Enhance Citizen Participation?: Exploring the Views of Participants and Non-Participants. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*. Vol. 25 (1), 23-42.

Jäntti, A., Kork, A. A., Kurkela, K., Leponiemi, U., Paananen, H., & Sinervo, L. M. 2021. Osallistumismalleista kohti vuorovaikutteista kaupunkiorganisaatiota. In Jäntti, A. Haveri, A. & Rannisto P-H. (eds.) *Tehokasta ja demokraattista kaupunkihallintaa?: Helsingin johtamisjärjestelmän uudistuksen akateeminen kokonaisarviointitutkimus*. 75-97.

Kim, S. & Lee, J. 2019. Citizen participation, process, and transparency in local government: An exploratory study, *Policy Studies Journal*. Vol. 47 (4), 1026-1047.

Laulainen, P. 2019. *From OmaStadi towards MeidänStadi – research about the first year of the participatory budgeting model of the city of Helsinki and suggestions for the development*. Masters' thesis. Aalto University. [Cited 18 May 2021]. Available at: <https://aaltodoc.aalto.fi/handle/123456789/42658>

Participatory Budgeting Project, Public Agenda, North American Participatory Budgeting Research Board. 2015a. 15 Key Metrics for Evaluating PB [Cited 28 May 2021]. Available at: <https://www.participatorybudgeting.org/15-key-metrics-for-evaluating-pb/>

Participatory Budgeting Project, Public Agenda, North American Participatory Budgeting Research Board. 2015b. 15 Key Metrics for Evaluating Participatory Budgeting: A Toolkit for Evaluators and Implementers. [Cited 31 May 2021]. Available at: <https://s3.amazonaws.com/uploads.participedia.xyz/aa5628ec-239a-4fab-b9bd-c4aa6c330294-PB%20Evaluation%20Toolkit>

Patton, M. Q. 1997. *Utilization-focused evaluation*. Third edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Rask, M. & Ertiö, T. 2019. The co-creation radar - a comprehensive public participation evaluation model. [Cited 28 May 2021]. Available at: https://bibu.fi/wp/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Bibu-Policy-Brief-2_englanti_verkkoversio-1.pdf

Rossi, P. H., Lipsey M. W. & Freeman H. E. 2004. Evaluation: A Systemic Approach. Seventh edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Scriven, M. 1991. Evaluation Thesaurus. Fourth edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Smith, P. D. & McDonough, M. H. 2001. Beyond public participation: Fairness in natural resource decision making. *Society & Natural Resources*. Vol. 14(3), 239-249.

Torfig, J., Sørensen, E. & Røiseland, A. 2019. Transforming the public sector into an arena for co-creation: Barriers, drivers, benefits, and ways forward. *Administration & Society*. Vol. 51 (5), 795-825.

Tuurnas, S., Stenvall, J., Virtanen, P. J., Pekkola, E. & Kurkela, K. 2019. Towards collaborative development culture in local government organisations. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. Vol. 32 (6), 582-599. [Cited 18 May 2021]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-05-2018-0119>

University of Bradford & the PB unit. 2009. Participatory Budgeting Self Evaluation Toolkit. [Cited 28 May 2021]. Available at: <https://pbnetwork.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/PBunit-self-evaluation-Toolkit.pdf>

Wampler, B., McNulty, S. & Touchton, M. 2018. Participatory Budgeting Spreading Across the Globe. [Cited 17 June 2021]. Available at: http://transparency-initiative.org/staging/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/spreading-pb-across-the-globe_jan-2018-1.pdf

Weiss, C. H. 1972. Evaluation research: methods for assessing program effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Yang, K. & Pandey, S. K. 2011. Further dissecting the black box of citizen participation: When does citizen involvement lead to good outcomes?. *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 71(6), 880-892.

Liliane Pintelon, Teresa de la Cruz, Ullamari Tuominen, Taina Vuorela, Piret Tamme & Mohamed Ouasghiri

Learning environment experiences in the HELP project: different modes of delivery enable a variation of activities

HELP - THE HEALTHCARE LOGISTICS EDUCATION AND LEARNING PATHWAY

Project period	2017-2021
Funding	Erasmus+ KA2 - Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices
LAB's role	Coordinator
Project website	https://help-project.eu/



Abstract

Healthcare-logistics study modules were created in the HELP project via piloting new course curricula and materials at four different educational levels: Vocational, Bachelor, Master and PhD. Different modes of delivery were used: face-to-face, online synchronous, online asynchronous and blended online learning. These modes were found to support different educational purposes, as their benefits and challenges were explored. Additionally, online delivery modes yielded new pathways for studying and networking, besides providing opportunities for engaging different types of participants.

Introduction: the HELP Project

European healthcare systems are facing challenges due to the increased need for healthcare services and decreased financial resources.

Growing demands of high-quality services, regulatory and compliance requirements as well as cost and margin pressures motivate healthcare organisations to seek new ways to

develop their operational efficiency, reduce costs as well as improve patients' care and safety. Logistics has been proven to be one of the most important cost and quality factors of healthcare services (de la Cruz et al. 2020). However, it also needs more efficient operating models.

The HELP project's main objective was to respond to the increasing needs of healthcare organisations in the field of logistics. The project answered the needs of international healthcare organisations by providing in-depth knowledge and increasing competencies in healthcare logistics. Also, it developed and piloted healthcare logistics education modules and a learning pathway from vocational education to doctoral studies in healthcare logistics. Additionally, it started the development of networking among healthcare logisticians as a long-term objective to create national and international networks of healthcare logisticians and healthcare logistics education institutions.

Background: key terms and concepts

Traditional or face-to-face (F2F) teaching (also known as in-person) is conducted synchronously in a learning environment where lecturers share physical space with students. Distance learning is the type of education where there is a physical separation of teachers and students during instruction. Today, it is basically a synonym for online learning (Kaplan & Haenlein 2016).

Online learning environments are considerably different to those of typical classrooms where students engage on a face-to-face basis with their teachers and peers. In remote settings, these face-to-face meet-

ing opportunities are limited and sometimes non-existent (Lowrie et al. 2012). Digital transformation has been transforming higher education for some years now (Adeyoin 2020). As online learning in higher education has steadily grown in popularity recently, mainly since it allows increased revenues while reducing expenses (Palvia et al. 2018), lecturers and faculties have been challenged in this transition (Stephens & Coryell 2020). However, the COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated this trend, forcing educational institutions worldwide to shift online (Galagher & Palmer 2020).

Online learning is usually divided into synchronous and asynchronous, depending on the delivery type (Barron 2009). Synchronous learning happens in real time, often under teachers'/lecturers' supervision with a class schedule and required login times. Asynchronous learning, on the other hand, does not require real-time interaction. Instead, content is available online for students to access when it best suits their schedules, and assignments are completed in accordance with deadlines. Research in the field shows that each method supports different learning purposes (Hrastinski 2008).

Hybrid learning combines different forms of study (College of DuPage 2012). It may contain classroom teaching and distance (typically online) learning tied to a specific time and place, as well as supervised classroom teaching, online work and studies carried out independently or in groups (ibid.). In the present article, blended online learning involves both synchronous and asynchronous modes of participation.

Delivery modes of the HELP project pilot

The HELP project was articulated around six (6) pilot training actions, one at Bachelor and PhD levels and two (2) at Vocational and Master levels. Generally, pilot participants were current students, researchers and experts from the project partner educational institutions and associated healthcare organisations and their networks. The content of the pilots was based on the competence analysis and other preparatory research conducted during the earlier stages of the project and was validated by the national advisory boards and other stakeholders working in the field: logistics service providers, warehouse and logistics managers, nurses, medical doctors and pharmacists.

During the project, the Higher Education Institutions (HEI) staff gained valuable experience

of different delivery modes and related pedagogical approaches. Two (2) pilots – Vocational and Bachelor – were conducted as F2F courses. Module 1 of the Master level pilot was carried out in online asynchronous mode, while module 2 materialised as an online synchronous course. The PhD pilot exploited both the asynchronous and synchronous modes of delivery, which we have named blended online learning. For a summary of the delivery modes of all the project pilots, see Table 1 below.

The Vocational healthcare and logistics pilot contained two modules delivered as F2F teaching: Logistics module, coordinated by the Tallinn Health Care College in Estonia, and Healthcare module, coordinated by Salpaus Further Education in Finland. In Estonia, logistics competences were added to care workers' curriculum and in Fin-

Table 1. Delivery modes used at different educational levels in HELP project pilots

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	F2F	ONLINE - ASYNCHRONOUS	ONLINE - SYNCHRONOUS	BLENDED ONLINE LEARNING
Vocational	x			
Bachelor	x			
Master: module 1		x		
Master: module 2			x	
PhD				x

land nursing competencies were added to the logistics curriculum. This course was designed for those students and professionals who wish to build their professional career around healthcare logistics. Students may be youth or adults from all educational sectors. At the vocational level, the idea is to give an introduction to healthcare logistics and also guidance to adaptation of the healthcare and logistics study modules and study materials developed during the project.

The main topics were ethics, patient safety, service design, sustainability, warehouse logistics and cost efficiency. The main aim was to offer the students competence-based knowledge and skills to work as a healthcare logistician in a health care unit. The unit may be in an elderly care home or nursing home, a healthcare factory, a hospital warehouse or

work as an independent healthcare goods provider at home care. Due to the participants and the nature of the module content, the F2F mode of delivery was considered appropriate.

The Bachelor level pilot included a pre-assignment, F2F sessions and a hospital visit. The Bachelor-level study modules were named as follows: Orientation to Healthcare Logistics landscape, Critical environment, Logistics Improvement methods and tools in healthcare, Capacity management and ICT in healthcare logistics. The LAB University of Applied Sciences and the Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences coordinated in planning and implementing the pilot, which took place F2F - before the outbreak of the worldwide pandemic - during an intensive week in Lahti, Finland in February 2020.

Picture 1. F2F learning during the pandemic (Photo by Teresa de la Cruz)



The Master level comprised two different modules. On the one hand, an entirely online pilot focused on managing and developing healthcare logistics (led by ZLC), and on the other, complementary project work initially planned for one week in the Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences premises, which finally took place also online due to the COVID-19 travel restrictions.

The module “Managing and developing healthcare logistics” was delivered entirely via the Moodle platform, following the principles of asynchronous learning. It was open for four months and the content was divided into two large blocks based on the results of the competence analysis: Introduction to healthcare supply chain and logistics, and healthcare supply chain analytics. Lessons were combined with exercises and quizzes for assessing the knowledge gained. An online forum was created on the platform and an e-mail account was created to support the students.

The “Healthcare Logistics Project work” module, on the other hand, was piloted online following the synchronous learning principles. The Moodle platform was used as a document repository, but the classes were delivered via MS Teams due to the pandemic.

The pilot training lasted five working days and included visiting lecturers on subjects such as Theory of Constraints in Healthcare and Lean Six Sigma in Healthcare. A pre-assignment together with a learning diary served for evaluation purposes.

KU Leuven was in charge of **the PhD level pilot**, initially planned as an intensive F2F week in Belgium, but finally delivered online due to the pandemic situation in Europe. KU











Leuven, like many institutions, adopted the blended learning concept already years ago, but intensified support for it over the last year, see e.g. [KU Leuven's Quick Guide to Blended Course Design](#) (website), where you can find tools for teaching staff and guidelines on how to give a course a blended design.

The PhD module was developed at KU Leuven; two faculties were involved (Faculty of Medicine, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Leuven Institute for Healthcare Policy and the Faculty of Engineering Science, Department of Mechanical Engineering, subdivision Maintenance and Healthcare Logistics). The module focused on the problems and opportunities with which healthcare logisticians at the PhD level typically are confronted: rather complex and unstructured issues which require decision support and management tools. In the module, a basis for working with such tools was provided.

For the PhD module, students with different backgrounds were expected to complete a flexible reading assignment before starting the module. The classes on healthcare logistics were delivered by professors of KU Leuven and the University of Twente (Ned), as well as by two doctorate-level professionals working at a hospital. For the case discussions, the multidisciplinary background of the participants was taken into account. Also, a field visit to a hospital and a serious game on lean healthcare were planned, but they had to be cancelled due to the COVID pandemic. The course closed with an assignment, customisable to the background of the participants.

Figure 1 Below shows the blended online learning concept used for the PhD module
(Figure by Liliane Pintelon)

PhD module – HELP – KU Leuven, Nov 2020

Pre-assignment	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Post-assignment
Typical healthcare logistics problems <i>(Notes)</i> Reading materials <i>(Complusory & recommended)</i> 	Welcome to the PhD module <i>(Presentation)</i> Getting to know the participants <i>(Elevator pitch)</i> 	Introduction to MCDM <i>(Lecture)</i> Introduction to inventory management <i>(Lecture)</i> Framework for healthcare supply chain <i>(Case - PhD research)</i> 	Introduction to healthcare technology management <i>(Lecture)</i> Introduction to risk/safety management <i>(Lecture)</i> RFID for logistics optimization <i>(Case – UZ Leuven)</i> 	Healthcare management & organization <i>(Lecture)</i> Health Logistics: future outlook <i>(Notes)</i> 	Critical reflection <i>(Paper to write)</i> 
	Logistics : Basics <i>(Lecture)</i> OR techniques <i>(Lecture)</i> Simulation <i>(Lecture)</i> 	Case study: Satellite hospital <i>(Team work)</i> 	Case study: H@H <i>(Team work)</i> Case study: Outsourcing <i>(Team work)</i> 	Case study: Lean pathways <i>(Team work)</i> 	
	Mo Nov 9	Fr Nov 13	Mo Nov 16	Fr Nov 20	

Legend:	  Off-line	 Synchronous, on-line	 Asynchronous, on-line class recordings	 Synchronous, online, discussion
---------	--	--	--	---

Benefits and challenges of different delivery modes

As already mentioned above in section 2, each mode of delivery supports a different educational purpose (Hrastinski 2008). Table 2 below shows the main insights drawn from HELP project Pilot experience comparing different modes of delivery.

Table 2 Comparison of delivery modes of HELP project pilot courses: benefits and challenges

ONLINE ASYNCHRONOUS	
Benefits	Challenges
Flexibility. It is easier for employed participants, since they can take the course at their own pace.	Lack of engagement, more students discontinue the course after enrolling.
It allows merging together international students from very different time zones.	Extra effort required to develop practical examples; recording short videos is advisable.
The class recordings remain available for use after the closing of the project.	Lack of interactive discussions; they are replaced by discussion forums that require effort to be dynamised.
ONLINE SYNCHRONOUS	
Benefits	Challenges
Much more interactive than asynchronous learning.	In larger groups, interactivity decreases.
Lecturers must invest much effort in the design of the sessions, especially regarding timing.	Prone to technical challenges.
Students gain new competences in how to operate in the continually changing digital working conditions.	Intensive group discussions in online environments are difficult to manage.

F2F	
Benefits	Challenges
It allows on-site visits and business games.	Lack of flexibility. Students must stick to the class schedule.
Discussions are more easily enabled and managed.	Involving silent students in discussions.
Personal interaction with students: teacher knows if they are confused.	Classroom teaching is tied to a specific place.
Providing direct feedback is easier.	Providing individual feedback is labour-intensive.

As a summary of the main points of Table 2, it can be concluded that the **F2F delivery mode** allows engaging with special activities, such as hospital visits. It may also be more successful for learning practical hands-on skills e.g. at the Vocational and Bachelor levels.

“The hospital visit was an excellent way to conclude the courses idea in a general view. It gave a sight of the future (automation, robotics, etc.)” as was described by a student in the Pilot course feedback.

F2F teaching also enabled multi-cultural discussions, which the students found beneficial. However, especially during the pandemic, is the fact that F2F is inflexible regarding space and time.

On the basis of the experiences gained during the HELP project, **online asynchronous learning** is the most flexible mode of

delivery. It is easier for employed people, as they can take the course at their own pace. However, the lack of engagement can result in students dropping out of the course. Hence, self-motivation is a key element in online asynchronous learning. It requires a different set of skills: self-motivation, perseverance to study on your own, as immediate feedback will not be available (see Stephens & Coryell 2020). **Online synchronous learning** in general solves the lack of interactivity of the asynchronous mode. Nonetheless, it requires technology-aware lecturers and students who are able to understand the purpose and use of different digital tools and platforms.

Blended online learning: combining asynchronous learning and synchronous learning provides yet further possibilities

(see e.g. Martin-Garcia 2020). This can be illustrated by the specific case of the PhD pilot in the HELP project. Although rethinking the delivery mode from a F2F concept to an online format required additional efforts, it also provided some benefits. Where at first the module was meant for PhD students, with either a logistic or a medical background, offering the module in a blended online way allowed opening the module for health care professionals as well. The asynchronous class recordings are available at all times, which is beneficial for practitioners who cannot find time in their schedules to follow the classes live. The interactive online sessions were announced well in advance and allowed for case discussions. Although preparation was slightly more time-consuming than F2F sessions, experience with online teaching and online meetings during the COVID-pandemic allowed us to deliver the content in an interesting way. Also, the class recordings remain available for use after the closing of the project.

A drawback of the online format of the PhD module was the fact that a field visit, meant to show different aspects of hospital logistics at one of the largest hospitals in Belgium, had to be cancelled. Also, a business game on lean healthcare could not take place due to the COVID pandemic. These were two missed opportunities, but by expanding the case discussion sessions a partial solution to this problem was found.

A long-term objective of the HELP project was to create national and international networks of healthcare logisticians and healthcare logistics education institutions, besides developing educational content. The majority

of the Pilots were originally planned to take place in a F2F learning environment. It was a surprising bonus of the challenging pandemic circumstances that we discovered that online courses allow new and flexible learning paths.

Educational collaboration in the context of international online Degree Programmes in Europe and beyond would enable new opportunities for both students and lecturers for developing competences, sharing knowhow and networking (Joshi et al. 2020). Hopefully, new modes of delivery raise students' curiosity and motivate them to opt for varying educational pathways (ibid.).

Conclusions

As a conclusion of the experiences of different modes of delivery for healthcare logistics learning, it can be stated that pre-planning and a careful analysis of the educational activities to be carried out are, of course, essential for both online and F2F offline learning. Yet, from a lecturer's point of view, improvising is more challenging online, so the implementation of online learning requires additionally plenty of technical pre-planning and assessing students' and instructors' needs. It is difficult to know how much of the newly acquired digital learning HEIs will retain after the pandemic, but many believe the change is permanent (see e.g. Lockee 2021).

Regarding the benefits of online learning, our experience showed that online learning provides a myriad of opportunities for both students and staff at HEIs, such as developing especially theoretical knowhow and related skills and also sharing them through networking; yet some more hands-on skills may

require a F2F mode of delivery for learning. Online learning further prepares the student for working life which is becoming increasingly digital and global. Additionally, blended online learning – which involves both synchronous and asynchronous modes of delivery – allows opening the module for a new target group: professionals. Combining online with F2F learning also allows for flexibility for learners, especially in adult education. Studies have also revealed an interesting discovery: as it is easier for students to engage in international studies via online learning, completely new pathways for learning can open up, even at degree programme level (see Joshi et al. 2020).

We have made some tentative discoveries of the pros and cons of different modes of delivery for learning. Further studies should explore the pedagogics related to different modes of delivery in closer detail. Also, the needs of different learner groups need to be considered when making decisions about appropriate modes of delivery.



Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

References

Adedoyin, O. B. & Soykan, E. 2020. Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: the challenges and opportunities. *Interactive Learning Environments*. [Cited 21 May 2021]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180>

Barron, A. 2009. *A Teacher's Guide to Distance Learning*. Florida Center for Instructional Technology. College of Education, University of South Florida. [Cited May 2021]. Available at: <https://fcit.usf.edu/distance/>

de la Cruz, T., Kuusisto, M., Ouasghiri, M., Tuominen, U. & Vuorela, T. 2020. Connecting Disciplines and Cultures in Healthcare Logistics Pilot Training: An Eye-Opening Experience. Salminen, N., Juvonen, P. & Vuorela, T. 2021. *LAB Innovations Annual Review*. The Publication Series of LAB University of Applied Sciences, part 9. 52-70. [Cited 07 May 2021] Available at: <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-827-343-4>

Gallagher, S. & Palmer, J. 2020. The Pandemic Pushed Universities Online. The Change Was Long Overdue. *Harvard Business Review*. Available at: <https://hbr.org/2020/09/the-pandemic-pushed-universities-online-the-change-was-long-overdue>

College of DuPage. 2020. *Introduction to Hybrid Learning*. [Cited 25 May 2021]. Available at: <https://www.codlearningtech.org/PDF/hybridteachingworkbook.pdf>

Joshi, M., Könni, P., Mäenpää, K., Mäkinen, L., Pilli-Sihvola, M., Rautiainen, T., Timonen, P. & Valkki, O. 2020. *Verkkotutkinnot. Raportteja 269*. Turku: Turku University of Applied Sciences. [Cited 14 May 2021]. Available at: <http://julkaisut.turkuamk.fi/isbn9789522167682.pdf>

Kaplan, A. M. & Haenlein, M. 2016. Higher Education and the Digital Revolution. *Business Horizon*. Vol. 59 (4), 441-450.

Hrastinski S. 2008. Asynchronous and Synchronous E-Learning. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*. Vol. 31 (4), 51-55. [Cited 14 May 2021]. Available at: <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2008/11/asynchronous-and-synchronous-elearning>

Lockee, B. B. 2021. Online education in the post-COVID era. *Nature Electronics*. Vol. 4, 5-6. [Cited 7 May 2021]. Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41928-020-00534-0>

Lowrie, T. & Jorgensen, R. 2012. The tyranny of remoteness: Changing and adapting pedagogical practices in distance education. *International Journal of Pedagogies & Learning*. Vol. 7 (1), 1-8.

Martin-Garcia, A. V. 2020. *Blended Learning: Convergence between Technology and Pedagogy*. Berlin: Springer.

Palvia, S., Aeron, P., Gupta, P., Mahapatra, D., Parida, R., Rosner, R. & Sindhi, S. 2018. Online Education: Worldwide Status, Challenges, Trends, and Implications. *Journal of Global Information Technology Management*. Vol 21 (4), 233-241. [Cited 14 May 2021]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1097198X.2018.1542262>

Stephens, M. L. & Coryell, J. 2020. Faculty Perspectives on Context, Benefits, and Challenges in Fully Online Graduate Adult Education Programs. *Adult Learning*. Vol. 32 (2), 79-88. [Cited 7 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1045159520959468>



RENEWING AND EVOLVING ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Heidi Myyryläinen & Anna Pajari

Perspectives to social impact – social enterprises benefit from communicating the social value they produce

ISEE - INNOVATING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION	
Project period	1.2.2020–31.12.2022
Funding	Interreg Central Baltic
LAB's role	Lead partner
Project website	https://www.lab.fi/fi/projekti/isee-innovating-social-entrepreneurship-education

Abstract

Social value creation means different things to different people and different enterprises. Social value creation is topical for any company, but in social enterprises it is at the core. In this article we discuss the terms social value creation and social impact as well as challenges related to measuring social impact.

Social value creation

Social value and social value creation can be defined and described in many ways. Porter and Kramer (2011, 66) have used the concept of shared value, which they define to include “policies and operating practices that enhance the competitiveness of a compa-

ny while simultaneously advancing the economic and social conditions in the communities in which it operates”. Porter and Kramer (2011) note that in shared value the benefits should be evaluated in relation with the costs. The social impact evaluation can have same ideas – it is important to evaluate the inter-

vention costs in relation to the experienced benefits – however there are many approaches to evaluating this.

The shared value has become an influential, but also contradictory and sometimes undefined, term. Dembek et al. (2016) note in their systematic literature review on the term, that it has been used loosely as a common word. They note that many studies have used the definition by Porter and Kramer (2011), but different definitions exist: some highlight the role of not just shareholders but also stakeholders, some point out balancing the social and economic value creation and creating them simultaneously, while others define shared value as a term referring to putting social and community goals before the profit. (Dembek et al. 2016) Many researchers have noted that the concept of shared value or social value creation are overlapping or closely related with the concept of corporate social responsibility (see review by Sinkovics & Archie-acheampong 2020).

Sinkovics et al. (2015) define social value creation as social constraint alleviation. Many influential insights also suggest that business has a new paradigm, and those who succeed in social value creation are able to grow (Tikka & Gävert 2014). Nieminen et al. (2018) suggest that the role of companies changes from product or service provider and employer to a problem solver of social and societal challenges. This development doesn't only cover social enterprises but also other companies. (Nieminen et al. 2018) Also understanding social impact is becoming more important.

What is the relation of solving social problems and creating economic value? At the end of the day, businesses are not able to suc-

ceed without providing some social value aspects to their customers since the basic idea of competitive advantage is the unique value the company is able to produce (Porter 1985). Porter and Kramer (2014) suggest that “shared value is about solving social problems to create economic value”. There remain different interpretations – are social problems instrumental for economic value in the view of Porter and Kramer (2014)? Evaluating social impact is useful for any company. Multi-national companies can be compared to nations in their power, also in a positive sense in their potential to create social impact. For anyone operating in the field, the economic side is anyway a necessary element for any imaginable mission. What makes social enterprises unique in the field is that they prioritise their social mission. This is at the core of many academic social enterprise definitions and EU operational definition on social enterprise: the economic activities are instrumental for social mission. This valuation may also have practical implications. It is not surprising that social impact is now often discussed in the context of social enterprises.

Many perspectives for social mission – social innovations and networks

Halme and Laurila (2008) categorise companies based on their way of implementing corporate social sustainability (CSR): 1) CSR is outsourced by means of donations and sponsorship, 2) CSR is an integrated part of core business, 3) the enterprise makes innovations or creates new business models that are based on solving social or environmental problems. Since the main aim of social enterprises is to have a social mission (to solve

a social or environmental problem) and because they operate by providing goods and services for the market in an entrepreneurial and innovative fashion. Kimmo Lipponen, the former CEO of Arvolitto (the Finnish association for social enterprises), sees social entrepreneurship as an example of category 3 in Halme's model. (Lipponen 2018, 15) According to Hautamäki (2008), a social innovation can be, e.g., a new business model, an innovation process, a product or a service. Social innovations are related to the whole society at all levels of activity. Their role is not only to develop new kinds of products, services and procedures but also to change existing institutions and different networks as well as to create new ones. (Viljanen & Juuti 2018, 23)

Hautamäki and Oksanen (2012) connect innovations with novelty, potential usefulness and implementation. According to them, innovation is not just an idea or invention but an implemented novelty that has an impact. Innovations create new practices by changing existing procedures and constructions. It is important to make a difference between the outcomes of an innovation from its actual impact. Outcomes are related to the direct goals of innovation development which can be e.g. competitiveness, economic result or productivity, whereas impact should be evaluated in relation to more general aims like long term success, welfare or sustainable development. (Hautamäki 2018, 109-110)

Today the problems and challenges are so complex that there are no single right answer to them. Solving this kind of problem requires acknowledging and respecting the viewpoints of several organisations and institutions. Multidimensional development re-

quires cooperation and discussion between several actors, e.g. within the supply network like suppliers, producers, innovation developers, users and authorities. This is true especially in the case of a multidimensional and complex set of social problems that requires involvement from multiple cooperators. (Nieminen et al. 2018) Later in this article, we talk about measuring social impact. The same way as what is said about measuring social impact, the success of socially remarkable innovations cannot be measured only with traditional indicators related, e.g., to the customer benefit or economic profit. In addition, attention must be paid to issues like benefit for the society, problem solving and indirect impact that should all be largely evaluated throughout the whole innovation process. (ibid)

What is social impact?

Social impact is a wide concept, which can mean many things. Social impact can be assessed from many human perspectives: individuals, groups and societies. Social impact evaluation can have many different time perspectives: short- or long-term impact or even impact on future generations. (Rawhouser 2017)

GECES report (2014) defines "social" as something that relates to individuals and communities, the interaction between them, contrasted with economic and environmental. But how can social value be measured? In research on social enterprises, as well as in non-profit organisations or programmes, this issue has been in debate (Kroeger & Weber 2014).

Rawhouser et al. (2017, 83) define social impact as "beneficial outcomes resulting

from prosocial behaviour that are enjoyed by the intended targets of that behaviour and/or by the broader community of individuals, organisations, and/or environments.” GECES (2014) defines social impact as “The reflection of social outcomes as measurements, both long-term and short-term, adjusted for the effects achieved by others (alternative attribution), for effects that would have happened anyway (deadweight), for negative consequences (displacement), and for effects declining overtime (drop-off).” By social outcomes they refer to “Social effect (change), both long-term and short-term achieved for the target population as a result of the activity undertaken with a view to social change taking into account both positive and negative changes.”

According to Rawhouser et al. (2017) social impact has been explored with multiple different concepts: i.a. Husted & Salazar (2006), Mair & Marti (2006) and Nicholls (2008) have used the concept of social performance, Moss et al. (2011) and Santos (2012) have used the term social value, Nicholls (2009) has also used the term social accounting, Emerson (2003) has used the term social returns, and Hall et al. (2015) have used the term social return on investment (SROI). Rawhouser et al. (2017) refer to Izzo (2013) who has noted that social impact has been studied in the fields of education, health care, poverty and environmental sustainability. As seen in the examples here, the contexts are very different and comparing is challenging.

Instead of seeing economic and social as distinct elements, Emerson (2003, 43) prefers to see them systematically interconnect-ed and inseparable. In other words, econom-

ic and social components are in a dynamic interplay, and social value should not be evaluated separated from economic value. Emerson (2003) proposes that for-profit and non-profit organisations need a framework and tools to track their performance and uses the concept of blended value proposition (BVP), where the value entails social, environmental and economic value components. Value can be evaluated from a blended value perspective. From the blended value perspective, optimal investments are such that maximise total returns, blended transformative, economic, environmental and social valuation. This evaluation can be viewed from the company perspective, or from some broader perspective. (Emerson 2003)

Measuring social impact of social enterprise

Measuring social impact is a complex challenge. There are neither a commonly agreed definition of social impact measurement nor a shared understanding of the overall aim of social impact measurement (European Commission & OECD 2015). This causes challenges in both the academic debate as well as the practices of measuring methods. Shortly, it can be said that social impact measurement aims to assess the social value and impact produced by the activities or operations of any for-profit or non-profit organisation. Although any business can have social impact, non-profit organisations and social enterprises are explicitly designed to create social value while addressing social challenges and are therefore expected to produce social impact. These two main objectives of social enterprises – creating both social value and econom-

ic wealth – are not mutually exclusive. (ibid.)

Social impact measurement is an evolving field (European Commission & OECD 2015). Social enterprises would benefit from being able to provide information on their social impact. The EU has set an Expert Group of the European Commission on Social Entrepreneurship (GECES) to study and make recommendations for the development of European policies regarding social enterprises. In 2014, GECES recommended approaches for measuring the social impact of social enterprises, given the fact that there are no standards with wide consensus for measuring it. The GECES sees that this information would be important in engaging partners, and private – or public – investors and funders. (GECES 2014) Ideally, social impact measurement should serve to identify and implement ways to enhance a social enterprise's operations (European Commission & OECD 2015). Social impact measurement can help social enterprises to set realistic objectives, monitor and improve their performance, prioritise decisions and access capital markets more competitively (Nicholls 2007). In an ideal case the measuring method is relevant, helpful and transparent. It should also be simple, natural and certain. It should be well-explained and founded on reliable evidence, and finally, understood and accepted by all relevant stakeholders. (GECES 2014)

There are different approaches in measuring social impact. The European Commission & OECD report on social impact (2015), in turn, categorises three different academic and non-academic views to measuring social impact. Positivist methods are based on accounting and objective value measure-

ments. In critical approaches, accounting is grounded in the principles of democracy and accountability and aims to view social impact from the perspective of multiple stakeholders, between and within organisations and society. The interpretative approach sees the role of accounting to serve as a “symbolic mediator between various social groups”. The interpretative approach aims to use tools that serve organisational and inter-organisational dialogue and support the aimed social change. (European Commission & OECD 2015)

However, as mentioned above, measuring social impact is a complex challenge, especially in social enterprises whose primary objective is to produce social value and at the same time act in a profitable manner and create economic wealth. Another reason why traditional performance measurements used to evaluate for-profit businesses do not apply to social enterprises is that the mission of social enterprises affects several stakeholders like public authorities, private investors, internal stakeholders and external beneficiaries. Social enterprises should therefore ideally use a ‘multidirectional’ accountability system, focusing not only on the economic bottom line, but also on social outcomes. (European Commission & OECD 2015). In addition, according to the OECD report (ibid), “social enterprises can be considered not only ‘double bottom-line’ organisations (Dart et al., 2010), but also ‘triple bottom-line’ organisations, adding an environmental dimension to their social mission and expected financial returns”. In other words, one single metric cannot cover all impact information that is relevant for different stakeholders but there

needs to be a variety of metrics to meet the stakeholder requirements concerning impact measurement. (European Commission & OECD 2015)

How to get started, then? The European Commission and OECD (2015) introduce two main approaches: the 'one-size-fits-all' and on the other hand an approach which recommends adopting different metrics to capture the differences among social enterprises by identifying the most appropriate measurement tools for each specific case. The latter has achieved larger consensus and also GECES (2014) clearly states that "no single set of indicators can be devised top-down to measure social impact in all cases". The Impact Measurement Working Group IMWG that works in the context of Social Impact Investment Taskforce SIIT, created within the framework of the G8 summit in June 2013, was built to define guidelines for impact investors. These guidelines are based on the fact that "impact can only be measured if data is collected, examined and reported in an efficient manner and that it is critical to harness the power and capital of private markets for public good" (GECES, 2014). The starting point of the IMWG recommendations is that defining impact depends on the goal and societal challenges the organisation in question aims to tackle. It expands the GECES definition of social impact (introduced in the previous paragraph) to include environmental objectives, too. Because the impact of social enterprises affects multiple stakeholders, the guidelines also refer to the whole impact value chain and recommend to clearly identify the causal links between the work, including inputs and activities, and the intended

results: different outputs, outcomes and impact. (European Commission & OECD 2015)

The recommended process for all social impact measurements consists of five stages: 1) identify objectives; 2) identify stakeholders; 3) set relevant measurements; 4) measure, validate and value; 5) report, learn and improve. To make the measurement appropriate for the stakeholders there should be freedom to choose which indicator to use to measure different aspects of impact. Due to the importance of different stakeholders in a case of social enterprises it is important to involve them throughout the process. All in all, social impact measurement should be seen as a potential source of value creation. (GECES, 2014) As mentioned before, social impact measurement can help social enterprises to set realistic objectives, monitor and improve performance, prioritise decisions and access capital markets more competitively (Nicholls, 2007). Measuring e.g. economic, social and environmental impacts separately helps the enterprise evaluate the optimal set of goals as well as actions needed to achieve them. One should namely bear in mind that these economic, social and environmental impacts may sometimes be in contradiction to each other and that the impact cannot necessarily be seen immediately. (Nieminen et al. 2018) While also a systematic view of blended value can provide insight into measuring these aspects as interconnected phenomena. (see Emerson 2003)

All enterprises need tools to monitor their activities and their impact. Nicholls (2007) suggests that measuring and communicating social value – the results and the impact of what a company does – can help social en-

terprises become more competitive. Different measuring tools serve different information needs and have their strengths and weaknesses. The important notion after all is how social impact measurement can provide value for both enterprise and its stakeholders. The European Commission & OECD report (2015) also underlines that rather than using social impact measurements as mechanisms for accountability, the focus should be on potential value creation. One aspect perhaps could be that enterprises themselves create

their indicators and metrics that truly reflect the social impact valued by them and their stakeholders.



European Union
European Regional
Development Fund



References

Dembek, K., Singh, P. & Bhakoo, V. 2016. Literature Review of Shared Value: A Theoretical Concept or a Management Buzzword?: JB. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 137 (29), 231-267.

Emerson, J. 2003. The Blended Value Proposition: Integrating Social and Financial Returns. *California management review*. Vol. 45 (4), 35-51.

European Commission & OECD. 2015. Policy Brief on Social Impact Measurement for Social Enterprises. Policies for Social Entrepreneurship. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [Cited 4 June 2021]. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/social/PB-SIM-Web-FINAL.pdf>

GECEs. 2014. GECEs Sub-group on Impact Measurement: Proposed Approaches to Social Impact Measurement in the European Commission legislation and practice relating to: EUSEFs and the EaSI. [Cited 4 June 2021]. Available at: <https://www.fi-compass.eu/sites/default/files/publications/proposed-approaches-to-social-impact-measurement-in-european-commission-legislation.pdf>

Halme, M. & Laurila, J. 2008. Philanthropy, Integration or Innovation? Exploring the Financial and Societal Outcomes of Different Types of Corporate Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 84, 325-339.

Hautamäki, A. 2008. Kestävä innovointi. Innovaatiopolitiikka uusien haasteiden edessä. Helsinki: Sitra. Sitran raportteja 76.

Hautamäki, A. 2018. Kestävät innovaatiot syntyvät eettisyydestä. In: Viljanen, S. & Juuti, P. Arvovallankumous – eettisyys innovaatioiden lähteenä yhteiskunnallisissa yrityksissä. Keuruu: Edita. 104-122.

Hautamäki, A. & Oksanen, K. 2012. Suuntana innovaatiokeskittymä. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.

Husted, B. W. & Salazar, J. de J. 2006. Taking Friedman seriously: Maximizing profits and social performance. *Journal of Management Studies*. Vol. 43 (1), 75-91.

Izzo, D. 2013. Aligning interests in impact investing. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. [Cited 4 June 2021]. Available at: http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/aligning_interests_in_impact_investing

Kiser, C., Leipziger, D. & Schubert, J. 2014. *Creating social value: a guide for leaders and change makers*. Sheffield, England: Greenleaf Publishing.

Kroeger, A. & Weber, C. 2014. Developing a conceptual framework for comparing social value creation. *The Academy of Management review*. Vol. 39 (4), 513-514.

Lipponen, K. 2018. Esipuhe. In: Viljanen, S. & Juuti, P. Arvovallankumous – eettisyys innovaatioiden lähteenä yhteiskunnallisissa yrityksissä. Keuruu: Edita. 13-16.

Mair, J. & Marti. I. 2006. Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction and delight. *Journal of World Business*. Vol. 41, 36-44.

Nicholls, J. 2007. Why measuring and communicating social value can help social enterprise become more competitive. Cabinet Office – Office of the third sector. [Cited 11 June 2021]. Available at: <https://www.socialtraders.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Why-Measuring-and-Communicating-Social-Value-Can-Help-Social-Enterprise-Become-More-Competitive.pdf>

Nicholls, A. 2008. Capturing the performance of the socially entrepreneurial organisation (SEO): An organisational legitimacy approach. In Robinson, J. Mair, J. & Hockerts, K. (Eds). *International perspectives on social entrepreneurship research*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 27-74.

Nicholls, A. 2009. We do good things, don't we?: Blended Value Accounting in social entrepreneurship. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*. Vol. 34 (6-7), 755-769.

Nieminen, M., Rilla, N., Leikas, J. & Ikonen, V. 2018. Innovaatiotoiminnan yhteiskunnallinen vastuullisuus ja vaikuttavuus. In: Viljanen, S. & Juuti, P. (eds.) *Arvovallankumous – eettisyys innovaatioiden lähteenä yhteiskunnallisissa yrityksissä*. Keuruu: Edita. 123-129.

Porter, M. 1985. Competitive advantage – creating and sustaining superior performance. New York: The free press. [Cited 11 June 2021]. Available at: [https://www.albany.edu/-gs149266/Porter%20\(1985\)%20-%20chapter%201.pdf](https://www.albany.edu/-gs149266/Porter%20(1985)%20-%20chapter%201.pdf)

Porter, M. & Kramer, M. 2011. Creating Shared Value. How to reinvent capitalism – and unleash a wave of innovation and growth. *Harvard Business Review*. January-February 2011.

Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M.R. 2014. A response to Andrew Cranes et al's article. *California Management Review*. Vol. 56, (2), 149– 151.

Rawhouser, H., Cummings, M. & Newbert, S. L. 2019. Social Impact Measurement: Current Approaches and Future Directions for Social Entrepreneurship Research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Vol. 43 (1), 82-115.

Santos, F. 2012. A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 111, 335–351.

Sinkovics, N. & Archie-acheampong, J. 2020. The social value creation of MNEs – a literature review across multiple academic fields. *Critical perspectives on international business*. Vol. 16 (1), 7–46.

Sinkovics, N., Sinkovics, R., Hoque, S. F. & Czaban, L. 2015. A reconceptualisation of social value creation as social constraint alleviation. *Critical perspectives on international business*. Vol. 11 (3/4), 340–363.

Tikka, V. & Gävert, N. 2014. Arvonluonnon uusi aalto – Näin rakennetaan vuosisadan arvokaimmat yritykset. [Cited 4 June 2021]. Available at: https://www.businessfinland.fi/globalassets/julkaisut/arvonluonnin_uusi_aalto_309_2014.pdf

Viljanen, S. & Juuti, P. 2018. *Arvovallankumous – eettisyys innovaatioiden lähteenä yhteiskunnallisissa yrityksissä*. Keuruu: Edita.

Heidi Myyryläinen

Developing future-oriented education on social entrepreneurship

ISEE - INNOVATING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION	
Project period	1.2.2020-31.12.2022
Funding	Interreg Central Baltic
LAB's role	Lead partner
Project website	https://www.lab.fi/fi/projekti/isee-innovating-social-entrepreneurship-education

Abstract

This article describes perspectives on creating social entrepreneurship education. In the iSEE project, four partner institutions create aligned education. In this article, I discuss some starting points and choices in developing social entrepreneurship education. Social entrepreneurship is still a widely misunderstood concept though social enterprises hold a significant socioeconomic and environmental potential in different societies and communities. I discuss the position of social entrepreneurship in education and its relation to entrepreneurship education. What kind of aspects could future-orientation in social entrepreneurship education entail, and could collaborative learning and communities of practice provide insight into planning social entrepreneurship education?

Many kinds of social enterprises

Berglund and Johannisson (2012, 1) remind that humans have always been enterprising, and entrepreneurship as a societal phenomenon has a far longer history than some academic entrepreneurship discourses pres-

ent. Entrepreneurship is a multi-dimensional phenomenon, and it has many different implications in society. (Berglund & Johannisson 2012, 1)

The combination of entrepreneurship and common good is not a new one (Bo-

nanni et al. 2012, 17). However, the academic concept of social entrepreneurship is still relatively young (Howorth et al. 2012).

Alone in Europe there exists a wide variety of different concepts of social enterprises. In some countries, there are no official definitions for social enterprises. While many European countries do not have an official definition of social enterprise, 29 European countries use their own criteria for social enterprise in their country. (European Commission 2015, 14) The European Commission report (2015, 17) concludes a common definition for social entrepreneurship, viewing social enterprise as an independent organisation having a social purpose with entrepreneurial activity. Social enterprises provide goods and services operating in a market. They use their profits primarily to achieve social objectives. The EU has introduced an operational definition for social enterprises and in addition to the aforementioned definition they have added an aspect of inclusive governance model to the definition of social enterprise: social enterprises are managed in an open and responsible manner. (European Commission 2015, 9)

What kind of issues can social enterprises solve?

Overall, creation of new enterprises and jobs are vital for societies. Social enterprises have a primary mission in solving social and environmental problems. Social enterprises have proven to have means to fight poverty, social exclusion and to provide services in operation areas or regional areas where other commercial companies are not interested in operating. Social enterprises can be instruments for self-employment, creating jobs and then

generating tax revenues while serving local community goals in different ways. Social enterprises also promote sustainable development goals. (OECD 2016, 3)

Based on sectoral classifications, social enterprises in Europe work for “social and economic integration of the disadvantaged and excluded”, social services of general interest such as social housing, health care, medical services, other public services such as community transport, maintenance of public spaces, strengthening democracy, civil rights and digital participation, environmental activities such as reducing emissions and waste, renewable energy” and “practising solidarity with developing countries” (European Commission 2015).

Also, the governance model can play an essential role in providing the social welfare. Mason et al. (2007) state that social enterprises are created in a close link with the community they are there to serve. Mason et al. (2007) note that social enterprises maximise positive social impact and ethical processes, and practices are integral part of their mission.

Does entrepreneurship education recognise the diversity of enterprises?

As social entrepreneurship can be a powerful tool for solving social and environmental problems, it could be assumed that social entrepreneurship is widely included in curricula in different education levels, such as in higher education. However, social entrepreneurship is still an underutilised concept in curricula and on the course level.

Rae (2010) notes that social entrepreneurship learning programmes have been developed in isolation with “mainstream entrepreneurship” programmes. Rae (2010) sees that

entrepreneurship education is at the crossroads as there are intellectual, economic, social and cultural movements influencing entrepreneurship education and learning. He (ibid.) calls for entrepreneurship education that gives space to the diversity of enterprises and includes insights about responsible and social entrepreneurship into its agenda.

In exploring how entrepreneurship education should respond to the changing landscape, Rae (2010) highlights the role of educators of entrepreneurship. He points out that the role of education is in creating understanding of entrepreneurship, sensemaking of en-

trepreneurship (such as “what it means to be an entrepreneur”) or supporting the development of entrepreneurial capabilities. He sees that education has an influencer role in making sense of opportunities, business models or organisational cultures that entrepreneurship and future entrepreneurs are to create. Rae (2010) calls for relational, “learning to learn” and life-long learning approaches, and notices that entrepreneurial education should aim to understand entrepreneurial identities and cultures at different levels: constructed in individual, collective and social layers. (Rae 2010)




Figure 1. Rae (2010) describes the dynamics of the learning relationships affecting entrepreneurial education. (Rae 2010, 602).

How to build future-oriented social entrepreneurship education?

Previously a major confusion in planning social entrepreneurship education has been lack of common concepts of social entrepreneurship (see Lawrence et al. 2012). The education should embrace the diversity of social enterprises and introduce unique stories and many interpretations from academics and practitioners.

Another question is how should entrepreneurship education be understood in the context of social entrepreneurship? Should entrepreneurship education follow the American research tradition which focuses on firm creation process, or the European tradition which highlights the development of entrepreneurial personality? (Hägg & Peltonen 2014). Entrepreneurial learning is one of the key concepts in entrepreneurship education (Peltonen 2014) Many research findings suggest that affective and conative (motivational) elements, which can also be viewed as competences, have a crucial role in entrepreneurial learning (Peltonen 2014; Ruohotie and Koiranen, 2001; Hoskins & Deakin Crick, 2010). Hence, education on social entrepreneurship should entail information, but also collaborative and engaging elements.

In the iSEE project the message from practitioners for us education developers has been to build future-oriented social entrepreneurship education. One answer to future-oriented education lies in sociocultural learning perspectives. Howorth et al. (2012) study education programmes for social entrepreneurs that highlight social learning perspectives. It can be interpreted that the same applies to higher education degree students or life-long

learning courses also. Building on the work of Wenger (1998) and Lave and Wenger (1991, 35), Howorth et al. (2012) view that learning happens through participating in a community and is an identity- and meaning-oriented process. Such learning emphasises participation and reflective thinking. The best way to equip practitioners to entrepreneurially learn and be able to solve complex governing and business challenges is learning in communities of practice. (Howorth et al. 2021) Lave and Wegner (1991) define communities of practice as “groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly”. This leads us to plan such social entrepreneurship education that invites interaction and are designed to evolve. (see Wegner et al. 2002)



European Union

European Regional
Development Fund



References

Berglund, K. & Johannisson, B. 2012. Introduction: in the beginning was societal entrepreneurship In: Berglund, K. Johannisson, B. Schwarz, B. Societal Entrepreneurship – Positioning, Penetrating and Promoting. Cheltenham, UK.: Edward Elgar.

Bonanni, C., Lepineux, F. & Roloff, J. (Eds.). Social Responsibility, Entrepreneurship and the Common Good. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

European Commission. 2015. Map of Social Enterprises and their Ecosystems in Europe. [Cited 13.6.2021] Available at: <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKewjklPeWobjzAhVDIosKHWqrCgwQF-noECA0QAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Fsocial%2FBlobServlet%3FdocId%3D12987%26langId%3Den&usg=AOvVawOzDCAohUz7bdCbHUz6nXN9>

Hoskins, B. & Deakin Crick, R. 2010. Competences for learning to learn and active citizenship: different currencies or two sides of the same coin? European Journal of Education. Vol. 45 (1), 121-137.

Howorth, C., Smith, S. & M. Parkinson, C. 2012. Social Learning and Social Entrepreneurship Education. Academy of Management learning & education. Vol. 11 (3), 371-389.

Hägg, O. & Peltonen, K. 2014. How can teachers' entrepreneurial competences be developed? A collaborative learning perspective. In: Peltonen, K. Opettajien yrittäjyyskasvatusvalmiuksien kehittyminen ja siihen vaikuttavat tekijät. Aalto University publication series. Doctoral Dissertation.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. 1991. Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lawrence, T., Phillips, N. & Tracey, P. 2012. Entrepreneurial Education. Stanford Social Innovation Review. [Cited 07 Oct 2021]. Available at: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/entrepreneurial_education#

Mason, C., Kirkbride, J. & Bryde, D. 2007. From stakeholders to institutions: the changing face of social enterprise governance theory. Management decision. Vol. 45 (2), 284-301.

OECD. 2016. Policy Brief on Scaling the Impact of Social Enterprises Policies for social entrepreneurship. [Cited 13.6.2021]. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Policy-brief-Scaling-up-social-enterprises-EN.pdf>

Peltonen, K. 2014. Opettajien yrittäjyyskasvatusvalmiuksien kehittyminen ja siihen vaikuttavat tekijät. Doctoral Dissertation. Aalto University publication series.

Rae, D. 2010. Universities and enterprise education: Responding to the challenges of the new era. *Journal of small business and enterprise development*. Vol. 17 (4), 591-606.

Ruohotie, P. & Koiranen, M. 2001. Yrittäjyyskasvatus: analyyseja, synteesejä ja sovelluksia. *Aikuiskasvatus*. Vol.02/2001, 102-111.

Wegner, E., McDermott, R. & Snyder, W. 2002. *Cultivating communities of practice: a guide to managing knowledge*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University press.



BUSINESS DESIGN AND THICK VALUE

Mervi Koistinen, Katerina Medkova, Anna Svartström, Carita Tanskanen, Kaisa Tuominen & Marjut Villanen

More sustainable consumption through cooperation and pilot experiments

ASKEL - CO-DEVELOPING SERVICES FOR SUSTAINABLE LIVING	
Project period	1.3.2020–30.9.2021
Funding	Päijät-Hämeen Liitto, EAKR
LAB's role	Lead partner
Project website	https://lab.fi/fi/projekti/askel



CECI - CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN CIRCULAR ECONOMY IMPLEMENTATION	
Project period	1.8.2019–31.7.2023
Funding	Interreg Europe
LAB's role	Lead partner
Project website	https://www.interregeurope.eu/ceci/



KESTI - KESTÄVÄ KIERROS	
Project period	15.8.2020–30.4.2021
Funding	Päijät-Hämeen liitto, AKKE
LAB's role	Lead partner
Project website	https://www.lab.fi/fi/projekti/kesti-kestava-kierros

MAALLEMUUTTAJAT 2030	
Project period	1.6.2019–31.12.2021
Funding	Maaseuturahasto
LAB's role	Lead partner
Project website	https://lab.fi/fi/projekti/maallemuuttajat2030



Abstract

Despite global warming and species extinction, economic and environmental measures are often contrasted. Luckily, many such practices that combine both of those aspects already exist. This article focuses on LAB projects, in which residents and consumers play an important role.

Shift from linear to circular economy and from owner to user

With the fast development of technology and digitalisation, the economic globalisation has moved forward rapidly. This development has had many notable positive effects over the years, but it has also enabled the transition from a scarce economy to an overflowing economy, in which consumer products are getting continually cheaper and easier to purchase. The disadvantages of accelerating production and consumption, and the concentration of wealth, can be seen all over the world. The Earth's resilience is limited and is already heavily burdened by current consumer behaviour. Therefore, actions are needed. (Hellström & Porevuo 2020; Lindgren et al. 2019.) The road to better results is already known. It has been counted that if raw materials are used smarter, goods are reused longer, and recycling is organised better, that could lead worldwide to a 20 per cent reduction in CO2 emissions. (Sitra 2021a)

The European Commission's (2019) Green Deal is an important step towards a cleaner and more sustainable environment. The new growth strategy also emphasises the circular economy and the involvement of residents in its implementation. It is seen as necessary to move from a linear and wasteful economic model to the one in which materials and value stay in circulation. (Hellström & Porevuo 2020) The transition to a more sustainable economy is progressing in individual European countries. The Finnish Ministry of the Environment published the new Strategic Programme to Promote a Circular Economy in January 2021 (Ympäristöministeriö 2021a).

The circular economy is seen as a great opportunity, not only for the environment, but also for various companies and countries. The potential of the circular economy is estimated in different sources slightly different. The Finnish Innovation Fund Sitra has calculated that by 2030 the circular economy could offer the Finnish economy at least 1.5–2.5 billion Euros annual growth potential (Sitra 2014).



Image 1. Rotating linear paths towards circular will open new opportunities
(Photo: Marjut Villanen)

The circular economy is often combined with the concept of the sharing economy. According to one definition of sharing economy, it is a new kind of economic thinking in which the opportunity to use goods and services is regarded as more important than owning them (Sitra 2021b). Sharing economy can also be defined as a community activity that saves and earns money. It allows us to use assets more efficiently. (Sjösted 2018.) The

European Commission also uses the concept of collaborative economy: "business models where activities are facilitated by collaborative platforms that create an open marketplace for the temporary usage of goods or services often provided by private individuals". "Collaborative economy transactions generally do not involve a change of ownership and can be carried out for profit or not-for-profit." (European Commission 2016, 3.) It is important to remember that although these two concepts, circular economy and sharing economy (or collaborative economy), are closely related, all sharing economy practices are not part of circular economy. Sharing economy implements circular economy when it promotes a wiser use of resources and reduces the need for virgin raw materials and new products. The goal of sharing economy is to get the maximum value out of the already existing goods. (Sjösted 2018.) The rapid and even radical development of digitalisation is creating more and more opportunities that allow us to take advantage of the sharing economy. Streamlining business and resource efficiency through data utilisation can have major implications for ownership. (Lindgren et al. 2019.)

LAB University of Applied Sciences (LAB) is involved in the implementation of several circular and sharing economy projects in which different experiments have been carried out at various levels and in diverse environments. Some of these projects focus especially on involving consumers and residents in the development process as key actors. The following chapters describe some of the work that has been done in these projects, the lessons learned and the results obtained.

Sustainable consumption – a possibility or absurdity?

Combined with the linear economy and mass production, buying new goods has become entertainment. Huge shopping malls are designed to be leisure and entertainment centres in which people not only buy goods, but also spend their time and meet friends. In comparison, many current second-hand shops and recycling centres have a very different feeling and environment. Therefore, to be able to shift from consuming in increasing amounts of new products, to reusing and sharing the existing ones, the latter needs to be made easily accessible, attractive, interesting and more entertaining. To move towards more sustainable consumption, and to make second-hand shops and recycling centres more attractive for a wider audience, it is important to pay attention to existing good examples, how they work and what kind of issues need to be considered to inspire consumers to use these centres and the services they offer.

In KESTI – Sustainable round (2020–2021), the aim was to increase information on the business conditions of the circular and sharing economy (CE) shopping centre, and to promote the establishment of a CE shopping centre in Lahti, Finland. Several CE shopping centres in Sweden, Norway and Finland were compared and some general findings are listed here. The location seems to be an important issue to make these CE shopping centres accessible and interesting for the customers. A slightly off-centre location is not a bad thing either, if the centre itself is well-designed, attractive and has comfortable facilities. Also, good public transport connections and park-

ing spaces are needed to make the centre easy to reach by a larger number of people. Furthermore, it is beneficial to have a variety of shops and services located in the CE shopping centre, especially services like cafes and repair shops (e.g., shoe repair, seamstress). The variety of services support each other and attract different groups of customers. (Rissanen 2021b) One good example, FAJNA DILNA, from Ostrava, Czech Republic, shows also that organised activities for citizens, such as repair workshops and information events, can make the place better known and more attractive for the public (Interreg Europe 2021e).

However, one notable feature emerged in all CE shopping centres compared: each of them had received support from society for their activities. Without that support (e.g., rent-free premises, availability of recycled goods free of charge) the business would not have been profitable. Even with the support, it has taken several years to make the business cost-effective. (Rissanen 2021b.) That notice draws attention to the consumer behaviour. Without a stronger change in customer shopping behaviour, the proliferation and profitability of new types of recycling department stores seems slow or even difficult. One of the key aspects on the road towards circular and sharing economy is how to influence consumers to shift towards more sustainable consumption habits.

One other issue that needs also to be discussed in connection with sustainable consumption is the fairness of circular and sharing economy practices. How to make sure that all groups of society will have access to this service? (Rissanen 2021a.) Perhaps surprisingly, reports show that particularly the middle class is enthusiastic users of the sharing economy

services, while people with lower incomes and education use these services less. In recent decades the quantity of goods has increased in households and those who have a lot can more easily participate in sharing economy. Also, many middle-class citizens recycle and buy second-hand products for ecological reasons, whereas for lower income citizens buying second-hand goods may be a must, not a matter of their own choice. One way to include wider groups to new sharing economy services is that public sector actors cooperate with third sector associations. (Vuolteenaho 2020.)

Sustainable consumption might still be far from reality, but there are ways to change consumption to be more sustainable. The increasing opportunities to easily share and borrow goods, the rising popularity of second-hand shops, and the new experiments e.g., in Helsinki, Finland, show that it is also possible to reshape existing shops by including second-hand shops in their premises. (Eromäki 2021.) This change towards more sustainable consumption will need work and cooperation with different actors from public, private and third sectors. In the coming chapters, the focus is on pilots that address, among others, these issues and show some possibilities to support the change.

Residential participation is the key to developing services for sustainable living

According to the Finnish Environment Institute's (Suomen Ilmastopaneeli 2020) estimate, households account for about 66 per cent of Finland's consumption-based emissions. Household emissions fall into four main categories:

1. Mobility (30% of the emissions)
2. Housing (25% of emissions)
3. Nutrition (20% of emissions)
4. Other goods and services (about 25% of emissions).

(Suomen Ilmastopaneeli 2020)

Since housing, food, and consumption cause together most of the climate emissions in Finnish households, it is important to draw more attention to how to make people choose more sustainable alternatives. The Askel - Co-developing services for sustainable living project (2020-2021) develops environmentally responsible services for resident communities to help residents move towards a lower-carbon lifestyle. Cooperation partners are two different resident communities in Lahti, Finland: the Anttilanmäki-Kittelä residents' association and the housing cooperative Asunto Oy Jalkarannan-Metsä.

To be able to meet the need for new sustainable services, also companies need an opportunity for business development. Hence, it is important to also involve companies in the planning process. In the Askel project, the services are developed by Market Shop Torikauppa Pupu, a software company CoReorient, and an energy company Lahti Energia.

The service development is carried out by following an iterative service design process that started on an initial survey and interviews with residents of the Anttilanmäki-Kittelä residential area. Suitable companies were searched to offer residents' interests, in-



Image 2. Participatory methods involve residents. (Photo: Riikka Flink)

formation acquisition, needs and social interactions based low-carbon services. After that, a workshop was organised for the residents of Anttilanmäki-Kittelä and the companies with the aim to develop resident-oriented customer journeys for the services in question. Co-development between residents and companies ensures that the challenges, positive aims, and feelings that are relevant to the residents, are considered. Based on the workshop, the companies were able to start developing services towards service pilots with the resident communities.

- Torikauppa Pupu's service assembles Finnish harvest vegetables to a vegetable bag with easy recipes, which will be transported to pick-up locations. The service responded to the residents' difficulties finding local harvest vegetables in

markets and not being skilful in preparing vegetarian meals.

- CoReorient's peer-to-peer lending platform makes it easier to borrow goods and share knowledge and skills within the resident community. Borrowing unused goods in the neighbourhood reduces the need for purchasing new things. A restricted group of users ensures a high level of trust for borrowing things and sharing skills.
- Reiot is a smart property condition monitoring service that allows residents to measure living conditions such as water and energy consumption of the household. Reiot helps optimise conditions in real estate and saves nature and money.



Image 3. Residents participating in the Askel project workshop at Anttilanmäki. (Photo: Mervi Koistinen)

The services are tested with the resident communities during the Askel project. Resident communities often have different needs, which are affected by, for example, the form of housing, the age of the residents and the size of the family. The service pilots consider how the services scale from Anttilanmäki-Kittilä's detached house area to the Jalkarannan-Metsä apartment building. Sustainable housing services and growing sense of community support the attractiveness of the living environment to existing and future residents.

During the pilot period it has become clear that seeking information about the sustainable service from a wide range of market offerings and lack of even understanding their content is challenging for the residents. Finding and getting interested in a service is vital for residents' starting to use the service and cooperation with communities can help solve this challenge.

Sharing economy cases in rural areas

In recent years, the sharing economy has risen to the debate about sustainable consumption. Although there are several different in-

terpretations of its concept and many different views on its impact on the economy, it is seen as one possible option supporting the shift towards more sustainable consumption. In many ways, the form of sharing economy, which has been seen to rise lately, is still in its infancy. A developing sharing economy requires a critical mass of users, which is why it often develops in cities. With digitalisation and platform applications downloaded to smartphones, more and more consumers have heard about the opportunities of sharing economy and have been able to participate in the options it offers. (TEM 2020.)

When talking about sharing economy and its history in Finland, it is good to notice that sharing economy is not a totally new thing in the Finnish countryside – it just was not called sharing economy. In the past, when there was not widely distributed wealth and quantity of goods, commonly owned agriculture machines were usual, and neighbours shared their time and did harvesting and other seasonal work together. Borrowing tools from neighbours was common.

Sharing economy looks different if we compare the countryside and the city. In cities, people have less space to store their stuff, which encourages them to borrow tools that are needed rarely. In the countryside, there is space, but distances are long. During recent decades, urbanisation has happened, and the rural population has declined also in Finland. That puts pressure on companies because their customers are also declining from rural areas. Sharing economy could be a solution also to maintain services in rural areas. What would it sound like to be able to borrow a steam cleaner from the library,

for example? Or if the village does not have a shop where to buy camping equipment, those could be borrowed from the library or from other residents?

In the *Maallemuuttajat 2030 – Sharing and Service Economy in Rural Päijät-Häme* project, the aim is to increase knowledge about sharing economy possibilities in rural areas, and to start three sharing or service economy-based service trials in the Päijät-Häme region in 2020–2021. One of these trials is Residents Tool Sharing Library in Asikkala's municipal library.

Residents Tool Sharing Library was built in co-operation with Asikkala's Municipal Library and Asikkala residents. The residents were involved in the project in two ways: first they were asked what kind of goods they would like to borrow from the Tool Library. Secondly, the residents were able to donate goods for the Tool Library, and the selection of the tool library consists mainly of donated goods. (Tuominen & Svartström 2020.)

To set up the Tool Library, the project conducted a survey of residents on the goods they wanted, conducted a goods donation campaign, built a new shelf for the library, considered storage solutions for the goods, created instructions for using the goods and created the visual appearance for the Residents Tool Sharing Library. The Tool Library was opened in June 2020. After the opening, it was discussed how the maintenance and repair of the goods would be carried out. The project also created a poster of other renting services in Asikkala for spreading the information and did different communication actions to bring the library to the attention of the residents.



Image 4. Residents Tool Sharing library has altogether 20 items to borrow (Photo: Kaisa Tuominen)

Another service trial started in the project is Hollola's municipal bikes. In the trial, used and maintained bikes could be borrowed for one day from various locations in Hollola; the Municipal Library, farm cafes, and a winery. The bikes were meant for tourists and locals to explore the local destinations, for everyday trips and to provide opportunities for carbon-neutral transportation. It is planned that after the project local entrepreneurs would continue bike lending or renting individually or in a group of entrepreneurs. During the service trials, it has been noticed that customers would be willing to pay a little fee for the bike renting (5€). Also, other companies close to the bike-renting spots benefit from the bikes because people may ride

bikes to places where they might not otherwise have gone. For example, from the winery there is a cycling route going right next to antique shop and FinnMari Factory Outlet.

Although sharing economy has more potential customers and possibilities to expand in cities, it can offer great opportunities also in rural areas. To support this development, public and private sector cooperation is welcomed. By including sharing economy options to commonly known and used public services e.g., libraries, the sharing economy is made more easily accessible and equal to all citizens.

The EU Circular Economy Action Plan can help the development of sharing economy

by guaranteeing citizens easy access to reliable information on product repairability and durability. The European Commission's aim is to have sustainable products as an EU norm. (European Commission 2020) With more durable and repairable products, the sharing economy has better chances to develop and to succeed. At the same time, a recent study shows that companies have not adapted their activities to the circular economy at their own initiative. This even if adaptation would benefit them. To make the move, it seems that companies also need more information and guidance. (Ympäristöministeriö 2021b)

Sharing good practices can help to improve regional CE strategies and involve citizens

As addressed already in this article, citizens play an important role as customers, consumers and buyers of products and services. That fact raises them to be important actors who should be considered also when designing regional circular economy strategies and roadmaps.

The CECI – Citizen involvement in circular economy implementation project (2019–2023) promotes circular economy solutions focusing especially on sharing economy. The key idea is to develop the local and regional cooperation between public, third sector and private actors and to support the regions to generate such circular economy strategies and solutions where citizens are at the centre and play a key role. The CECI partnership consists of partners from Finland, France, the Czech Republic, Spain, Bulgaria and Belgium. (Interreg Europe 2021a.) It collects and showcases good practices on citizen involve-



Image 5. Municipal bikes can be recognised from Hollola signs. (Photo: Outi Wright)

ment related especially to sharing economy services. These good practices are connected to reuse and extending product life cycles, while emphasising social sustainability with the help of the third sector organisations and building community around circular economy. The collected good practices promote citizen education and raise awareness of how everyone can contribute to circular economy e.g., through various food waste and zero waste campaigns. (Interreg Europe 2021b.)

All the CECI partners identify the good practices available in their regions. These are then exchanged among the partners and shared via the project website to a wider audience. This exchange also includes knowledge sharing through various thematic work-




 European Union
 European Regional
 Development Fund


CECI
 Interreg Europe

Image 6. CECI identifies good practices on citizens' involvement in circular economy. (Photo: Oona Rouhiainen)

shops in which the regional stakeholders can discuss with each other, ask questions, get answers and more in-depth information. As an outcome of this capacity building and inspired by already existing and tested examples from other regions, the regional partners will design their own regional action plans to boost the citizens' involvement in circular economy.

The Askel and Maallemuuttajat 2030 projects, described in the earlier chapters, have been promoted as CECI good practices from the Päijät-Häme region (Interreg Europe 2021c; Interreg Europe 2021d). They are both concrete examples of projects involved in influencing circular and sharing economy practices for citizens, and to improve sustainable services. Hence, several CECI project partners have chosen them as the basis of their own regional CE action plan and to be further developed for their regional needs. This is a strong sign that it is important to share knowledge and good examples, to learn from each other to gain new ways to solve similar challenges in different European regions.

Change is possible, although more work and cooperation are needed

A successful transition from a linear to a circular economy requires all actors, both political and municipal, decisions and actions, as well as the participation of businesses and residents. Also, multi-regional knowledge exchange is beneficial and can help find new solutions.

Although global warming and species extinction are rapidly advancing and the current waste of resources can no longer continue, there is still hope for change. The good

news is that there are already many existing good practices that support the circular economy, offering solutions to ever growing consumption, promoting sharing economy practices instead of increasing private ownership and the volume of privately-owned goods. Many European, national, and regional plans and strategies have been developed to support this change from linear to circular economy and from owning to sharing.

This article has highlighted a few perspectives on how to locally support the transition from a linear to a circular economy. By developing these and other existing good practices further, it is possible to reform linear business and offer new, more sustainable business opportunities. This is a good start, and it offers hope that things will change in the future. Still there is a lot more work to be done, more new ideas to be developed and more cooperation and learning processes needed. This progress can succeed when different actors participate and work together.



PÄIJÄT-HÄMEEN LIITTO



European Union
European Regional
Development Fund



**Interreg
Europe**

European Union | European Regional Development Fund



Euroopan maaseudun
kehittämisen maatalousrahasto:
Eurooppa investoi maaseutualueisiin

References

Eromäki, V. 2021. Korvaavatko second hand- putiikit keskustoista lähtevät vaateketjut? Ekonomisti ja kirpputorinpitäjä uskovat, että elämme murrosvaihetta. Yle uutiset. [Cited 15 June 2021]. Available at: <https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-11955229>

European Commission. 2016. A European agenda for the collaborative economy. [Cited 21 Jan 2021]. Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52016DC0356&from=EN>

European Commission. 2019. A European Green Deal. Striving to be the first climate-neutral continent. [Cited 21 Jan 2021]. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/european-green-deal_en

European Commission. 2020. Changing how we produce and consume: New Circular Economy Action Plan shows the way to a climate-neutral, competitive economy of empowered consumers. [Cited 17 May 2020]. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_20_420

Hellström, E. & Porevuo, M. 2020. Talous tulevaisuuden palveluksessa. Kestävän talouden tilannekuva 2020-luvun taitteessa. SITRA. Työpaperi. [Cited 8 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://media.sitra.fi/2020/10/20140203/talous-tulevaisuuden-palveluksessa.pdf>

Interreg Europe. 2021a. Project Summary. CECI. [Cited 8 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://www.interregeurope.eu/ceci/>

Interreg Europe. 2021b. Project good practices. CECI. [Cited 8 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://www.interregeurope.eu/ceci/good-practices/>

Interreg Europe. 2021c. Good practice: Developing sustainable housing services. Policy Learning Platform. [Cited 8 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://www.interregeurope.eu/policylearning/good-practices/item/4909/developing-sustainable-housing-services/>

Interreg Europe. 2021d. Good practice: Sharing economy library in the rural area of Päijät-Häme. Policy Learning Platform. [Cited 8 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://www.interregeurope.eu/policylearning/good-practices/item/4663/sharing-economy-library-in-the-rural-area-of-paeijaet-haeme/>

Interreg Europe. 2021e. Good practice: Public Workshop FAJNA DILNA. Policy Learning Platform. [Cited 8 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://www.interregeurope.eu/policylearning/good-practices/item/4837/public-workshop-fajna-dilna/>

Lindgren, J., Mokka, R., Neuvonen, A. & Toponen, A. 2019. Digitalisaatio. Murroksen koko kuva. Helsinki: Tammi.

Rissanen, M. 2021a. Saavutettavampia kierto- ja jakamistalouden palveluita. [Cited 31 May 2021]. Available at: <https://blogit.lab.fi/labfocus/saavutettavampia-kierto-ja-jakamistalouden-palveluita/>

Rissanen, M. 2021b. Taustoitus kiertotalouskauppakeskuksen perustamiselle Lahteen. AMK-opinnäytetyö. LAB-ammattikorkeakoulu, Liiketalous. [Cited 31 May 2021]. Available at: <https://www.theseus.fi/handle/10024/497831>

Sitra. 2014. Kiertotalous Suomelle jopa 2,5 miljardin euron mahdollisuus. [Cited 14 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://www.sitra.fi/uutiset/kiertotalous-suomelle-jopa-25-miljardin-euron-mahdollisuus/>

Sitra. 2021a. Circular economy initiatives around the world bring us closer to reaching Paris goals. [Cited 8 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://www.sitra.fi/en/news/circular-economy-initiatives-around-the-world-bring-us-closer-to-reaching-paris-goals/>

Sitra. 2021b. Dictionary. [Cited 8 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://www.sitra.fi/en/dictionary/the-sharing-economy/>

Sjöstedt, T. 2018. Mitä nämä käsitteet tarkoittavat? [Cited 13 Sep 2021]. Available at: <https://www.sitra.fi/artikkelit/mita-nama-kasitteet-tarcoittavat/>

Suomen Ilmastopaneeli. 2020. Suomalaisten kotitalouksien hiilijalanjäljen pienennytävä 70 prosenttia – vähähiilisiä vaihtoehtoja voidaan tukea myös ohjaukskeinoin. [Cited 14 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://www.ilmastopaneeli.fi/tiedotteet/suomalaisten-kotalouksien-hiilijalanjaljen-pienennyttava/>

TEM. 2020. Kuluttajat ja kansalaiset jakamistaloudessa. TEM oppaat ja muut julkaisut 2020:3 [Cited 15 Jun 2021]. Available at: https://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/162529/TEM_oppaat_3_2020_FI_Kuluttajat_ja_kansalaiset_jakamistaloudessa_09112020.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Tuominen, K. & Svartström, A. 2020. Tool and device sharing library: from a local example to an interregional good practice. LAB Focus. [Cited 15 June 2021]. Available at: <https://blogit.lab.fi/labfocus/en/tool-and-device-sharing-library-from-a-local-example-to-an-interregional-good-practice/>

Vuolteenaho, S. 2020. Vauras keskiluokka intoilee jakamistaloudesta ja nauttii sen hyödyistä – Tutkijat yllättyivät, kun yksinhuoltajien jääminen avunsaamisen ulkopuolelle selvisi. Yle Uutiset. [Cited 14 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-11649609>

Ympäristöministeriö. 2021a. Strategic programme to promote a circular economy. [Cited 26 Feb 2021]. Available at: <https://ym.fi/en/strategic-programme-to-promote-a-circular-economy>

Ympäristöministeriö. 2021b. Valtioneuvoston selvitys ja tutkimustoiminta. Tutkimus: Tuotepolitiikkaa kehitettävä kiertotalouden ytimessä. [Cited 16 Jun 2021]. Available at: <https://tietokayttoon.fi/-/10616/tutkimus-tuotepolitiikkaa-kehittava-kiertotalouden-ytimessa>

Olga Bogdanova

Developing customer-oriented business concepts and models in culture and tourism sectors

DEVELOPING CUSTOMER-ORIENTED BUSINESS CONCEPTS AND MODELS IN THE CULTURE AND TOURISM SECTORS

Project period	1.10.2019-30.09.2022
Funding	South-East Finland-Russia CBC
LAB's role	Lead partner
Project website	https://educro.org/



Abstract

Business model innovation and internationalising are the keys to SMEs' growth and market survival. The EDUCRO training programme was designed to enhance the innovation capacities, foster new service development (NSD) and support cooperation between the culture and tourism organisations in Finland and Russia. The programme follows the NSD process stages using the service design and business model innovation approaches.

Introduction

Both business model innovation and internationalising are the keys to SMEs' growth and market survival. Service innovation especially is essential in the context of increasingly growing digitalisation (Vuorio et al. 2020). Creating new customer-oriented value is a result of the process called new product development (NPD), which involves the plan-

ning of the stages, beginning with the stage of idea generation and ending with market launching (Kim et al. 2016). The same process in the context of services is referred to as the new service development (NSD). The NSD process developed by Scheuing and Johnson (1989) outlines 15 stages: formulation of new service objectives, idea generation, idea screening, concept development, concept


testing, business analysis, project authorisation, service design and testing, process and system design and testing, market programme design and testing, personnel training, service testing and pilot run, test marketing, full-scale launch and post-launch review. One of the most critical phases in the service development process is the preparation phase, when customer insight is gained and a service concept is created.

The EDUCRO training programme, targeting professionals in the field of culture and tourism, was designed to emphasise the preparation phase, mimicking the process of NSD to facilitate the emerging of new ideas and collaboration (see Image 1). The training programme started in August 2020 from a series of seminars organised by the Institute for Cultural Programs (ICP) in Saint-Petersburg, Russia, and continued with the launch of an international online training programme

organised by the LAB University of Applied Sciences (LAB) and Humak University of Applied Sciences (Humak) with informational support by the ICP. The essence of the programme is in developing the cross-border ecosystem for culture and tourism professionals that enables life-long learning, development of new services and networking. The programme consists of 6 educational modules; each module includes webinars, workshops, individual mentoring sessions with companies and monthly informal networking events. The programme was organised online due to COVID-19 restrictions, and multiple platforms for communication and collaboration were tested: Zoom, Remo, Jamboard, Miro, and Padlet.

This article illustrates the stages of new service development created as a part of the experiences of EDUCRO project participants. It provides summaries of participants' learning in this process. Each section of the article of-

Image 1. The EDUCRO Training Programme: structure and content. (Image: Olga Bogdanova)



fers information about activities related to each stage of the NSD process and explains the main concepts.

Exploring business opportunities and ideas for cooperation

The training programme started in September 2020. A half-day networking event was organised in October 2020, when participants from both sides of the border made presentations about their companies and organisations, and some of them suggested ideas for future cross-border cooperation. In addition, further informal monthly T-time Talks were organised monthly starting in December 2020. T-time Talks are networking events without agenda supporting networks building and free discussions. These events were held as a response to the needs of the project participants, whose primary motivation for participation in the project, according to the interviews conducted at the end of 2020–beginning of 2021, was in building partnerships, exchanging ideas and plans for joint projects (Bogdanova et al. 2021).

At the same time, the companies and organisations were offered an opportunity to tap into the “wisdom of the crowd” and outsource the first steps of the NPD – idea generation – to the students. The activities were organised as a part of the Value Through Innovation and Service Design courses taught by Anu Kurvinen, Sari Jokimies and Mika Tonder to the Bachelor level students of LAB. During the 12-hour innovation, a hackathon event held in October in LAB Lappeenranta campus, representatives of the Imatra Base Camp and the Museums of Lappeenranta introduced their cases and challenges. Both challenges were relat-

ed to improvements in sales and marketing processes. Hanna Lommi, the representative of the Museums of Lappeenranta, specifically, was interested in learning about the younger generation’s customer preferences to attract them to the museum. At the end of innovation day, students presented seven different ideas. These ideas were developed further in small groups during the following weeks using service design methods (see Image 2).

Each team pitched their ideas during the Shark Tank event held in November 2020 on-campus and online to the jury of the teachers and project representatives. The best ideas received prizes from the EDUCRO project and the opportunity of developing the concept together with the case organisation. The winning idea was a service concept of audio tours for different target groups and audiences that would help to attract the younger generation to the museum. Other solutions included insights on improving user experience by creating informative, participatory and entertaining videos to be shared in popular channels in social media. The second place won the idea of organising a Marathon day for Imatra Base Camp, a networking sports event in Imatra at First Snow Ski Track (see Image 2). Students also had several development ideas for Imatra Base Camp’s web pages, including storytelling, quizzes, and streaming. The winning team continued collaboration with Panu Kärri, a representative of Imatra Base Camp, and proceeded to the project planning as part of the Business Projects course taught in January–April 2021.

During November 2020, a two-day workshop and individual mentoring sessions “Identifying new opportunity: Moving from crisis



Image 2. Brainstorming is in progress. (Image: Olga Bogdanova).



Image 3. Pitching the second winning solution during the Shark Tank event. (Image: Olga Bogdanova).

management to future building" with Ville Tikka from consulting company Poem was organised for cooperating companies and organisations. The COVID-19 crisis seriously affected the culture and tourism sectors (Bogdanova 2020), and the landscape of these sectors has changed dramatically. At the same time, crises always reveal opportunities. Participants of the workshops were offered to change their attitude from resentment and stress towards noticing changes and capturing interesting, relevant and surprising aspects. The participants discussed how they could utilise the opportunities, resources they have, skills they need to learn, and barriers they may face.

The COVID-19 trends are related to slow living, rediscovering simple things, personal growth and development, reconsidering pri-

orities in life, altruism and digitalisation. With travel curtailed, people seek real-life diversions outside of their homes, exploring experiences from farm tours to kayak rentals (Tikka 2020). Obviously things will change fast once the COVID-19 restrictions are over, but some trends will likely remain persistent (Landers 2021). Digitalisation is another megatrend that emerged some time ago; COVID-19 has accelerated the adoption of digital technologies, both on the organisational and industry levels (LaBerge et al. 2020). Virtual travel experience is evolving: socially-distanced craft classes, virtual tango lessons, augmented reality technology GPS-guided city tours accompanied by avatar guides. Artists and cultural organisations are going where their audiences are and creating new types of gigs, spectacles

Service design: developing service concepts

Customer orientation was further emphasised during the Service Design workshops with Lauri Lukka from the consulting company Solita. One of the main reasons of start-ups' failures is the lack of market need; the same may apply to the new services. To develop a service that the customers will accept, we need to pay attention to the customer needs, validate the design with the users and iterate based on the feedback (CB Insights 2019). According to Lukka (2021), service design is a human-centred viewpoint to service development and business innovations, focusing on the customer, business, and sustainability. Service design is a highly visual iterative and experimental approach based on the actual needs, takes into account the experiences of everyone involved and incorporates all the stakeholders in the process. Service design is based on the principles of desirability, feasibility and viability. Desirability is the main point in the realm of the limited resources. It means understanding customer needs and identifying a competitive advantage in the existing ecosystem. The feasibility of the service is another vital aspect that assumes access to resources, customers and existing stakeholders. Viability deals with the financial side of services, such as revenues and costs. (Lukka 2021)

During the first day of the workshop, participants were given the chance to think honestly about existing problems related to their services and imagine a worst-case scenario when the problem is not solved, e.g., decreased sales and profits. The following steps were to think about how customer insight

could be created: who, what, and how to research, and how to incorporate this insight into design decisions. Participants were provided with the guidelines for conducting the customer interviews as their homework to get customer insight. According to the participants' feedback, this assignment was highly beneficial for their organisations.

During the second day of the workshop, Lukka showcased the example of a very good planned online service, and participants highlighted the main points of the great product. Then the service design tools, such as customer profile, customer journey and service blueprint, were introduced and tested during the group work at online platform Miro. Customer journey is a visual tool that describes the customer interaction with the service over time and identifies what customers appreciate and dislike at each phase of the service. The service blueprint further examines the customer journey together with the service production. Finally, customer profiles are represented as archetypes of key service users and their fundamental motives, needs, hopes, and skills relevant to the service and based on the behavioural differences of the customers regarding the use of the services (Lukka 2011).

According to the participants' feedback, they appreciated the interactive group work. Still, at the same time, they needed more time to work with the tools. The individual mentoring sessions organised by Taina Vuorela (LAB), Juha Iso-Aho (Humak) and Olga Bogdanova (LAB) were offered to the participants of the project. Six companies from Finland and Russia participated in them. Juha-Pekka Natunen from the Nuijamies cul-

tural centre in Lappeenranta took another look at the customers and their experiences of the Nuijamies cultural tourism product “Ruoka ja Drama”. Pekka Mäkinen from Airtouch identified four main customer profiles for their Finnish tourism marketing platform services, Stopover.fi and Lakeland Experiences, and focused on the most critical customer profile, corporate clients. Katri Lätt from Black and White Theatre Festival (Imatra) focused on the local customers due to COVID-19 restrictions and improved their service concept based on the customer profiles. Finally, Alexandra Baturina from Kaykino Creative Projects created customer profiles based on insight collected during interviews and surveys and updated customer journeys and service blueprints for their services.

During the project and individual sessions, the most active participants were Irina Kelner from Museum Experience Center (St. Petersburg) and Elli Niaria from AXiiO (Helsinki). During the session with Elli Niaria from AXiiO, a virtual reality (VR) equipment developer and content developer for culture and tourism organisations, we looked into the B2B sales process related to the innovative VR equipment they developed – a stationary obscurer creates an extended reality of the place – its historical moments. The customer journey helped the company create an understanding of the end-user of the service and create a convincing proposal for the museums. Irina Kelner from the Museum Experience makes an innovative service – city and museum quests in St. Petersburg for children using the chatbots on Facebook and Vkontakte (so-called “Russian Facebook, the largest social media platform in Russia).

Customers were segmented into four categories: communicator/influencer, player/experiencer, researcher/collector and contemplator. The categorisation was based on the purpose of using the service (fun or knowledge) and behavioural characteristics of the user, such as peace or communication. The primary customer profile was created during the session, and the company continued developing other customer profiles with the Higher School of Economics students. When creating a customer journey and service blueprint (see Image 6), several ideas appeared at various stages of the service, for example, related to promotion, collaboration with other stakeholders, service components.

Updating business models

The business model has been long in the focus of analysis of innovation studies. According to Magretta (2002), business models are the stories illustrating how the company operates. Good business models provide the answers to the questions like: Who are our customers? What do our customers value? How do we earn money? How do we deliver value to our customers? A typical business model consists of two dimensions, value proposition and operating model, which in turn include six components: target segments, product or service offering, revenue model, value chain, cost model, and organisation (Lindgardt et al. 2009). All the companies have business models, whether they articulate that or not. Understanding the concept business model helps assess the current state of the business model and develop the plan for Business Model Innovation (BMI). BMI requires the involvement of the top leadership of the com-

pany to succeed (Chesbrough 2007).

During module 3, we already started developing a value proposition, module 4, dedicated to new business models and funding concentrated on the operating model. During the first session of the module, various ways of raising funding for culture and tourism organisations were presented. Leena Janhila from Humak suggested the overall funding path for cultural organisations and outlined the various public funding opportunities in Finland. Tomi M. Virtanen, Founder of Doerz, discussed how to raise money using crowd-funding and shared his experiences of success and failure of his campaigns. Elizaveta Ordinartseva presented the experiences of developing a funding path for the non-governmental museum in Russia: raising funding from various sources available, such as crowd-funding and governmental funds. And finally, Taina Vuorela from LAB held a practical hands-on workshop on Goal-Oriented Project Planning. Participants were given the possibility to try the tools for creating an appealing grant application based on the Logical Framework (LogFrame) approach. LogFrame is a matrix that includes interconnected components of the project, such as its goal, activities, results and outputs (Couillard et al. 2009).

On the final day of module 4, the holistic view of the business model was taken during an interactive workshop with Taina Vuorela (LAB), when participants of the project learned about Business Model Canvas (BMC) and Value Proposition Canvas by A. O. Osterwalder (Osterwalder et al. 2014). The BMC is a visual tool for identifying key elements of the business and how they relate. Using the BMC, one can develop a structured one-page

view of the value proposition, operations, customers, and finances (Mock 2017). The Value Proposition Canvas is an approach that can help link the positioning of the product or service to match the customer needs and values (Fox, 2021). EDUCRO project participants, students of LAB and the Higher School of Economics co-created the new business model of the joint idea between Museum Experience Center and AXiiO (see Images 7–8).

Innovative ways of marketing

In May–June 2021, module 5 of the EDUCRO training programme was dedicated to marketing and branding the culture and tourism services. The module was open to everyone interested in the topic. During the first event of the series, “Stories to buy! Storytelling as a tool for better customer experience”, Pekka Vartiainen and Juha Iso-Aho from Humak introduced storytelling. Storytelling has been the most natural form of communication since the beginning of human history (Patterson and Brown 2005). Storytelling can keep relationships with existing customers and attract new ones (Delgadillo & Esealas 2004). Stories and other elements of cultural heritage can be integrated as part of the service products of tourism and culture entrepreneurs. Iso-Aho and Vartiainen suggested that stories can enable the tourist visiting Southeast Finland to reach the same feeling that fills the senses of the tourist in Rome or Athens, where the multiple layers of history with their stories can be found almost at one glance (Vartiainen & Iso-Aho 2021).

During the webinar and panel discussion “Innovative Practices in Digital Marketing”, over 70 participants were brought together

online. Five bright speakers discussed how to create new marketing opportunities in the digital space. Sami Lanu (LAB) highlighted that most successful companies choose the latter in the trade-off between data collection and user experience. Oleg Nikolaenko (AXiiO Oy) showcased how creative companies use virtual reality to promote their brands. Juha-Pekka Natunen (Nuijamies cultural centre) discussed how culture and arts could collaborate with other industries and produce high-quality marketing content. Pekka Mäkinen (Airtouch Oy) illustrated how 3D and VR bridge and connect services and products. Finally, Alexandra Kovaleva (Manege Central Exhibition Hall) shared how cultural space can use digital to connect with the audiences. The motivation to discuss this topic and the number of participants indicate that the issue is highly important for the culture and tourism professionals and requires more exploration. The contact workshops and masterclasses will be organised during the project's third year to try technologies hands-on.

The final workshop of the series was organised on 4 June when participants explored the topic of branding and brand cooperation together with Heikki Laaninen from Fairly, a Finnish company specialised in digital products and publishing. The questions were collected from participants in advance, and the speaker addressed them with examples from his own experience.

Findings

The project attempted to create an ecosystem that allows for developing new business models and improving existing ones to build relationships with customers and their expe-

riences. Another critical aspect of the ecosystem was to foster cross-border collaboration between the participants of the project. While most participants declared the motivation for cross-border cooperation, only a few engaged in the new business idea development and building networks. The funnel-type pattern of participant engagement in the training programme was identified. The funnel structure includes three stages: participation in the educational events, applying the knowledge in the organisational context (1-on-1 mentoring sessions and experiments) and building cross-border products and services. The main challenge for participants, according to their feedback, was to build collaboration online.

The set of measures is planned for the third year of the project aimed at advancing the cooperation. First, the final module of the programme will focus on internationalisation and networking. Second, a new format of regular events will be introduced to the participants and tested. The format will include a previously successfully tested session of short presentations and panel discussion, which will be combined with the networking session tested during monthly T-time talks. The events will be organised in cooperation with the Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture (NDPC), an initiative bridging the practitioners from the culture and creative industries. The first event will be organised online, and the other two will be held in Finland and in Russia. Finally, two summer camps will be held in both countries to recap the learning, test the tools and technologies, network and build collaboration.

The EDUCRO project is an interesting example for building an online professional learning community, and the results of the project pilot can be used in the other programmes for adult education and degree programmes in culture and tourism. Several articles written by the team for international conferences, such as INTED21, Cross-Cultural Business Conference, EDULEARN21, reveal the experiences and lessons learnt: sustainability and innovation orientation of culture and tourism SMEs (Vuorela et al. 2021), collaboration methods and channels between the higher education institutions and SMEs

(Meltovaara et al. 2021), experiences of participants in online learning and community building (Bogdanova et al. 2021). The articles' findings can be helpful for the higher education institutions personnel involved in planning and implementing the international projects.



CBC 2014-2020
SOUTH-EAST FINLAND - RUSSIA

References

Bogdanova, O. 2020. Culture and Tourism: Life in “The New Normal”. [Cited the 28th of June 2021]. Available at: <https://blogit.lab.fi/labfocus/en/culture-and-tourism-life-in-the-new-normal/>

Bogdanova, O., Brusila-Meltovaara, K., Janhila, L., Iso-Aho, J. & Vuorela T. 2021. Cross-border experimental e-learning experiences. 13th annual International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: https://iated.org/concrete3/view_abstract.php?paper_id=89438

CB Insights. 2019. The Top 20 Reasons Start-ups Fail. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://www.cbinsights.com/research/startup-failure-reasons-top/>

Chesbrough, H. 2007. Business Model Innovation: It’s Not Just About Technology Anymore. Strategy & Leadership. Vol. 35, No. 6, 12-17. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/10878570710833714>

Couillard J., Garon S. & Riznic J. 2009. The Logical Framework Approach-Millennium. Project Management Journal. Vol. 40(4), 31-44. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.20117>

Delgadillo Y. & Esealas, J.E. 2004. Narrative word-of-mouth communication: exploring memory and attitude effects of consumer storytelling. Advances in Consumer Research. Vol. 31, 186-192. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/8881/volumes/v31/NA-31>

Fox G. 2021. How To Use The Value Proposition Canvas – 10 Step Guide Plus Free Templates. Gary Fox. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://www.garyfox.co/canvas-models/value-proposition-canvas-guide/>

Kim, Y.-H., Park, S.-W. & Sawng & Y.-W. 2016. Improving new product development (NPD) process by analysing failure cases. Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Vol. 10 (1), 134-150. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJIE-12-2016-002>

LaBerge, L., O’Toole, C., Schneider, J. & Smaje, K. 2020. How COVID-19 has pushed companies over the technology tipping point—and transformed business forever. McKinsey. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/how-covid-19-has-pushed-companies-over-the-technology-tipping-point-and-transformed-business-forever#>

Landers, L. 2021. What We've Learned About Consumer Trends So Far in 2021. Business 2 Community. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://www.business2community.com/consumer-marketing/what-weve-learned-about-consumer-trends-so-far-in-2021-02401355>

Lindgardt, Z., Reeves, M., Stalk, G. & Deimler, M.S. 2009. Business Model Innovation. When the Game Gets Tough, Change the Game. The Boston Consulting Group. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: https://image-src.bcg.com/Images/BCG_Business_Model_Innovation_Dec_09_tcm81-121706.pdf

Lukka, L. 2021. Introduction to Service Design. Unpublished Lecture Materials. LAB University of Applied Sciences Event, 18.02.2021 & 25.02.2021.

Magretta, J. 2002. Why Business Models Matter. Harvard Business Review. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://hbr.org/2002/05/why-business-models-matter>

Meltovaara, K., Bogdanova, O. & Vuorela, T. 2021. A cross-border collaboration involving SMEs and universities of applied sciences. In Überwimmer, M., Füreder, R. & Schmidthaler, M. (eds.). Cross-Cultural Business Conference 2021. [06 Oct 2021]. Available at: <https://www.shaker.de/de/content/catalogue/index.asp?lang=de&ID=8&ISBN=978-3-8440-8032-2&search=yes>

Proceedings of Cross-cultural Business Conference, 2021. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://www.shaker.de/de/content/catalogue/index.asp?lang=de&ID=8&ISBN=978-3-8440-8032-2>

Mock, T. 2017. The Benefits of Using the Business Model Canvas. Asheville SCORE. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://asheville.score.org/blog/benefits-using-business-model-canvas>

Osterwalder, A., Pigneur, Y., Bernarda, G. & Smith, A. 2014. Value proposition design: How to create products and services customers want. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Patterson, A. & Brown, S. 2005. No Tale, No Sale: A Novel Approach to Marketing Communication. The Marketing Review, Vol 5, 315-328. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1362/146934705775186863>

Riserbato, R. 2020. Customer Orientation: What it Is and How to Implement It [+Examples]. HubSpot. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://blog.hubspot.com/service/customer-orientation>

Scheuing, E. E. & Johnson, E. M. 1989. A proposed model for new service development. *Journal of Services Marketing*. Vol. 3 (2), 25-35. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000002484>

Tikka, V. 2020. Identifying new opportunity - Moving from crisis management to future building. Unpublished Lecture Materials. LAB University of Applied Sciences Event, 18.11.2020 & 25.11.2020.

Vartiainen, P. & Iso-Aho, J. 2021. Stories to buy! Storytelling as a tool for better customer experience. Unpublished Lecture Materials, LAB University of Applied Sciences Event, 22.04.2021.

Vuorela, T., Meltovaara, K., Tuominen, U. & Bogdanova, O. 2021. Developing Sustainable Business Management Education in the Cultural sector. 15th International Technology, Education and Development Conference. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: [DOI: 10.21125/inted.2021.1109](https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2021.1109)

Vuorio, A., Torkkeli, L. & Sainio L-M. 2020. Service Innovation and Internationalisation in SMEs: Antecedents and Profitability Outcomes. *Journal of international entrepreneurship*. Vol. 18, 92-123. [Cited 28 June 2021]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10843-019-00266-z>



NEW RADICAL INITIATIVES

Heidi Myyryläinen, Taina Vuorela & Anna Pajari

Social Entrepreneurial Competences in Higher Education

SEINHE - DEVELOPING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURIAL SKILLS IN HIGHER EDUCATION	
Project period	1.11.2020-30.10.2022
Funding	Erasmus 2014-2020
LAB's role	Partner
Project website	https://lab.fi/fi/projekti/seinhe-developing-social-entrepreneurial-skills-higher-education



Abstract

In this paper we discuss the social entrepreneurial competences in higher education. The topic is multifaceted. There are many ways to define social entrepreneurship and social enterprises. We discuss the theme relying on the EU's operational definition of social enterprise and e.g. European framework for entrepreneurial competences (EntreComp) and some notions from academic literature on social entrepreneurship.

Defining social entrepreneurship

In understanding competences needed in social enterprises, it is important to understand what we are talking about when we talk about social enterprise. Social enterprises are diverse in different countries and even within one country. In addition, social enterprises operate in different legal forms and ownership structures. (European Commission 2019)

It can be said, however, that what they have in common is that they have two dimensions – economic and social (Defourny & Nyssens 2010) – where the social or environmental outcomes are focused primarily over profit maximisation or other strategic considerations. In other words, the economic value serves social objectives. (Huybrechts & Nicholls 2012)

The European Commission's operational definition is in line with the previously men-

tioned aspects. It describes a social enterprise as “an operator in the social economy whose main objective is to have a social impact rather than make a profit for their owners or shareholders. It operates by providing goods and services for the market in an entrepreneurial and innovative fashion and uses its profits primarily to achieve social objectives. It is managed in an open and responsible manner and, in particular, involves employees, consumers and stakeholders affected by its commercial activities.” (European Commission 2019) In practice, it means that the reason for economic activity can be described as social or societal, there is a relatively high level of social innovativeness involved, the profits are mainly reinvested in the enterprise to achieve the set social goals, and the management system includes democratic or participatory principles and has a focus on social justice. (European Commission 2019)

Finland is among a few European countries where there are labels or certification available for social enterprises to apply for, if they choose to (European Commission 2020, 66). Companies and organisations can apply for a certificate, the Finnish Social Enterprise Mark, based on the European Commission’s Social Business Initiative definition. It is intended for businesses with social aims that address either social or ecological issues. They invest most of their profits back into their business or promote their social aims in other ways. Any type of organisation that meets these criteria can be awarded the Social Enterprise Mark SEM. (European Commission 2019) The three main criteria are more precisely: 1) the social enterprise has a social purpose, either environmental or social, 2) it invests at least 51% of the profits in promoting

their aims: by developing their own business or by donations, 3) its business is open and transparent. Secondary criteria are that employees have the opportunity to participate in and influence the decision making, the social impact is measured, and that the organisation implements innovative operating and service models. (Suomalaisen työn liitto 2021)

One form of social entrepreneurship is the so-called Work Integrated Social Enterprises (sosiaaliset yritykset) WISEs. Their main aim is to offer employment to the disabled and long-term unemployed. The difference between WISEs and other companies is that in WISEs 30% of the employees must be disabled or long-term unemployed. (Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment of Finland 2021) In Finland, WISEs are regulated by specific law (Act on Social Enterprises 1351/2003 revised 924/2012) and separated from other types of social enterprises. All types of enterprises and social economy organisations with business activities that fulfil the requirements set for WISEs can register on the WISE list. WISE-registered organisations can additionally be awarded SEM status, too, if they meet the requirements set for the SEM certificate. (European Commission 2019)

However, in addition to the previously mentioned institutionalised forms, enterprises with the Finnish Social Enterprise Mark or WISEs, there is a wide group of other enterprises and organisations which can be viewed as social enterprises. It is important to understand that the social enterprises are a diverse group; they can be small local enterprises or growth-oriented international companies, and their missions, sectors, target groups, operation environments and business models vary.

The EU recognises the importance of ethics in entrepreneurship

An important framework for understanding competences related to entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship is provided by the European framework for entrepreneurial competences (EntreComp). Nearly two decades ago, entrepreneurship and a general sense of initiative were qualified as key competences in the knowledge-based society (Bacigalupo et al. 2016). As the lack of jointly agreed learning outcomes for entrepreneurship education was recognised as an obstacle to developing entrepreneurial education in the member states of the European Union, the JRC – Joint Research Centre – of the European Commission launched a research project to explore the issue (ibid.). As a result of the project, the European Commission created a Reference Framework on entrepreneurial competences – the EntreComp Framework – in order to promote entrepreneurship in the world of work, as well as in education (ibid.). The framework contains three (3) competence areas, namely, Ideas and opportunities, Resources, and Into action, with five (5) competences each.

Ethical and sustainable thinking is presented as one of the key entrepreneurial competences under Ideas and opportunities in EntreComp (Bacigalupo et al. 2016). According to the EntreComp framework, competences such as creativity, vision and ethics are the prerequisites for creating successful entrepreneurial ideas and opportunities (ibid.). An individual's entrepreneurial resources include e.g. self-efficacy, perseverance, economic literacy, mobilising oneself and others; while working with others, coping with

uncertainty and management are important competences when moving to action (ibid.). The model is progressive, as it describes the competences at three levels of proficiency: foundation, intermediate and advanced (ibid.). Hence, it can be exploited in curriculum development at educational establishments representing different levels of education: primary, secondary or tertiary.

Social entrepreneurship competences – dynamic view to competences

The EntreComp framework that we described in the previous chapter concerns also social entrepreneurship. Also, we view that the competence areas described in the EntreComp framework are the competencies needed also in social entrepreneurship.

Miller et al. (2012) studied social entrepreneurship courses in 77 universities, and as a result they suggest what kind of competence areas are needed in social enterprises. They interpret that most of the competencies are similar to those in any commercial enterprise – social enterprises need strategic development, relevant knowledge or financial capital management or selling and marketing just as other enterprises, but some competencies are distinctive: social enterprises need competencies in balancing with the social and economic mission, and according to Miller et al. (2012), they need competencies in being attentive to their social mission. Already in the initiation stage, the social enterprises have needed competencies in spotting the social problems and business opportunity while also having interest in creating social impact. Miller et al. (2012) also suggests that

social enterprises need competencies regarding their collective goals and committing to it. Miller et al. (2012) note that some social enterprises also have voluntary participation in their company, and they need volunteer support development regarding that.

What does it mean to combine social mission with business from the perspective of competences? It is suggested that value-based entrepreneurs “demonstrate that it is possible – and in some cases more profitable, to build businesses and exercise their social values concurrently” (Choi & Grey 2011, 6). On the other hand, some studies suggest that

having both social and economic missions in the company is more challenging and requires competencies. Some studies suggest that aligning social mission and business can cause tensions between the social aims and business aims (Cho 2006; Tracey and Phillips 2007; Whittam & Birch 2011).

Even though the needed competencies are partly the same as the competencies needed in other types of enterprises, the meaning of them may be different in the context of social entrepreneurship due to their social mission. Miller, Wesley and Williams (2012) explain these differences in their study where they



Image 1. What kind of issues do social entrepreneurship competences entail? A word cloud in accordance with some of the social entrepreneurship competencies suggested by Miller et al. (2012). (Image: Heidi Myyräläinen)

evaluate competencies deemed important by 150 social entrepreneurship practitioners and compare them to competencies that are mostly taught in 77 social entrepreneurship syllabi. Good examples are, e.g., problem solving (ranked the most important skill by practitioners) and measuring outcomes. In addition to measuring the economic impact like financial indicators, market share or customer satisfaction, social enterprises need to measure also their social impact.

Measuring social impact or social change has, however, been found challenging. (Miller et al. 2012) The same goes for problem solving: on the one hand it is a general skill but in the context of social enterprises the problems are related to social problems that are usually deep, intractable and closely related to communities, governments and infrastructure. Marketing and selling the organisation enlighten the differences clearly: in the case of a social enterprise marketing is not just focused on increasing sales or transactions but rather on ethical issues as well as on reshaping positive social behaviours, appealing to customers to help others, and informing stakeholders about the benefits of sustainable solutions solving a social problem. In other words, the aim of marketing is to gain long-term social benefit instead of immediate financial returns. Also, skills like ability to communicate with customers, suppliers and other stakeholders as well as ability to challenge traditional ways of thinking were both rated high by practitioners. The importance is probably based on the fundamental need of constructing new value chains and business models, especially in situations where the society or the markets have failed to meet so-

cial needs. (Miller et al. 2012)

Most importantly, it is viewed that entrepreneurs create – or co-create – the enterprise, and its social impact, in interaction with their stakeholders, community and environment. (Schoonhoven & Romanelli 2001; Gelderen et al. 2012) So should competencies also be examined as dynamic and interactive phenomena and not purely as individual phenomena but also in group-level and community-level phenomena? In this sense, the groups and communities may be supportive for entrepreneurial processes, or the group or community may have complementary competencies with each other. With social enterprises, it might be even more important how they engage with their social context. This can also be linked to the two differing theories on entrepreneurship, namely, creation and discovery (see Alvarez & Barney 2007).

It can be concluded that combining social mission and business activities requires a wide range of social and business competences. Inclusive corporate governance is also an area where particular competences are needed. Besides, exploring the competences required of individual social entrepreneurs, it may be necessary to consider the factors required at the organisational level in social purpose organisations. Wickert et al. (2017) discuss the importance of organisational culture on whether and how multinational companies adopt CSR practices of smaller socially oriented enterprises in the case of mergers. The identity of the buying organisation seems to be decisive in whether CSR-related practices are adopted substantially (i.e. operationally), selectively or purely symbolically – where CSR remains rhetorical (ibid.).

The project SEinHE - Developing Social Entrepreneurial Skills in Higher Education - aims at raising awareness about social entrepreneurship and its benefits around higher education institutions (HEIs) and in a wider range, to promote the development of this business model. There is obviously a lack of understanding of the concept of social entrepreneurship among HEIs as well as in societies. To get a comprehensive understanding of the current situation, the project collects information on perceptions and insights of different target groups like social entre-

preneurs, business incubators, students and teachers in participating universities related to social enterprises and social entrepreneurship education. The project will publish the report on social entrepreneurship competences and proposed education approaches at the end of 2021.



Funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

References

Act on Social Enterprises 1351/2003. Finlex. [Cited 7.10.2021]. Available at: <https://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2003/en20031351>

Alvarez, S. A. & Barney, J. B. 2007. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*. Vol. 1, pp. 11-26. [Cited 15 June 2021]. Available at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/sej.4>

Bacigalupo, M., Kampylis, P. Punie, Y. & van den Brande, G. 2016. *EntreComp: The Entrepreneurship Competence Framework*. Luxembourg: Publication Office of the European Union; EUR 27939 EN. [Cited 15 June 2021]. Available at: <https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC101581>

Cho, A. H. 2006. Politics, values and social entrepreneurship: A critical appraisal. In Mair, J. Robinson, J. & Hockerts, K. (Eds.). *Social entrepreneurship*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 34-56.

Choi, D. Y. & Gray, E. R. 2011. *Values-centered entrepreneurs and their companies*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Defourny, J. & Nyssens, M. 2010. Conceptions of Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and Divergences. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. 1: 1, 32 – 53.

European Commission. 2019. *Social enterprises and their ecosystems in Europe. Updated country report: Finland*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [Cited 15 June 2021]. Available at <https://europa.eu/Qq64ny>

European Commission. 2020. *Social enterprises and their ecosystems in Europe. Comparative synthesis report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [Cited 15 June 2021]. Available at: <https://europa.eu/Qq64ny>

Gelderden, M. Verduyn, K. & Masurel, E. 2012. Introduction to Entrepreneurship in Context. In: Gelderden, M. van. & Masurel, E. (Eds.) *Entrepreneurship in context*. New York, N.Y: Routledge. 1-23.

Huybrechts, B. & Nicholls, A. 2012. *Social Entrepreneurship: Definitions, Drivers, and Challenges*. In: Volkman, C., Tokarski, K., Ernst, K., (eds.) *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business: An Introduction and Discussion with Case Studies*. Wiesbaden: Gabler Verlag. 31-48.

Miller, T. L., Wesley, C. L. & Williams, D. E. 2012. Educating the minds of caring hearts: Comparing the views of practitioners and educators on the importance of social entrepreneurship competencies. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*. Vol. 11 (3), 349-352.

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment of Finland. 2021. Social enterprises. [Cited 1 June 2021]. Available at: <https://tem.fi/en/social-enterprises>

OECD. 2010. *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation SMEs*. Entrepreneurship and Innovation. Paris: OECD Publishing.


Schoonhoven, C.B. & Romanelli, E. 2001. Emergent themes and the next wave of entrepreneurship research. In: Schoonhoven, C.B. & Romanelli, E. (Eds.). *The Entrepreneurship Dynamic*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 383-408.

Suomalaisen työn liitto. 2021. Finnish social enterprise. [Cited 1 June 2021]. Available at: <https://suomalaisytyo.fi/en/services/finnish-social-enterprise/>

Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. 2007. The distinctive challenge of educating social entrepreneurs: A postscript and rejoinder to the special issue on entrepreneurship education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*. Vol. 8, 264-271.

Whittam, G., & Birch, K. 2011. Can the market deliver the goods? A critical review of the social enterprise agenda. In Southern, A. (Ed.). *Enterprise: Deprivation and social exclusion*. Abingdon: Routledge. 239-253.

Wickert, C., Vaccaro, T. & Cornelissen, J. 2017. 'Buying' Corporate Social Responsibility: Organizational Identity Orientation as a Determinant of Practice Adoption. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 142, 497-514.



The Commercialisation of Innovations is one of the four strategic focus areas of the research, development and innovation (RDI) activities of the LAB University of Applied Sciences. The aim of this review is to communicate the actions and results of ongoing and recently completed RDI projects in the strategic focus area as well as convey lessons learnt from and experiences yielded by the experiments carried out as part of these projects.

The Publication Series of LAB University of Applied Sciences, part 28
ISSN 2670-1928 (PDF)
ISBN 978-951-827-377-9 (PDF)