

entrepreneurial endeavors” (p. 315). Environmental changes that cause EEs are assumed by Davidsson et al. (2020) as actor-independent circumstances that can affect entrepreneurial outcomes, including natural and artificial and physical and socially constructed changes. These authors only consider the well-known forces of the macro-environment (technological, regulatory, demographic, socio-cultural, macroeconomic, political, and natural-environmental), thus agreeing with Pigneur et al. (2010) on the key trends and macroeconomic forces. However, Davidsson et al. (2020) do not consider the micro dimensions of the environment, such as industry and market forces, as Pigneur et al. (2010). For Davidsson et al. (2020), the industry and the market changes are within the scope that changes in the macro-environment can cause on them. This research assumes their perspective.

Within the EEs model, the mechanism variable can facilitate students to understand why an environmental change can constitute an enabler. It also helps to know how this change can be leveraged into a new business idea or a transformation into the current business.

Mechanisms represent “the influence enablers have on entrepreneurial action and outcomes” (Davidsson et al., 2020, p. 317). Mechanisms are “a relational construct, providing a means to connect external elements and the entrepreneurial agent” (Davidsson et al., 2020, p. 317). Hence, the mechanism is the attribute that drives the cause-effect relationship between the enabler and the initiation, ongoing development, and success of new business ventures.

Davidsson et al. (2020) identify nine mechanisms expanded by Kimjeon and Davidsson (2022) to fifteen, ranging from resources to competition and finally to the market. The fifteen mechanisms are compression, conservation, resource access, resource creation, resource expansion, resource substitution, combination, generation, risk/uncertainty reduction, legitimization, market access, demand creation, demand expansion, demand substitution, and enclosing. The authors define each mechanism. For instance, when a compression mechanism is present, an environmental change can lead the entrepreneurship to reduce the amount of time required for an activity.<sup>1</sup> That way, an environmental change like the increased possibilities of artificial intelligence can help an entrepreneur in the consulting industry of due diligence processes to reduce the time for searching the information on a company provider’s portfolio. That EE and its

mechanism can make the venture more competitive than its competitors.

Even though objective by nature, the authors propose that an EE is not valid for every venture in any industry. EEs are agent-independent. Nevertheless, it is the actor, in his entrepreneurial endeavor, who must identify, make sense of, and act based on the EEs. However, being the mechanisms the cause-effect connectors to the roles, they present two key attributes: opacity and agency intensity.

Opacity is “the extent to which the benefits of an enabling mechanism for specific purposes are rather obvious or requires specialized knowledge and/or extraordinary imagination” (Kimjeon & Davidsson, 2022, p. 5). Although a mechanism feature, opacity materializes not in the mechanism but in the agent. Thus, different agents can see the mechanism as more or less opaque. In fact, opacity can be the initial obstacle to achieving the connection between the disequilibrating environmental change and the entrepreneur’s action. However, since opacity is a characteristic of the agent, an interesting question is whether combining several agents could reduce the opacity.

In Davidsson et al. (2020) model, mechanisms lead to roles. Roles are higher-order influences or functions the EE mechanisms produce at the different stages of the venture creation process. Roles range from triggering to outcome-enhancing, passing through shaping the venture, the product, the market, and the process. So, roles incarnate SEA.

Therefore, it is in the causal relationship EEs—mechanisms—roles where there is an opportunity to make a relevant connection between theory and practice in entrepreneurship teaching. To this end, we run a simulation in which students are exposed to EEs and are asked to convert them into SEAs. Davidsson et al. (2020, p. 327) recommend that in education, their framework “can be used to identify enablers, and assess their potential for entrepreneurial activity.”

Although this simulation could be carried out through different didactic strategies, the BMC of Pigneur et al. (2010) is chosen for its practical value. Davidsson et al. (2020) also see the potential of their theoretical model to articulate with Pigneur and Osterwalder’s BMC. Sheppard (2020) and Thrane, Blenker, Korsgaard, and Neergaard (2016) also validate the BMC’s usefulness in teaching entrepreneurship.

McNamara and McNamara (2019) report that simulations can develop the ability to teamwork, understanding oneself, and learning about the real world. We chose the practice-based approach grounded in actionable theory to build our simulation.

<sup>1</sup>For a detailed list of mechanism’s definition, see Table 1, p. 4 in Kimjeon and Davidsson (2022).