

# *Organizing Innovation*

An Evaluation Report on  
the Work of the Swedish  
Case Method Centre

Ivar Bleiklie, Norwegian Research Centre in  
Organization and Management, 1995

Högskoleverket 1996

**Organizing Innovation – An Evaluation Report on the Work of  
the Swedish Case Method Centre**

Högskoleverkets skriftserie 1996:4 S

ISSN 1400-9498

ISRN HSV-SS--96/4--SE

Produced by National Agency for Higher Education (Högskoleverket),  
Stockholm, in June 1996

Contents: Ivar Bleiklie, Norwegian Research Centre in Organization and  
Management, 1995

Graphic Design: Information Department

Printed by Printgraf, Stockholm, Sweden, August 1996

# Table of Contents

<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 Methodology</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3 Basic Concept</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4 Strategy and Tasks</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5 Accomplishments</b>	<b>15</b>
5.1 Building a network	15
5.2 Faculty development	17
5.3 Case production	17
<b>6 Information</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>7 Results</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>8 Student Experiences</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>9 Recommendations</b>	<b>27</b>



# I Introduction

The Swedish Case Method Centre (SCMC), formally established on May 14, 1992, was the outcome of an initiative by the Karl-Adam Bonnier Foundation and the Council for the Renewal of Undergraduate Education. The Centre was located at the University of Stockholm after an open competition, but has a nationwide responsibility. It is financed by grants from the three aforementioned institutions. The aim of the Centre is “*To contribute in various ways to the development of case pedagogics*” in the academic fields of business administration, law and political science. It may be regarded as one among several efforts to renew Swedish undergraduate education in the wake of the recommendations of the Swedish Higher Education Commission, that had pointed to case methodology as one possible source of renewal. The Centre employs three academics on a half-time basis one in each of the three fields, plus a half-time assistant in business administration. The Centre was established for a three year period on a trial basis, at the end of which the granting institutions will decide the future of the Centre and its activities. This evaluation was commissioned by the Board with a deadline in January 1995. It was scheduled to represent one month’s work.

The evaluator faced three main problems: Firstly, the Centre has been given originally a very general mandate, and however specified, it is difficult to form any clear opinion on the merits of a long term project after just 2 1/2 years, given the relative inertia of academic curricula. Secondly, to this evaluator’s knowledge a national centre with pedagogical aims at university level is not a common phenomenon for which established international standards of evaluation exist. The evaluation will therefore base itself on the views and opinions of those involved in or affected by the activities of the Centre rather than scrutinizing its activities in terms of any externally given standards. Finally, to anticipate somewhat, based on a comparison of the tasks it was assigned and what it has actually accomplished the Centre seems on the whole to have met most of its obligations. Several respondents in particular praised the Director, Yngve Myrman for his work. Yet it has received mixed reviews. The main task will therefore be to clarify the main perspectives of the actors involved, on what presumptions they are based and what implications they might have for the evaluation and its recommendations.



## 2 Methodology

The approach chosen for this evaluation was clearly affected by the fact that it was explicitly asked to answer eight specific questions about the idea of a national centre, its performance and its future existence. In this sense the approach, rather than being responsive, takes certain key issues for granted and seeks to clarify how the object of evaluation fits into predetermined categories (cf. Tony Becher's discussion in his evaluation of the Council for the Renewal of Higher Education). However, being aware of the dangers of this approach - most important among which is the insensitivity to the interests and concerns of the actors involved, the initial questions were therefore given a general form that might cover a wide range of more specific issues. These questions were thus used as reference points and were supplemented by a more responsive approach. In order to do that, respondents were first asked to describe the background for and their actual relationship with the Centre. At this point those who knew very little, had the opportunity to terminate the interview if they so pleased and if possible refer to other relevant respondents at their institution. On that basis the evaluator tried to form a better picture of the perspectives and concerns of each respondent. Accordingly, the original questions were modified or new ones were added as the scrutiny proceeded and adjustments were indicated.

Two sources of data were used, most important of which were the interviews. Three types of interviews were made: a) Personal interviews with the board members, its secretary, the staff and other persons involved with the Centre at the University of Stockholm (9). These interviews were semi-structured and lasted on average one hour. b) Telephone interviews with users of the Centre's services at eight different universities and university colleges (19). Originally the intention was to visit a few selected institutions for personal interviews with users. However, as it soon became clear that it would be important to get an idea of how and to what extent the Centre fulfilled its national obligations, telephone interviews were chosen in order to cover a larger number of institutions in a relatively short time. The respondents first contacted were persons formally responsible for the teaching program at their institution, teaching coordinators (studierektor) or chairs (prefekt). If they felt unable to respond, they always referred to another staff member

who was better informed. The telephone interviews lasted from 5 minutes to 20 minutes depending on the extent of previous contact between the respondent and the Centre. c) Two group interviews, one with students in law (3) and another with students in political science and business administration (11), which lasted about half an hour each. The interviews spanned eight universities and university colleges and numbered altogether 42 respondents, partly persons formally in charge of the teaching programs at their institution (14), and partly persons who were related to the Centre as recipients of fellowships, as seminar participants or as producers of cases for the Centre (5).

The second source of data was a variety of written documents: minutes from board meetings, one annual report, the Centre newsletter, travel reports, reports from seminars and meetings, surveys of the seminars organized by the Centre, lists of participants from selected seminars, a manual in case methodology produced by the Centre, 31 cases produced by or in connection with the Centre, a survey of available cases freely distributed by the Centre, and a database of Swedish cases.

Full notes were taken during each interview and later written in readily accessible form. Each answer was also registered as a response to the main questions about performance and recorded in a table, with crossreferences to the interview notes where the reasons were given that could explain the response. The viewpoints expressed in the interviews were later supplemented by the written material, the main function of which was to provide a concrete picture of the activities of the Centre against which the viewpoints expressed by the respondents could be judged. The evaluator has taken the liberty of translating and presenting quotations from the interviews in English.

### 3 Basic Concept

In principle one can imagine several ways in which to spread a pedagogical or another innovation in a university system. One approach might be to diffuse the innovation along the bureaucratic chain of command as in a *public agency*, where the chairs and teaching coordinators would be responsible for the implementation of the innovation in their department. A second approach might be to concentrate on distributing financial incentives, like a *research council* and offer means to those, be it individuals or institutions, who demonstrate their interest and capability through an application procedure. A third possibility, which is the one actually chosen, is to act as a *service provider*, where a set of services, like teacher training, available cases, information and some financial support are offered to interested parties.

Finally one might discard a national strategy and concentrate on one or a few institutions based on the notion that case methodology is more than a mere tool, but represents a *culture* that should permeate the institution in order to be effective.

Most of the respondents were positive to the concept of some sort of a centre and three main arguments were given in favor of the idea: Firstly a centre can provide case material for teachers at other institutions who do not have the time to produce cases themselves. Secondly it can provide money and prestige to the effort that could not have been obtained otherwise. The possibility of going to teacher training seminars and to meet foreign specialists in case methodology were pointed out as important assets, particularly by teachers at smaller university colleges who otherwise would not have had such opportunities. The fact that the Centre staff also has visited institutions across the country and given courses in case methodology free of charge, was also mentioned as an important resource in this connection. Thirdly a centre represents an important contact point, a core in the network, where teachers can collect information about available case material, get in touch with colleagues abroad as well as at other institutions in Sweden.

The major argument that was given against the basic idea of a centre was that case methodology could only be put to use effectively within an institutional

culture that favored the case approach. To quote one of the respondents: “If you want to break with tradition, you must break up the institutions, and develop initiatives at the institutional level. The strategy must be to find an institution that is willing to change its mode of operation, its approach. You need to have at least more than half the teachers using the case approach.” Another respondent argued against the idea of a national centre from the exact opposite position. In this case the argument was that case pedagogics is not that special. It is therefore an activity that the institutions should be able to sustain themselves without the aid of a national centre.

The two other concepts of a centre as a public agency or as a research council was not supported by the respondents. They argued unanimously against the public agency concept because it would represent a bureaucratic top down approach alien to academic culture and thus would result in nothing. Neither did the research council approach receive any support. The argument that was levelled against it was that dispersing money to individual applicants without any regard for infrastructure was extremely inefficient.

Based on the respondents’ evaluation it seems fair to conclude that the basic idea of a national centre has important merits in the sense that it has provided resources, support and case material that otherwise would not have been available. These are services that seem to be appreciated by a majority. Based on the evidence presented below it seems that the basic concept is a good one if the objective is to support the activities of individual teachers in various institutions. However, if the establishment of a “case culture” that permeates the institution in question is the objective, then the concept of a national centre is less effective at least in the short term.

## 4 Strategy and Tasks

The establishment of the Centre was a consequence of a number of coinciding events: Firstly, the case methodology had been discussed by the Swedish Higher Education Commission. Secondly, the Karl-Adam Bonnier Foundation was looking to support university teaching, particularly in the fields of economics, business administration and law. Thirdly, the newly established Council for the Renewal of Undergraduate Education had received many applications that turned on the case approach, and according to one of the respondents: “It would not have been rational to send all those people to the United States to learn the case approach”. Finally, there were universities and individual academics who were able and willing to run the Centre with a view to promoting the case approach in the Swedish university system.

The establishment thus had the character of an opportunity seized rather than a decision meticulously planned. Under the circumstances this was necessary, and thanks to the flexibility and decisiveness of those involved, the SCMC was established. It has undoubtedly made achievements that could not otherwise have been realized. However, from the wisdom of hindsight one may ask whether the parties involved nursed different visions of SCMC’s contribution, the implications of which might have been more fully clarified at the outset. On the other hand, these considerations do not mean that it is unnecessary to look critically at the actual achievements of the Centre itself as well. The Centre has been well equipped in terms of resources, and all the respondents who offered an opinion on the subject also held that half-time positions were preferable to full-time positions because it was important for the staff to keep in touch with active teaching.

*Strategy.* The first board meeting discussed the Centre policy in the form of a more precise set of goals and a strategy. The Board pointed out three main objectives for the Centre: 1) developing cases with a view to establishing the SCMC as a serious and well regarded centre for developmental work in the area, 2) developing forms of teacher training in the use of case methodology and 3) building a “case culture” which is necessary in order to fully exploit

the benefits of the case approach. These objectives would benefit from the linking of the national interest in case pedagogics with international efforts in the area and seek to establish cooperation between Swedish and foreign teachers/researchers in the production of new cases.

The strategy implied that the first year the staff was supposed to emphasize building its own network of contacts, and seek ways to link the production of cases with research in order to fit in better with the research efforts at university institutions. The second year was to result in a national conference and regional courses in the application of case methodology. The courses would imply that a manual in Swedish on the application of case methodology was to be written. The final year a database was supposed to be operational, the first “research case” to be available and an evaluation was to take place. The above mentioned strategy may look like a list of minimum demands that the board presented to the centre. Another strategy-like formulation was given by one member of the Centre staff: “I saw for myself the following development. Year one we were supposed to learn, year two to establish a network and year three to produce cases.”

*Pattern of activities.* If one looks at the pattern of activities it appears that it has developed over time in a way that by and large is compatible with this latter strategy: The travels abroad took place during the first year including visits to the European Case Clearing House (ECCH) at Cranfield Institute of Technology UK, Darden Graduate School of Business Administration at the University of Virginia, Harvard Business School, Western Business School at the University of Western Ontario and the World Association of Case Research (WACRA) conference in Bratislava. Teacher training activities increased steadily from 3 seminars and meetings held in 1992, through 11 in -93 and 17 in -94. Case production rose during the second year starting at 6 in -92, rising to 19 in -93, levelling off at 16 in -94 and totals 41, 13 of which have been produced by the Centre staff itself. The manual has been published as promised, as have the recently published Case bank of Swedish cases, currently numbering 77.

One major complaint about the formulations of tasks was raised by one of the respondents. Because the goals were too vaguely formulated, the production of cases, which this respondent regarded as the main task, had been overlooked. Apart from that, few if any objections were raised against the three main tasks: case production, teacher training and network building.

Provided one accepts the concept of a national centre, the tasks it was given seem to be well chosen. The previous discussion has indicated two competing concepts of the Centre: one is a more specialized version of a service provider concentrating on case production and distribution. The second is a concept of the Centre as a vehicle for culture formation (p.5). Although the formation of a “case culture” may, as pointed out by one of the respondents, appear a more realistic enterprise within the framework of one specific institution than across an entire educational system, the Centre was supposed to develop a “case culture” by way of network building. However, the Centre was never criticized for not having built a “case culture”, and it may still appear that the Centre may contribute to a development in the direction of such a culture, in the longer run. It certainly has started the process of building a network.

A critical observer might object that these observations tell little about whether the Centre has been productive enough and the quality of its work good enough to meet the standards one could reasonably expect. These questions will be addressed in the next section.



## 5 Accomplishments

There can be no doubt that the Centre has addressed the major tasks it was given. The questions raised in this section concerns how well the tasks have been accomplished. In order to describe the accomplishments, some simple quantitative measures will be used to supplement the interview material.

### 5.1 Building a network

*The national network.* Although teacher training and case production also make part of the development of the network, the Centre itself listed its network efforts the following way: a catalogue of Swedish and foreign cases in use at Swedish university departments in the three fields in question, an inventory of cases for undergraduate education and on this basis the development of a database called a Case bank, a newsletter to serve the network and four network reports. Several respondents mentioned network building as the most important effort of the Centre. The fact that university teachers at various institutions were motivated and trained in the use of case methodology were emphasized as particularly significant, and by the Centre staff it was emphasized that this meant more to the small university colleges with few resources than to the major universities.

A network may be several things however, depending on how much reciprocal activity one expects to take place within the network. On the one hand is the formal network of institutions in the three fields, represented by those formally in charge of the teaching programs; the teaching coordinators or the department chairs. This is a network of *information recipients*, and although it is fairly easily established, it forms the base of the other more reciprocally active and informal networks of *seminar participants*, *case users* and *case producers*.

One may note in this context that within *the formal network of case recipients* all respondents knew of the Centre's existence and that their institutions had received information from the Centre, like the newsletter and invitations to seminars. All respondents who were formally in charge of teaching programs, also passed along the information to colleagues that might be interested.

The more active *informal networks* comprised fewer persons, although the exact number is hard to judge. Based on the lists of participants from the five seminars and meetings (out of totally 31) that still were kept at the Centre, *the participants* spanned at least 19 universities and university colleges across Sweden. Even though almost two thirds of these participants came from the major universities in Stockholm, Uppsala, Gothenburg and Lund, the Centre has managed to attract teachers from an impressively wide range of institutions. The fact that Centre staff has travelled and arranged a majority of the seminars and meetings at different locations outside Stockholm may account for the wide network of participants.

The network of *case producers* is naturally a more narrow one. From the Case bank and the list over freely available cases it appears that 44 persons, from 10 different institutions have produced cases. In this network however, the concentration around Stockholm institutions is noticeable. Whereas case production in the field of business administration is fairly evenly distributed across institutions in Stockholm, Lund, Umeå and Mid-Sweden University, the Stockholm University dominance within political science and law is very clear.

There remains the crucial question of *case users*. It is difficult to estimate the number and location of actual case users, but some remarks should nevertheless be offered on the subject. It seems fair to assume that the number is somewhat higher than the number of producers but lower than the number of information recipients and possibly lower than the number of seminar participants. Provided that actual users are distributed across the institutions in a pattern similar to the producers and seminar participants, this indicates that case methodology primarily is used at the University of Stockholm in law and political science, whereas it is somewhat more widely used in business administration. The interviews corroborate this impression.

To the extent that case methodology is used at Swedish universities it is done on an individual basis by teachers who are interested in the approach. It may to some extent be integrated in the institutional efforts of certain institutions in business administration and it is definitely so in political science and business administration at the University of Stockholm. In both cases the Centre has been able to profit from already established traditions and earlier accomplishments, and it is still an open question to what extent the use of case methodology has increased as a result of the efforts of the Centre.

However, after just two and a half years, it is extremely important to be realistic about the possibilities of changing curricula and teaching practices in a university system that traditionally values research above teaching, and where the incentive structures motivate teachers to seek reduced teaching loads rather than embark on time consuming experiments in new teaching methodologies. On the other hand, some of the respondents argued that thanks to the Centre, interest in case methodology was now on the rise and about to take off. Furthermore it was held that for the smaller institutions the Centre was crucial to their efforts, because it gave them possibilities of training and networking that otherwise would have been absent.

*The international network.* This leads to a final aspect of network building, the international contacts and the linking of foreign and Swedish efforts in case methodology. The Centre seems to have been effective in establishing contacts with prominent case teaching universities like Cranfield, Darden, Harvard and Western Ontario. This has resulted in visits where prominent people in the field like Jim Erskine from Western Ontario have held seminars in Stockholm. It has also resulted in a cooperation between the Centre/ Political Science Department and the John F. Kennedy School at Harvard in a case writing project. Respondents at smaller universities mentioned visits by foreign capacities to Sweden as one of the great advantages that the Centre could bring.

## **5.2 Faculty development**

The *meetings and seminars* form the core of faculty development in the areas of case production and case teaching. There were no negative reactions against these efforts. The participants who were interviewed seem by and large to have found them interesting.

The Manual of *Case Study Methodology*, produced by the Centre staff, is based on their experiences with “front line methodology” from their visits at universities abroad. Judged by the interviews it is well known and has been positively received. As such the Manual represents a visible contribution by the Centre.

## **5.3 Case production**

The case production at the Centre involves different elements. On the one hand there are the cases produced by the Centre staff itself, altogether 14

cases. Then there are cases that are distributed freely by the Centre. Including the Centres own production there are 44 such cases. Finally there is the Case bank over cases that are used in Sweden totalling 77 cases.

Although quite a few respondents mentioned case production as one of the positive contributions of the Centre, several issues were also raised in this connection. It has already been pointed out that one respondent held that the Centre itself produced too few cases, based on the notion that case production was *the* main task of the Centre. On the other hand, if one takes for granted that case production is one among three main tasks, and that cases might as well be produced by anyone as long as they are produced within the network established by the Centre, the picture looks quite different. Staff members suggested that average production time of a case is one month (to the extent that such averages make sense). If one further assumes that the three staff members were supposed to use about one third of their time at the Centre for case production, the total output is not very far from what one could expect.

However, the production is not evenly distributed across the three academic fields. This is also the case for the forty cases available through the Centre. The dominance of political science at the University of Stockholm as a case producer is striking (25 cases). Stockholm dominates also in business administration and law, but in these fields the number of cases is much lower (respectively 9 and 6 cases). If one looks at the total number of cases registered in the Case bank, the case production within business administration (36) almost matches that of political science (38), but still with a low production in law (11).

These differences illustrate a problem several respondents pointed out. Whereas business administration and political science could build on established traditions, one started from scratch in law. Because much of the traditional teaching is based on legal cases, it was harder to argue that case methodology represented something new that deserved special attention. Some of the respondents emphasized the special problems faced by law in this connection.

The Centre as a whole encountered problems in its attempt to motivate colleagues to make cases freely available through the Centre. Several explanations were given for this reluctance to distribute their cases through the Centre. On the legal side many potential contributors were uncertain

about copyrights, although the Centre assured that this would not inflict upon the authors' rights. Furthermore, the increasing competition between Swedish universities made cooperation difficult according to some respondents, especially in a situation where the cooperation is requested by the Centre, it may be assumed to benefit its home institution rather than that of its partners. To put it in the rather blunt terms of one respondent: "Why should we write for them?" According to one respondent the social dynamics of the "Jante law", the notion that no one should stand out in any respect and be distinguishable from the rest of the community, was also a reason for a kind of scepticism against the Centre that tended to affect everything that comes from Stockholm. This observer encountered only one respondent who expressed negative attitudes of this kind, and at the smaller institutions they seemed to be absent. Given such attitudes, the process of creating a Case bank and a stock of freely available cases is not without hurdles, and should serve as a reminder of the necessity of realism in the evaluation of the Centre's accomplishments.

One respondent had expected the cases to be written in English and that cases might be traded between American and Swedish case producers. The fact that the vast majority of the cases were produced in Swedish was therefore disappointing. Most respondents and all the students emphasized on the other hand that the cases ought to be based on Swedish material in order to be useful, apart from specific courses that deal with international or comparative issues.

As a means to integrate case production in Swedish universities, the Centre has attempted to link case production with research. The Centre has therefore made available stipends, 10 in 1993, of SEK 20.000 to academics who are interested in producing cases in the three fields. In practice the stipends have been distributed among doctoral candidates who write cases based on their theses. As application procedures were first published in the fall of 1993, it is a bit early to form an opinion about these arrangements. The same applies for the 10 stipends for case production and the prizes for the best cases in Business and Commercial Law in 1993/94 set up by the Karl-Adam Bonnier Foundation.

The only explicit productivity requirement that was formulated by the foundation of the Centre, was a minimum requirement of one case in each field pr. year related to environmental problems. From the list of freely available cases it appears that this requirement has been fulfilled.



## 6 Information

According to the respondents, the Centre has informed quite successfully about itself. As pointed out above, all respondents knew about the Centre and had seen their publications. Among those who actually read the information, there were few negative and many positive comments. The Newsletter was held forth as very good, but also the Manual in case methodology, other written material, the Case bank and the seminars were mentioned. Characterizations such as “interesting”, “good”, “tempting” and “exciting” dominated. One respondent reported that the impression was “mixed” without specifying further, and another complained about not receiving adequate information in one specific case when asking for it. The Centre staff, however, felt that it was more difficult to get information across than did the information recipients. When evaluating the effects of information efforts in a modern university system, it is important to remember a point made by one respondent: High quality information work is not sufficient to penetrate an institution with new information, in a situation where the competition for attention is hard. In this perspective it seems that the Centre has done a very good job at presenting itself and making its activities known in the Swedish university system.



## 7 Results

The question of whether the Centre has achieved results in the form of more widespread use of case methodology in Sweden is hard to answer. When asked about such results, most respondents either pointed to what the Centre has done in terms of network building, teacher training and case production or such things as increased interest, more convinced persons, greater enthusiasm for the methodology. More specifically, the teaching programs in political science and the construction of special “case rooms” at Stockholm University, and the Business administration programs at the Universities of Karlstad and Lund were mentioned as examples of progress in the use of case methodology. On the other hand, at these institutions case methodology already was in use well before the Centre was established, and quite naturally no one could tell for sure the effect of the Centre’s activities from that of the institutions themselves. However, one should take the observation of an increased interest and enthusiasm seriously. It is a laudable achievement, and perhaps what one can expect to achieve after 2 1/2 years.



## 8 Student Experiences

Finally, and in a slightly different vein, it might be of interest to have some idea about student experiences with case methodology. The two student groups that were interviewed had different experiences in the sense that the law students only had attended one course at an advanced level, whereas many of the political science and business administration students had much more extensive experiences with case methodology. The overall impression is that the students valued the case approach positively.

The law students were extremely positive in their judgement, and they all felt that the criminal law case they worked with formed a crucial part of their study. They emphasized as positive that they could work in smaller groups of 25, had to work independently, could go in depth on one topic, and could work in a manner they felt was realistic. The following quotations illustrate well what one may achieve by means of the case approach in the eyes of the students. a) On group activity: "It was great being in a group where we discussed a case that everybody knew about equally well, so nobody had to pretend or feel intimidated. There was a lot more activity than you would find in other kinds of seminar groups". b) On the teacher role: "The teachers had a very different role. They did not tell us what to do. They were very well prepared and had ... foreseen many possibilities. If we did not ask this or that question they might ask why not. So they had a pretty good picture of what might happen and how the discussion would develop... If we asked a teacher about what the correct legal decision was in this or that matter, he would shrug. We had to make up our minds ourselves. This is what it is like very often. In real life there are no clear answers, even in law". c) On preparation for work: "I think the good thing about it is that now the thought of being a lawyer feels less strange".

The group of political science and business administration students had more experience with case methodology and therefore quite naturally more mixed impressions. On the positive side, they felt that the methodology itself was: "cool, exhilarating and triggered enthusiasm". On the other hand the quality of the teaching varied with the abilities of the teachers and the quality of the cases. In general they were satisfied with the teachers. However, in

some cases they were dissatisfied because the teachers were incapable of shedding old habits and therefore controlled and directed the class room situation too much. They also felt that teaching quality and enthusiasm was higher if the teachers used cases they had written themselves. They also gave several examples of cases they found particularly good and interesting.

## 9 Recommendations

Although the evaluation is somewhat mixed, most respondents regarded the Centre as an asset and wanted it to continue in some form, because an investment had been made and might otherwise be wasted. From the presentation above it appears that a network is in the process of being established, that an interest has been aroused and important resources like the Case bank, the collection of freely available cases and the Manual in case methodology now are available as a result of the Centre's activities. It is therefore the recommendation of this evaluator that the Centre's functions still should be taken care of and still need some kind of targeted support.

However, if the Centre is to continue it does not have to be in the same form as presently. The form that is chosen should depend on the priorities that are made. In section three it was argued that support to individual teachers across the Swedish university system suggests a different form of organization than the development of a "case culture" in a particular institution.

If one wants to pursue the latter course, the University of Stockholm is undoubtedly the institution where case methodology in the three disciplines appears to be most developed. Both in political science and law it looks like the only viable alternative and in business administration it seems to be the best alternative. This suggests that the task of developing a "case culture" at the three departments at the University of Stockholm should be given a clearer priority and institutional support.

However, the national functions catered to by the Centre, such as the Case bank and the teacher training seminars, should not be discontinued if one wants to support the emerging interest at other universities and capitalize on investments already made. To the extent that the national strategy is pursued, one should expect it easier to imagine alternative locations. However, only one respondent leaned towards another location than Stockholm, but when asked about possible alternatives respondents were only able to find likely candidates in business administration at two other universities. None of the respondents from universities outside Stockholm expressed any wish to change the location.

The above considerations amount to a changed emphasis from a national centre at the University of Stockholm to a University of Stockholm centre with certain national functions. One possible financial model would then be a joint effort by the University of Stockholm on the one hand and the Council for the Renewal of Undergraduate Education and the Karl-Adam Bonnier Foundation on the other, the two latter financing the national tasks. Two alternative possibilities for the financing of the national tasks are joint financing by participating universities and commercialization. The former is likely to be politically difficult and administratively complicated. The latter may be easier to handle in political-administrative terms, but would probably not be suited to the aim of providing support to smaller universities as well as to the major research universities.

A redefinition of the Centre for a new period would naturally imply that the part-time positions as Centre staff be announced for a new time limited period, and the staff recruited if possible on a competitive basis.