Social Imaginaries of Entrepreneurship Education

The United States and Germany, 1800-2020

Wadhwani, R. Daniel; Viebig, Christoph

Document Version
Final published version

Published in:
Academy of Management Learning and Education

DOI:
10.5465/amle.2020.0195

Publication date:
2021

License
CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for published version (APA):
Wadhwani, R. D., & Viebig, C. (2021). Social Imaginaries of Entrepreneurship Education: The United States and Germany, 1800-2020. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *20*(3), 342-360. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2020.0195

© *Academy of Management Learning & Education*
2021, Vol. 20, No. 3, 342–360.
https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2020.0195

SOCIAL IMAGINARIES OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION: THE UNITED STATES AND GERMANY, 1800–2020

R. DANIEL WADHWANI
University of Southern California

CHRISTOPH VIEBIG
Copenhagen Business School

While conventional historical narratives of entrepreneurship education focus on its rise in business schools since the 1970s, this paper traces its roots to the early 19th century and chronicles its evolution within the field of higher education more broadly. Using a comparative history design, we show how changing social imaginaries of entrepreneurship education in Germany and the United States were based on divergent and evolving justifications of entrepreneurial autonomy and its relationship to the common good. Our narrative explores how these social imaginaries shaped the moral and political legitimacy of entrepreneurship and the aims, practices, and organizational forms of entrepreneurship education. We draw out the implications of this deeper history for entrepreneurship education today, including (a) its current social imaginary, (b) the character of entrepreneurial knowledge, and (c) the relationship of entrepreneurship education to the modern university.

Contemporary histories of entrepreneurship education date its origins to the 1970s and 1980s and chronicle a meteoric rise in classes, students, and university-based programs over the subsequent decades (Kuratko & Morris, 2018). While scholars point to educational programs that predate this period (Katz, 2003), the widely accepted narrative takes a clear and compelling shape: "the reality of entrepreneurship education as a force in business schools began in the early 1970s" at a handful of North American universities (Kuratko & Morris, 2018: 12) and grew unabated in the United States and then internationally beginning in the 1990s (Dana, 1992).

Business schools, according to this interpretation, responded to soaring demand for entrepreneurship education from students, foundations, and government authorities by launching classes and developing curricula that have institutionalized the teaching of entrepreneurial knowledge and skills (Solomon & Fernald, 1991), which subsequently spread into other corners of the university and even into the business ecosystem (Gorman, Hanlon, & King, 1997).

This historical narrative serves as more than just a colorful backdrop for entrepreneurship educators; it shapes the self-identity of entrepreneurship as a new and promising field and serves as the yardstick against which the progress of entrepreneurship education is evaluated. Also, it is often used, at least implicitly, as the starting point for imagining the future aims and methods of entrepreneurship education and its place in the university (Kuratko & Morris, 2018; Neck & Greene, 2011). Thus, the way we tell the history of entrepreneurship education anchors its identity today and shapes its ambitions and programs for the future.

However, a richer view of the prospects and aims for entrepreneurship education's future can be gained by developing a deeper understanding of its past. In contrast to histories of management education (Engwall, Kipping, & Üsdiken, 2016; Khurana, 2007), historical narratives of entrepreneurship education have been limited to the recent past and focused on university-based business schools. As a result,

We would like to thank Patricia McLaren, Jeffrey Fear, Anna Guagnini, Bontu L. Guschke, Daniel Horowitz, Amal Kumar, Christina Lubinski, Isabell Stamm, and colleagues at the Centre for Business History at Copenhagen Business School and the Greif Center at University of Southern California for comments and guidance on earlier drafts. We also appreciate the constructive criticism provided by three anonymous referees. Finally, we thank Klaus Nippert from the Karlsruhe Institute for Technology (KIT) Archives, Christian Hillen from the Rheinisch-Westfälisches Wirtschaftsarchiv, and Jens Blecher from the Universitätsarchiv Leipzig for assisting us in assessing the archives.

entrepreneurship education's deeper historical roots—originating well *before* the rise of modern university-based business schools—have been lost, and with them the opportunity to reflect more critically on the accomplishments and limits of entrepreneurship education today and to imagine more boldly its relevance for our world tomorrow.

In this paper, we develop a deeper historical narrative of entrepreneurship education, comparing its development in the United States and Germany since the early 19th century and taking into account broader developments in the field of higher education. Our approach situates the evolution of entrepreneurship education within what the philosopher Charles Taylor (2004) has called the development of "modern social imaginaries" of human freedom and their relationship to everyday theories of the common good. Applied to entrepreneurship research (Dey & Mason, 2018; Laine & Kibler, 2020), the construct of modern social imaginaries has been associated with a definition of entrepreneurship characterized by a drive for emancipation from an existing social status quo (Rindova, Barry, & Ketchen, 2009) and, hence, with the process of social and economic change (Schumpeter, 1934). In line with this scholarship, we define "entrepreneurship education" as the forms of business education that prepare students for business formation in ways that aim at autonomy and emancipation from an imagined social status quo.

To produce this deeper history of entrepreneurship education, we examine the development of educational publications, courses, and programs not only in universities, but also, more broadly, in the field of education and knowledge dissemination. Drawing on a rich variety of historical sources, we trace the origins of modern entrepreneurship education to the declining legitimacy of apprenticeships and the establishment of new higher educational institutions: proprietor-owned commercial colleges in the United States and higher polytechnical schools in Germany. These institutions embraced entrepreneurship as a form of self-empowerment, albeit with very different social imaginaries about its relationship to the common good. The subsequent rise of university-based business education in the late 19th century initially held out the promise of producing broadly educated entrepreneurial leaders, but evolved in a way that marginalized this vision in favor of training in "management" as a profession that used scientific methods to produce, test, and codify knowledge. The post-World War II resurgence of student and public interest in entrepreneurship education in response to the perceived dangers of managerialism and the stagnation of large corporations in the 1960s and 1970s was initially served by business associations, government agencies, local nonprofit organizations, and vocational schools, but again with very different social imaginaries of entrepreneurship in Germany in comparison to the United States. Universities, in contrast, were relatively slow adopters of entrepreneurship education because their epistemic and pedagogical aims fit poorly into the disciplinary conventions and standards that had evolved in the modern research university. Understanding this longer history helps us grasp the nature and limitations of entrepreneurship education and knowledge today, and provides a vantage point from which to more fully appreciate its promise as what we call the "undisciplined discipline."

THE SOCIAL IMAGINARIES OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

To examine the deeper history of entrepreneurship education, we adopt a theoretical frame that allows us to identify historical variations and changes in entrepreneurship education in relation to its social, cultural, and political contexts (Welter, 2011). In particular, we draw on the theoretical perspective that characterizes "entrepreneurship as social change" rather than "entrepreneurship as positive economic activity" (Calás, Smircich, & Bourne, 2009: 552; Rindova et al., 2009). The scholarship that takes such an approach—sometimes embracing the term "entrepreneuring"—conceives of entrepreneurship in terms of "efforts to create something new—a new idea, a new thing, a new institution, a new market, a new set of possibilities for the entrepreneuring individual or group and/or for other actors in the environment" (Rindova et al., 2009: 478). The perspective has its roots in the Schumpeterian concept of entrepreneurship as involving human autonomy and agency to contest a status quo to create a desired change in the modern capitalist world (Swedberg, 2006).

Following Laine and Kibler (2020) and Dey and Mason (2018), we see the concept of entrepreneurial autonomy not only as an academic theory of entrepreneurship but also as embedded in what the Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor termed "modern social imaginaries." Taylor (2004: 23) defined a "social imaginary" as a widely held conception of "moral order" that defines the way people "imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie all these

expectations." Social imaginaries, Taylor emphasized, may be based in but are distinct from academic theories, in that they may not involve conscious theorizing, are widely held by a community of people, and form a common understanding that legitimizes social action. According to Taylor (2004), modern Western social imaginaries in which self-determined humans exchange goods and services within a mutually beneficial economy replaced classical and pre-modern imaginaries in which one's place was divinely determined and hierarchically organized.

A defining aspect of the modern social imaginaries of entrepreneurship is the extent to which entrepreneurship's conception of agency rests on a robust premise of human freedom. Taylor (2004: 49–50) attributed this emphasis on freedom to the influence of Enlightenment thought over the public imagination, and to the "great disembedding" that accompanied the "unprecedented primacy" it ascribed to the individual in moral, economic, and political thought. Following Rindova et al. (2009), a number of entrepreneurship scholars have come to view the premises for treating entrepreneurship within this line of reasoning as an act of emancipation (Alkhaled & Berglund, 2018; Calás et al., 2009). Most of this scholarship defines "emancipation," in the context of entrepreneurship, as an act of breaking free from a status quo (e.g. Alkhaled & Berglund, 2018). But, as Taylor (2004) emphasized, modern social imaginaries couple the exercise of human free will to a conception of the common good. Entrepreneurial autonomy, like most conceptions of freedom, is thus premised on the notion that there is a relationship between entrepreneurial action and a mutually beneficial common good.

Focusing on the changing social imaginaries of entrepreneurship, including their conceptions of the relationship between entrepreneurial freedom and their vision of the common good, provides a robust approach to producing a more socially and culturally contextualized history of entrepreneurship education, for several reasons. First, as education scholar O'Neill (2016) observed, educational institutions explicitly or implicitly reflect the social imaginaries of the societies and historical periods in which they are embedded. Thus, they help us take context into account, especially since the concept of entrepreneurial emancipation only makes sense "in relation to a status quo" (Rindova et al., 2009). Examining the prevailing social imaginary of entrepreneurship in any historical time and place hence involves asking what social status quo is legitimate entrepreneurial action presumed to be challenging. Second, as Laine and Kibler (2020: 2) pointed out, "social imaginations … change over time," thus allowing us to consider how the meanings of entrepreneurship education evolved over time and how these shaped educational aims, practices, and institutions. Third, thinking in terms of social imaginaries allows us to examine the moral foundations of entrepreneurship education and identify its social and ideological relationship to a society at large.

SCOPE AND METHODS

Our study is designed as an "analytically structured history" (Rowlinson, Hassard, & Decker, 2014), in that it uses the core construct of the "social imaginaries of entrepreneurship" to examine the evolving organization and practices of entrepreneurship pedagogy in the United States and Germany between 1800 and 2020. We begin in the early 19th century, as this period aligns with Taylor's (2004) account of the origins of modern social imaginaries, and because the decline in traditional apprenticeships based on the legal and social authority of masters and the emergence of new educational models to fill this void constituted a major shift in the educational landscape throughout much of the Western world (Aldrich, 1999). Building on Godley and Hamilton (2020), we use a comparative history design to identify similarities and differences in the evolution of entrepreneurship education and to move beyond U.S.-centric accounts. Germany represents an especially useful point of comparison because its pioneering and influential role in the development of business education had a strong influence on similar developments in much of Continental Europe and in Japan (Engwall, 2004; Locke, 2008), and because its role in the development of the model of the modern research university had a more general long-term influence on higher education (Rüegg, 2004).

Our interpretive approach is based on the application of cultural history methods to entrepreneurship research (Wadhwani, Kirsch, Welter, Gartner, & Jones, 2020). Specifically, we draw on a variety of primary sources—including archival records of early educational institutions, textbooks, memoirs, regulatory reports, and published pamphlets—and interpret them using hermeneutic methods (Kipping, Wadhwani, & Bucheli, 2013). Our interpretive aim is to understand the "social imaginaries of entrepreneurship" within which particular authors and texts made sense of and legitimized their educational practices.

The relationship between our theory and our methods accounts for how we interpreted

entrepreneurship education over two centuries, during which language, categories, and meanings of both entrepreneurship and education changed significantly (Koselleck & Presner, 2002). In line with our theory, we define "entrepreneurship education" as the forms of business education that prepare students to create businesses in ways that foster autonomy and emancipation from an imagined social status quo. Hence, we identify sources and historical developments in 19th- and 20th-century Germany and the United States that validate and give credence to this definition. In line with Engwall et al.'s (2016) treatment of "management," these sources are not limited to those produced by formal educational institutions, but also include educationally motived publishing and lecturing outside of formal educational institutions and involving a wide array of organizations. In interpreting these sources, we adopt a hermeneutic stance through which we seek to understand the definitions, meanings, and moral reasoning that actors themselves ascribed to the social context for their actions, including the language and distinctions through which these actors saw and ascribed legitimacy to the aims, epistemologies, and practices of actions (Stutz & Sachs, 2018). In short, we seek to understand the historically situated social imaginary of entrepreneurship in which entrepreneurial educators acted, especially their constructs of the character of entrepreneurial freedom and agency and the morally legitimate ends to which it could be applied. We develop our three-period structure based on our interpretation of major changes in the social imaginaries of entrepreneurship and developed our historical narrative based on actors' own accounts of the moral illegitimacy of a declining social imaginary and the legitimacy of an ascendant one (Wadhwani & Decker, 2018).

A HISTORY OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

Entrepreneurial Virtues in an Industrializing World (*c.*1800–1880)

Modern entrepreneurship education in the West, with its connotations of preparing students for economic autonomy and self-determination, can be traced to the rise of Enlightenment political thought about liberty. Rejecting age-old conceptions of a people's political dependence on church or state, intellectuals from John Locke to John Stuart Mill developed a notion of political sovereignty that was closely tied to economic self-determination. Political freedom, it stood to reason, required economic foundations in order for people to be capable of self-governance (Pocock, 1972).

Within Western systems of training and education, this political movement, along with the rise of wage labor relations, led to the rejection of hierarchical systems of master and apprentice, in which masters held almost complete social and political authority over their charges (Ruef, 2020). Economic and political independence could not rest on an educational institution deeply embedded in dependence (Rorabaugh, 1986). These educational movements took on different meanings and forms in Germany and in the United States that depended on each nation's specific understanding of both the threats to and the appropriate ends of freedom.

United States. In the United States, the emancipatory goals of "practical" education in a trade were infused with an ascendant republican ideology that rejected European conventions of social hierarchy in favor of a citizenry capable of the character and virtues of self-government (Pocock, 1972). As early as the 18th century, but gaining considerable momentum in the 19th century, this education took the form of published pamphlets, magazine articles, and books that emphasized the importance of virtue and character as much as the knowledge and skills required in trade. The decline of apprenticeship was replaced by publications, public lectures, and apprentice's libraries in which the young could educate themselves and acquire both the skills and mindset required to make their own way in trade, avoiding the economic dependence associated with the kind of economic and political corruption that was thought to undermine republics since classical times (Wilentz, 2004).

No figure served as a more influential teacher and model of that ethos than Benjamin Franklin (Reinert, 2015). An ideal type as much as an actual historical figure, Franklin was both a high-minded modern man who rejected social hierarchy based on political principle and a practical entrepreneur who navigated social and commercial relationships with street-smart skills. Though Franklin lived in the 18th century, his influence as an educator and exemplar grew even larger in the 19th century, due to the enormous popularity of his publications. *Advice to a Young Tradesman* (Franklin, 1748) and *Way to Wealth* (Franklin, 1758) were published in dozens of languages and hundreds of editions (Reinert, 2015). In these handbooks, Franklin focused on "industry" and "thrift" as the crucial attributes of successful entrepreneurship and the essential qualities of an economically virtuous citizenry. These attributes and practices not only built the character required to be a

good entrepreneur, Franklin argued, but also formed the basis of credit—and hence of access to capital—for young entrepreneurs.

Franklin's influence on entrepreneurship education is difficult to overestimate and was reflected not only in the advice and guidance he espoused but also in his own story. Franklin's (1793) autobiography, which narrates his rejection of apprenticeship and his experience in making his own way in the "foreign country" of Pennsylvania as an upstart printer, became its own textbook in entrepreneurship (Rorabaugh, 1986). It is also arguably the most influential of a genre that quickly became a mainstay of entrepreneurship education: the entrepreneurial biography. In the decades between the 1820s and the 1860s, publishers in the United States offered a growing number of books and pamphlets that focused on the lives of famous entrepreneurs as models for aspiring businessmen. These profiles offered key lessons as a form of pedagogical knowledge and drew on the ancient Greek tradition of *historia magistra vitae*, or history as life's teacher (Koselleck, 2017). Freeman Hunt's *Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review*, arguably the most important publication for young American businessmen around the mid-19th century, published regular profiles of founders of notable institutions (e.g., Hunt, 1854).

Entrepreneurial knowledge was disseminated in a number of new forms. First, the publication of advice books and manuals for those looking to become independent tradesmen or merchants emerged as an industry unto itself. Most of these, published in Franklin's shadow, combined practical and moral advice and intimated a close relationship between business success and personal virtue. Among other topics, they addressed how to seek commercial advice and partners and the high failure rate among those who ventured on their own (Rorabaugh, 1986: 160). Second, "mechanics libraries" and "apprentice's libraries" were established in most commercial cities as a means not only of providing access to practical and moral knowledge to aspiring tradesmen, but also as a form of community building. Finally, lectures on commerce and the trades reflected the values of the American Lyceum Movement, which sought to cultivate self-improvement through free public lectures. As one lyceum orator explained:

> Where liberty is given to each one to act freely for himself, and by all lawful means to better his condition, the consequence is inevitably what we see—an universal and unprecedented activity among all the classes of society, in all the departments of human industry. (Dewey, 1838: 10)

By the middle of the 19th century, a number of small private schools were established for tradespeople and merchants in the major commercial cities of the Northeastern and Midwestern United States. The first of these appear to have been founded as early as the 1820s as essentially little more than tutoring businesses, but some of them had grown into modest private academies by the time of the Civil War (Conn, 2019). Their curriculum was typically divided into "theoretical" classes in business law, accounting, penmanship, and political economy, as well as an extensive "practical" curriculum that involved elaborate simulations in which students established a business by making initial investments, engaged in transactions with suppliers and customers, and pursued strategies involving leveraging banks, the post office, the telegraph, and insurance companies. The education was often rounded out with invited public lectures by political, commercial, or religious leaders as part of the Lyceum Movement.

The history of Eastman Business College illustrates well the trajectory of the commercial college movement as a whole. H. G. Eastman was a lawyer, abolitionist, and the nephew of a prominent commercial college proprietor from Rochester, New York, who set up his first school in Oswego in 1855. Eastman pioneered the development of a simulated market as part of his curriculum and incorporated an impressive set of public lectures on political, literary, and moral topics that featured some of the country's leading figures. Sensing the opportunity for business education in the West, Eastman decamped to St. Louis in 1858, but, while his new school was commercially successful, his list of speakers, which included strong abolitionists and founders of the newly established Republican Party, generated a political firestorm in a city edging toward the Civil War. Eastman retreated back East to Poughkeepsie to design a business college that was "a fitting finale to such a curriculum as that of Yale, Harvard, Hamilton, or Union (Eastman Business College, 1875: 10)."

The curriculum was divided into three stages that lasted approximately four weeks each. The first stage, designated "preparatory" or "theoretical," introduced students to bookkeeping, commercial law, political economy, and penmanship in a lecture-based format. The Eastman College student guidebook introduced the remaining, practical phases of the curriculum, labeled "junior" and senior," by emphasizing: "You are here enabled to gain a knowledge of *men* and *things*" (Eastman Business College, 1866: 3). In an elaborate college-wide simulation, the school's main building was laid out as a small

economy, complete with simulated banks, insurance companies, post offices, and telegraph offices, to teach students to navigate the practical and competitive world of commerce. In the school's simulated merchant business, students purchased and resold clothing inventory, real estate, and stock in addition to managing all other aspects of their business. Students then rotated through other positions in the school's simulated offices and companies (Eastman Business College, 1866).

By the late 19th century, however, the character of commercial colleges like Eastman's was changing dramatically. Responding to the rapidly growing demand for skilled office workers—telegraph operators, clerical assistants, and office managers—many of them reoriented their curricula to focus on specific technical skills and clerical occupations. Some—like Bryant and Stratton College—expanded rapidly, using franchise operations and highly standardized curricula designed to credential graduates for entry-level positions (Gulski, 1973). This rapid expansion and standardization left little time for the broader education Eastman had initially promoted. The business colleges "may qualify a young man to be a good clerk, but they do not prepare him to be merchant in the wider and nobler meaning of the word," complained James Hodges (1887: 465), the cofounder of the Hodges Brothers trading firm and mayor of Baltimore. "They give a technical, but not a liberal education … to look beyond the limited horizon of his personal occupation and interests."

Germany. Nineteenth-century Germany had a very different social imaginary shaping entrepreneurship education. In contrast to the United States, German entrepreneurship education was largely organized and funded by state governments and set up as part of a broader political agenda that promoted industrialization and ultimately aimed at strengthening the economic position of the German states (Kocka, 1975). Shaped by the historical experience of a set of loosely affiliated states facing growing foreign competition from British manufacturing in the wake of the Industrial Revolution, German entrepreneurship education was oriented toward cultivating emerging industry and bolstering national economic autarky (König, 1990). The focus on the strength of the state and the economic independence of the nation reflected the historical influence of "Cameralism," a German version of mercantilism that conceived the state as the prime beneficiary of economic activity (Wakefield, 2009). However, state officials influenced by Adam Smith's idea of a free-market economy rejected the old cameralist notion that the state must be the prime initiator of entrepreneurial activities and encouraged private entrepreneurs to establish industrial firms. Hence, educational initiatives set up in German states in the early 19th century focused on new industrial technologies, engineering skills, and commercial competencies to prepare entrepreneurs who were free to make profits and decide what to produce, but, in the process, contributed to the economic strength of the German states (Mieck, 1965).

The German authorities identified a lack of technical and commercial competences as the prime obstacle for industrialization. As the Humboldtian universities, delivering an education predominantly in classics and humanities for the elite, refused the idea of integrating technical and commercial education into their curricula, the German authorities established commercial schools (*Gewerbeschulen*), which varied substantially in terms of curricula (e.g., some included languages, natural sciences, commerce, and administration), educational quality, and educational aims (König, 1990). In addition to formal education, state authorities promoted exhibitions and competitions for technical innovations to strengthen the transmission of technical–commercial knowledge and to create incentives for entrepreneurial action. The emphasis on industry creation was picked up by liberal media ("Kaufmann und Fabrikant," 1856), which promoted the social imaginary of an economically strong Germany based on the idea of a unified nation (Kocka, 1975).

From the 1820s onwards, many of the commercial schools were transformed into higher polytechnical schools, the birthplaces of early modern entrepreneurship education in Germany. The curriculum of the new schools initially entailed a combination of technical and commercial subjects, such as political economy, commercial geography, commercial history, bookkeeping, commercial correspondence, commodity composition, and calligraphy (Passant, 2019). More than that, the higher polytechnical schools even offered courses specialized in industrial entrepreneurship with topics such as founding, staffing, financing, organizing, and managing an industrial company (Emminghaus, 1868; Haushofer, 1874).

The higher polytechnical school in Carlsruhe (Karlsruhe) established in 1825 served as a role model for higher polytechnical schools in Germany (Passant, 2016). In its early years, the school offered a two-year program for aspiring "manufacturers and entrepreneurs" (*Fabrikanten und Unternehmer*), which entailed a variety of technical subjects as well as classes on general commerce and trade (Polytechnische Hochschule Karlsruhe, 1832). After

a curriculum reform in 1865, the school added commercial courses to all civil engineering programs—among them, an entrepreneurship course called "General Industrial Commercial Doctrine" (*Allgemeine Gewerkslehre*) taught by Arwed Emminghaus (Polytechnische Hochschule Karlsruhe, 1865). Considered one of the intellectual pioneers of German business economics (*Betriebswirtschaftslehre*) (Klein-Blenkers, 1996), Emminghaus published a textbook, *Allgemeine Gewerkslehre*, in 1868 that included not only an overview of the rationale and content of an early modern entrepreneurship education course, but also defined the role, rewards, and responsibilities of industrial entrepreneurs in Germany. The book depicted the industrial entrepreneur as a man of character and virtue, who, in his pursuit of profits, also contributes to economic progress and societal prosperity. This role required a combination of comprehensive theoretical education in technology and entrepreneurial knowledge and skills, such as finding and combining resources, managing workers, and understanding entrepreneurial finance, in addition to practical work experiences (Emminghaus, 1868).

However, in the 1870s, the higher polytechnical schools abandoned their curriculum on entrepreneurship in favor of a narrower focus on engineering as an academic discipline and profession (Passant, 2019). This shift was motivated by the schools' "teaching staff, who aspired towards full recognition by the established universities" (Berghoff & Moller, 1994: 271). To improve their academic status, technical courses became increasingly theoretical and scientific while commercial and entrepreneurship courses were either eliminated or replaced with economics, a well-established discipline (Locke, 1984). At the polytechnical school in Carlsruhe, all commercial courses were shut down in 1873 and it was more than a hundred years before students could take an entrepreneurship course again (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, 1999; Polytechnische Hochschule Karlsruhe, 1865).

Rise of University-Based Business Education (*c.*1880–1950)

In the late 19th century, education reformers in both the United States and Germany began to articulate new social imaginaries for entrepreneurship education that sought to take into account the increasing scale of domestic and international trade and the emergence of complex corporations. They rejected older conceptions of entrepreneurship based on small business or industrial start-ups as antiquated dogma that had itself become part of a social status quo, hindering the pursuit of entrepreneurial opportunities for better organizational coordination and control in service of the common good. In doing so, they reimagined entrepreneurial freedom in a way that rejected classical liberalism's emphasis on the autonomous individual in favor of a moral vision based in the social sciences of pragmatic experimentation, group dynamics, and mutualism. And they looked to the university as the only institution that could prepare such entrepreneurial leaders broadly enough to pursue such a vision.

United States. Joseph Wharton, the benefactor of what is considered the first freestanding business school within a university, heralded from a long line of Philadelphia merchants steeped in classical republican moral values. But his vision for the Wharton School was forged through his own entrepreneurial experience in the increasingly complex industrial world of metal mining, processing, and international trade (Yates, 1987). The trade in nickel and steel alone required knowledge of developments in an increasingly globalized world as well as the ability to lobby skillfully to shape trade policy (Sass, 1982: 19). The commercial colleges' narrow focus on technical knowledge and clerical skills, he argued, made them incapable of preparing modern entrepreneurs for this increasingly complex world. Ambitious young businesspeople needed a university-based business education steeped in "broad principles deduced from all human knowledge, and ground in science, as well as in art, pupils who are thereby fitted both to practice what they have learned and to become themselves teachers and discoverers" (Sass, 1982: 22). As Stephen Sass has explained in his careful history of the Wharton School, Joseph Wharton sought to create a "new market for an entrepreneurial service—a market for entrepreneurial education" (Sass, 1982: 19).

The contention that a broad university-based business education was the best way to cultivate well-rounded leaders capable of becoming entrepreneurs as well as political leaders and effective managers emerged in the late 19th century. At Wharton, this meant a course of study that introduced students to accounting and commercial law in their later undergraduate years but especially to political economy, which included elements of what we would today categorize as moral philosophy, economic history, and logic, in addition to classical and heterodox economic thought. "Students of the economy did not unfold a chain of rules and reasons as did accountants and lawyers," Sass (1982: 37) noted, "They had to use the apparatus of scientific investigation: induction and

deduction—the interpretation of evidence and logical reasoning."

Though Penn was the only one to establish a separate school, many other late 19th-century American universities revised their curricula to introduce social science courses that prepared students broadly for entrepreneurship and business. Explaining how universities had adjusted to the needs of their students, a 1903 conference report of business educators explained: "Just as modern conditions have made necessary special preparation for the direction of modern industry in the school of engineering, so modern business demands preparation of young men to act as entrepreneurs, employers, and supervisors of business" (Loos, 1903: 548). Indeed, for nearly two decades after its founding in 1881, Wharton was the only separate school of business; universities simply incorporated business-relevant education as an extension of a liberal arts education designed to produce well-rounded citizens for the world they encountered.

The social imaginary underlying the new vision of university-based business education was based on a fundamentally novel moral formulation of the relationship between human freedom and the common good. Moral philosophers like John Dewey questioned antiquated formalist conceptions of individual human freedom as solipsistic and articulated an alternative concept based in "the development of a shared culture" (Dewey & Tufts, 1906: 129). Meaningful entrepreneurial freedom, in this vision, took a pragmatic bent in the human capacity for inquiry and experimentation across a broad range of areas of knowledge. A liberal education could play a central role in deepening this intrinsically social character of freedom because it "trained powers of initiative and reflection requisite for free preference and for circumspect and far-seeing desires" (Dewey & Tufts, 1906: 438).

Yet, the actual practice of university-based business education soon drifted away from this social imaginary of entrepreneurship education after the turn of the century. Between 1900 and 1913, 25 universities established separate schools of business based on the premise of training professional salaried managers rather than liberally educated entrepreneurial leaders. While the liberal arts model persisted in some places, university administrators increasingly treated business as a distinct and specialized form of education. Growing numbers of students saw employment opportunities in the emerging occupations that technological changes and corporations had created and sought classes and programs that could be relevant to these goals. Corporations not only sought employees capable of staffing such positions, but also came under increasing public scrutiny for the concentrations of wealth and power they were accumulating and controlling, and looked for ways to politically and morally legitimize their power over labor and markets. Caught between these shifting pressures, universities increasingly introduced the separate business school as a way to legitimize university-based business education based on the premise that management was a "profession," and that management education required a professional school analogous to those serving medicine and the law (Khurana, 2007).

The shift in the focus of university-based business education was clearly reflected in the curricula of business schools by the 1920s, including the one Joseph Wharton had funded. Emory Johnson, Wharton's dean from 1919 until 1933, pushed the school's programs to specialize by occupation and industry. Fully reversing Wharton's identity as a school steeped in educating business leaders within a liberal arts tradition, Johnson introduced commercially successful programs in accounting and insurance and fragmented the general curriculum to emphasize specializations in finance, marketing, and production. Economics classes embraced neo-classical orthodoxy and an essentially value-free technical stance, fundamentally rejecting the political economic premises on which Wharton was founded. Taking over Wharton in the mid-1930s, its new dean Joseph Willits pondered a question that ended up being repeatedly asked for the remainder of the century: "Have we not put too much emphasis on turning out business technicians alone, and paid too little attention to the development of business men with a sense of statesmanship?" (Khurana, 2007: 183).

Germany. In Germany, entrepreneurship education reappeared in the higher education system of as a response to a legitimacy crisis of German businessmen. The country's economy, thanks in part to earlier generations of German entrepreneurs, had come to rival Britain's and in many ways surpassed its former competitor in the high-technology industries of the Second Industrial Revolution (Fear, 1997). Yet, German entrepreneurs continued to be looked down upon by social elites as self-interested actors focused narrowly on the pursuit of personal wealth (Böhmert, 1897). Envying lawyers and doctors for their status as "legitimate" members of the middle class and confronting an increasingly well-organized and politically recognized working class, German businessmen pursued the creation of a university degree to secure their social status and moral standing in the country's corporatist political order (Redlich, 1957). This social imaginary not only shaped the

reappearance of entrepreneurship education but also would also eventually lead to its demise.

Entrepreneurship education reappeared in German higher education with the formation of the higher trade schools (*Handelshochschulen*), established between 1898 and 1920. Funded primarily by the business community, the higher trade schools initially aimed at educating entrepreneurs and business leaders with a combination of broad humanist subjects and practical business knowledge (Meyer, 1998). Their early curricula included courses in established academic disciplines such as law, economics, history, and geography, and more practical subjects such as bookkeeping, commercial technique, arithmetic, and correspondence (Tribe, 1994). The idea was that humanist subjects ensured academic and social legitimacy, while commercial ones provided use-value for practice. However, the focus on educating a civic and virtuous entrepreneur, equipped for high society and business alike, soon vanished in favor of an education for the employed manager based on codified and specialized business knowledge (Locke, 1984), much as it did in the United States.

The higher trade school in Leipzig, Handelshochschule Leipzig (HHL), the first of its kind in Germany, serves as a good example to illustrate the shift from entrepreneurship to management education. Established in 1898, the school aimed to educate those "that will be part of the business class" (Ehrenberg, 1897: 1). Eugen Schmalenbach, a graduate of HHL and, later, one of the founding fathers of business economics, specified:

> We wanted to educate the future entrepreneur at the higher trade school [which meant not] to fill his head with information [but] to impart on him the entrepreneurial way of thinking in the best sense of the word; which means to think in a collective way. (Schmalenbach, 1920: 106)

This aim could be reached, he posited, with a curriculum that consisted of broad liberal subjects such as law, economics, geography, literature, history, and philosophy taught by professors from the University of Leipzig and practical courses in commercial arithmetic, bookkeeping, and merchants' correspondence supplied by teachers from a vocational commercial school in the city (Handelshochschule Leipzig, 1898). Like commercial colleges in the United States, HHL had a model bureau (*Musterkontor*) for experiential learning in which students practiced business processes (Franz, 1998: 73–74). Over the first decades, HHL gradually replaced the liberal and practical courses with theoretical business subjects (Handelshochschule Leipzig, 1914). The focus shifted from educating well-rounded entrepreneurs to educating specialized managers.

The transformation was paralleled by the formation of business economics as a discipline. Faculty at the higher trade schools pushed toward the formation of a business discipline, which helped to fulfill the aspiration of the business class for a university degree equal to those of doctors and lawyers. The university degree (*Diplom-Kaufmann*) brought social prestige while also establishing business as a morally sound discipline that contributes to society. After significant scholarly debate about its aim and purpose (*Methodenstreit*), the new discipline centered on the company as an extant entity for which questions of efficiency became the paradigm (Locke, 1984). Business efficiency was understood as a contributor to common welfare and not only to individual profit making (Kieser, 2004). It was argued that there should no longer be a difference between a business education for entrepreneurs and one for employed managers, as both are commanders of codified business knowledge and scientific principles (Thieß, 1914).

The higher trade schools fulfilled their mission to socially legitimize the business class by establishing a specialized discipline, and they were also successful at educating entrepreneurs. In a statistic of trade school graduates from 1924, independent businessmen formed the largest group (Walb, 1927, as cited in Lindenfeld, 1990). By the end of the 1920s, business economics was a legitimate academic discipline with a "self-recruiting, orthodox elite comparable in training and outlook to the elite that held faculty positions in older university disciplines" (Locke, 1985: 234). Thus, the higher trade schools were either integrated into the universities or closed down entirely by 1945, while business economics programs were established in almost all German universities (Franz, 1998). In many ways, the higher trade schools followed the same path as the polytechnical schools in the earlier period; both started outside of the established universities with a rather broad and unscientific curriculum, gave birth to their respective disciplines, and became integrated into the German university system (Tribe, 1994).

During the Third Reich (1933–1945), business economics and its focus on large corporations "came under attack for installing a liberal, capitalist spirit, and prioritizing self-interest" (Engwall et al., 2016: 103). Instead, the Nazis rhetorically celebrated the "*Mittelstand*," referring to independent, owner-managed companies (von Saldern, 1979). Business economics as a discipline survived this time and

continued its development path after World War II. The years after the war until 1970 were a period of integration of existent research areas and gradual addition of new fields influenced by U.S. business schools under the scope of business economics (Klein-Blenkers & Reiß, 1993). The pedagogy and general aim of higher business education in Germany remained unchanged.

The Rebirth of Entrepreneurial Education (*c.*1950–2020)

The growth of entrepreneurship education in the last quarter of the 20th century is most often attributed to the economic crisis of big business in the 1970s and the need for business students to find salaried employment. But its origins also lay in a growing critique of big business, and of management as a profession in particular, that had begun brewing much earlier. Social critics charged that management as a profession had failed to deliver on its promise of making business more rational and socially just and had in fact systematically constrained the humane qualities of individual salaried managers to judge and act for themselves. Economic critics added that the ethos of managerialism and planning had constrained competition, stifled innovation, and undermined individual liberty. The economic crisis of the 1970s hence only served as powerful confirmation of a new social imaginary of entrepreneurship that had begun to see management careers—along with management education—as a constraint on a more authentic human capacity to innovate and compete, free from the contrived hierarchies of corporations.

United States. In contrast to common narratives, government and private business organizations, and not the American business schools, were the first to re-introduce entrepreneurship education in the United States. The Small Business Administration (SBA), established under the Eisenhower administration in 1953, was the frontrunner in this development and revived entrepreneurship education as a way to strengthen individual economic autonomy and the creation of small businesses (Bean, 2001). In opposition to "big business dogma," it was the SBA's mission to provide support for small business entrepreneurs in forms of capital, contracts, and counseling (Schoen, 1957). Eugene Foley, the administrator of the SBA from 1963 to 1965, pointed out that the term "counseling" "covers a tremendous range of topics and a variety of activities including educational courses" (Foley, 1965: 2). In response to growing interest and demand in the 1970s and 1980s, the SBA set up numerous entrepreneurship education programs. The courses and programs, often jointly offered with chambers of commerce and trade or local community colleges, were broad and practical, covering a wide array of business subjects such as taxation, strategy, market research, and production, and were delivered with a variety of pedagogies ranging from lectures and discussion-based formats to forms of experiential learning such as role plays and simulations of concrete business situations (Luchsinger & Luchsinger, 1977; Solomon & Carney, 1985).

When American business schools integrated entrepreneurship education into their curricula in the 1970s and 1980s, the focus shifted from small businesses to entrepreneurship for high-growth companies, a narrative that aligned much better with the big-business focus of business schools (Carland, Hoy, Boulton, & Carland, 1984). In light of the economic stagnation of large corporations of the 1970s, business students increasingly demanded courses and programs providing an alternative career path that corresponded to their need for authenticity and purpose. Business students in the United States, tired of the big-business orientation that favored analytics and tools over skills and mindset, demanded entrepreneurship courses (Solomon & Fernald, 1991). Within higher education in the United States, entrepreneurship education courses and programs have seen unprecedented growth since the 1980s (Katz, 2003; Kuratko, 2005). This most recent wave of entrepreneurship education in the United States has embraced a neoliberal social imaginary in which entrepreneurial freedom in the form of start-ups has disrupted the status quo of corporate stagnation and managerial complacency to once again stimulate innovation and economic growth for the common good.

Even though entrepreneurship education is comparatively well established within higher education in the United States, it has still suffered from skepticism regarding its character as a legitimate discipline (Finkle & Deeds, 2001). Critics of early entrepreneurship education believed that entrepreneurship lacked the distinct domain of knowledge required to form a legitimate and independent discipline at business schools, which underwent a notable process of "scientification" after the 1960s (Khurana, 2007). Seeking academic legitimacy as a discipline, entrepreneurship scholars devised the metaphysical notion of "opportunity" as the distinctive domain of entrepreneurship (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). At the same time, entrepreneurship educators moved further

away from teaching codified scientific knowledge and toward teaching the entrepreneurial process. More recently, they have adopted cognitive and methodological conceptions of being and acting entrepreneurially (Neck & Greene, 2011). Nevertheless, entrepreneurship at business schools today remains in a paradoxical position of drawing strong interest from students while still facing skepticism from scholars from other business disciplines (McMullen, 2019).

Germany. As it did in the United States, entrepreneurship education reemerged in post-World War II Germany in collective and public efforts to support small- and medium-sized businesses, rather than in universities. In the "miracle years" of the 1950s and 1960s, German policy-makers and public officials sought to navigate a "third way" between unfettered free-market capitalism and socialism by pursuing the notion of a "social market economy" that could capitalize on the advantages of the markets while harnessing them to ensure balanced development (Giersch, Paqué, & Schmieding, 1994). A central aspect of the ordoliberal imaginary of the social market economy was re-envisioning the role of Mittelstand firms, Germany's historically vibrant small- and medium-sized enterprises, as those embracing an ethos of independent ownership and societal responsibility and opposed to the excesses of big businesses controlled by salaried managers (Welter, 2018).

Alarmed by the decline of Mittelstand firms throughout the 1960s and 1970s, chambers of industry and trade (*Industrie- und Handelskammer*) re-introduced entrepreneurship education programs in the 1970s. The chambers identified a negative public image of the entrepreneur and a lack of business knowledge as the main barriers for entrepreneurship. In response, they created educational programs—some of them inspired by those of the SBA (Naujoks, 1978)—that entailed basic business knowledge and, occasionally, elements of personality development (Vogel, 1979). The chambers' attempts were reinforced by increased interest in entrepreneurship from the German media (Rosellen, 1984), which promoted the societal shift from the entrepreneur as a man of yesterday toward the image of an important figure contributing to society and the economy. In particular, younger generations began to see entrepreneurship as an authentic, exciting, and purposeful path to self-fulfillment (Bögenhold, 1999).

Besides the chambers of industry and commerce, it was most notably German banks that offered entrepreneurship education. The German banks, especially the government-sponsored *Sparkassen* (savings banks), had a long tradition of supporting the small- and medium-sized companies of the Mittelstand (Lubinski, in press). Seeing how quickly many of the small Mittelstand firms transformed into profitable clients during the post-war boom, banks provided guidance, planning tools, and educational seminars for new entrepreneurs (Deutsche Bank, 1981).

German universities were hesitant to integrate entrepreneurship education into their curricula. While the more practice-oriented universities and colleges (*Fachhochschulen*) began with entrepreneurship education in the 1980s (Uni- und Berufswahl, 1981), it was not until 1997 that the first entrepreneurship chair was established at a university. Prior to that, influential scholars of business economics, such as Horst Albach (1979: 538), argued that studying business economics was the ideal preparation for entrepreneurs and salaried managers alike. Others openly admitted that the focus on functional business processes in large companies was ill suited to educate entrepreneurs (Szyperski, 1980). Critics pointed to a societal and economic need for entrepreneurship education as well as to the precedents set by U.S. universities, but business economics scholars still remained wedded to providing codified knowledge for the management of established businesses (Kipping, 1998). Unsurprisingly, the establishment of the first university chairs for entrepreneurship in the late 1990s and early 2000s was grounded not so much in scholarly interest as in political considerations and push from the business community.

Since the turn of the century, entrepreneurship education has proliferated rapidly in higher education in Germany. As in the United States, entrepreneurship education courses can be found at almost all German universities, while its research struggles to gain legitimacy within the business economics discipline (Klandt, 2018). Large numbers of accelerators, incubators, consultancies, and other private entrepreneurship support organizations entered the scene by providing a mix of educational formats related to entrepreneurship (Zinke et al., 2018). However, entrepreneurship education focused on high-growth firms—a model imported from the United States—stands in some opposition to the German Mittelstand tradition of entrepreneurship as an ethos around the responsible owner–manager contributing to the social good.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Table 1 provides an overview of selected aspects of our historical narrative. For each period and country, we identify an ascendant social imaginary that theorized a relationship between the exercise of

TABLE 1
Social Imaginaries and Emergent Forms of Entrepreneurship Education in the United States and Germany, 1800–2020

	Early Modern Period (*c.*1800–1880)	Modern Period (*c.*1880–1950)	Rebirth Period (*c.*1950–2020)
United States			
Social imaginary	Republicanism	Corporate liberalism	Neoliberalism
Challenge	Self-government	Coordination and control	Corporate stagnation
Initial aim	Independent businessman	Well-rounded entrepreneurial leader	Business founder
Organizational form	Commercial bolleges, Lyceums & Magazines	University-based business schools and departments	SBA, community colleges (later) universities, and business schools
Germany			
Social imaginary	State industrialism	Corporatism	Ordoliberalism
Challenge	Foreign economic competition	Legitimacy crisis of business class	Domestic economic competition
Initial aim	Industrial entrepreneur	Well-rounded business class	Mittelstand / independent entrepreneur
Organizational form	Polytechnical schools, exhibitions, and competitions	Higher trade schools	Chambers of industry & trade, (later) university colleges, and universities

entrepreneurial freedom, on one hand, and a vision of the common good on the other. In all cases, the relationship between entrepreneurship and the common good was premised on the contention that entrepreneurial autonomy was justified because it challenged the status quo in a way that was mutually beneficial. However, each social imaginary articulated a unique, historically situated moral vision of the common good and of the central challenge posed by the status quo. Hence, early 19th-century entrepreneurship education in the United States was shaped by republican political theories of individual economic independence as essential to the challenge of self-governance in a new democratic nation, whereas, in Germany, it was shaped by the promise of developing strong industrial states capable of competing internationally against the ascendant economic might of the United Kingdom. As our historical narrative shows, these social imaginaries in turn shaped the design of entrepreneurship education in each period, including perceptions of the ideal-type entrepreneur who was being trained, the choice of curricular content and methods, and the organizational forms through which entrepreneurial action was pursued.

The remainder of this discussion draws out the implications of this deeper history for entrepreneurship education today, including (a) how entrepreneurship education evolves, (b) the nature of entrepreneurial knowledge, and (c) the relationship between entrepreneurship education and the university.

The Social Imaginary of Entrepreneurship Today

Our historical narrative demonstrates that entrepreneurship education does not evolve in a linear fashion, but, rather, experiences periods of punctuated change when new social imaginaries arise that challenge new understandings of the status quo. As Table 1 shows, the end of the 19th century and the 1970s to 1980s were moments of significant change when new forms of entrepreneurship education linked to new social imaginaries were introduced that challenged the educational institutions and practices of the previous period. Historically, the conditions for these punctuated changes in entrepreneurship education arose because of the apparent success—*not* the failure—of existing institutions and practices.

Based on these patterns, we posit that entrepreneurship education has its own internal dynamic of change in which each wave of educational reform creates conditions for its own potential demise. As the entrepreneurial imaginaries of today become part of the status quo of tomorrow, existing institutions and forms of education come to be seen as constraints on the meaningful exercise of entrepreneurial freedom. Over time, educational institutions and practices can become routinized and detached from the social imaginary on which they were initially based. Likewise, a historically situated vision of the common good or understanding of the status quo can seem less morally pressing as perceived challenges to the common good change. The growth of entrepreneurship education institutions and standardization of

practices can hence come to form their own status quo and become a target for educational reformers with a new and more compelling social imaginary.

Our historical view of how entrepreneurship education evolves has important implications for how we evaluate the status of entrepreneurship education today. From this point of view, the rapid expansion of entrepreneurship education in recent years can be seen as much as a cause for concern as a reason to celebrate. On one hand, the growth of programs and students since the 1970s and 1980s provides strong evidence for the relative strength of entrepreneurship education today (Kuratko & Morris, 2018). On the other hand, it raises questions about whether the problems of corporate and economic stagnation that initially motivated this wave of growth remain the most important challenges for a compelling social imaginary of entrepreneurship education in our own time. Critics argue that they do not (Hägg & Schölin, 2018; Lackéus, 2017), and that the neoliberal view of entrepreneurship education has itself become a threat to freedom by producing "useful unreflective citizens" (Hägg & Schölin, 2018: 656) who are capable of advancing their own wealth and happiness at the expense of freedoms available to others (Lackéus, 2017). The growth of student interest in social entrepreneurship (Pache & Chowdhury, 2012), with its focus on addressing inequality, poverty, environment, and health (Kickul, Janssen-Selvadurai, & Griffiths, 2012; Lyons, Hamlin, & Hamlin, 2018), can also been interpreted as a critique rather than an extension of the social imaginary of mainstream entrepreneurship education.

Our view is that the future of entrepreneurship education lies in the field's ability to articulate a morally compelling social imaginary at a larger societal scale once again. Just as previous periods of change led reformers to reimagine the moral and political foundations of entrepreneurial freedom and its relationship to a mutually beneficial vision of the common good, the vitality of entrepreneurship education in the future will be determined by educators' ability to reimagine entrepreneurship education in response to the challenges we face today.

Moral Reasoning as Entrepreneurial Knowledge

Our narrative also has implications for how we conceive of "entrepreneurial knowledge" today. Much of the scholarship on entrepreneurship education focuses on one of two "epistemic stances" (Bhatia & Levina, 2020) regarding the nature of entrepreneurial knowledge. The first views entrepreneurial knowledge as based in the core social sciences of management (i.e., economics, sociology, psychology) but evolving to create a distinct field focused on a core body of scientific knowledge on how entrepreneurs pursue opportunities (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). For example, Kuratko and Morris (2018: 16) articulated that the "content of modern entrepreneurship program[s]" that has matured over the last few decades includes "(1) business basics in a new venture management context; (2) core entrepreneurial content; and (3) the entrepreneurial mindset." A second view of entrepreneurship knowledge sees it as based in personal experience and practice. For example, in calling entrepreneurship education a "method," Neck and Greene (2011: 62) described going "beyond understanding, knowing and talking" to "using, applying, and acting." Neck and Greene (2011) also located their notion of pragmatic, experiential entrepreneurship knowledge in relation to the recent history of entrepreneurship education as the "new frontier" of entrepreneurship education that moves beyond the "analytical–functional" conceptions of entrepreneurial knowledge.

Our historical narrative reveals that both these forms of knowledge contributed to important aspects of entrepreneurship education dating back to the early 19th century, but so did a third form of entrepreneurship epistemology that plays a far more marginal role today: moral reasoning. Whereas modern business schools based on social sciences embrace an essentially value-free concept of knowledge, viewing it as akin to knowledge in the physical sciences, 19th-century entrepreneurship education was steeped in moral reasoning, which included both logical and political reasoning from philosophy and empirical reasoning from history. Indeed, many programs aimed at entrepreneurship included courses in "political economy," which, in the 19th century, was seen as a branch of moral philosophy and included logic, history, and economics. Early business schools, such as Wharton or HHL, that viewed business education as part of the liberal arts in fact elevated moral and political reasoning in relationship to technical skill as integral to business practice (Sass, 1982). It was only when university-based business schools in the United States and higher trade schools in Germany truly embraced the premise that management was a science focused on training professionals for business occupations that moral reasoning was marginalized, and later reinvented as a separate subject called "business ethics."

Before the "professionalization" of modern business education, moral reasoning was understood as essential for educating entrepreneurs because it gave

purpose to the scientific and experiential aspects of entrepreneurship knowledge. Given that entrepreneurship education involved the disruptive notion of emancipation from an existing status quo, it raised questions of "freedom from what" and "freedom to what" that made entrepreneurship just and justifiable (Laine and Kibler, 2020). As Table 1 shows, the ideologies that underlay entrepreneurship education in the United States and Germany all entailed entrepreneurial freedom, but each also espoused unique and historically situated conceptions of the societal challenges that justified that freedom and the moral and political ends that entrepreneurial freedom was designed to achieve. While the German social imaginaries of entrepreneurship have been more collectively oriented than the American ones, both involved theorizing about how a vision of mutually beneficial common good could be achieved by entrepreneurs challenging an existing status quo. Without this foundation of moral reasoning, the promise of emancipation and agency would have seemed directionless; there would have been no shared understanding about those aspects of the status quo worthy of challenge nor a vision of the positive ends of entrepreneurial action.

Today, moral reasoning, in the form of both philosophy and history, is rarely understood as an *essential* form of entrepreneurial knowledge with anything near the same standing as objective social scientific or experiential knowledge. Yet, the premise that entrepreneurship knowledge, or any form of social scientific knowledge, can be value free is questionable at best (Sandel, 2013). Our ability to effectively teach a subject that is premised on human freedom and the exercise of human agency without careful attention to the development of the skills involved in weighing the purposes of that freedom are at best incomplete. As John Dewey pointed out, "experiential education" that allows students to learn by doing is of little promise without the skills to reflect on the moral justifiability of its ends (Dewey & Tufts, 1906).

A future that integrates moral reasoning back into entrepreneurship education, in our view, would necessarily require incorporating humanistic thinking as a fundamental and practical entrepreneurial skill rather than as part of a general education. It would include moral and political philosophy—the ability to critically reason about not only the justifiability of entrepreneurial means but also the just ends of entrepreneurial agency—as essential to reflexively considering the social imaginary of entrepreneurship in which one is embedded. And, second, it would include history as a way to grapple with and take into account alternative social imaginaries of entrepreneurship. In effect, studying entrepreneurial history would allow entrepreneurs to learn to judge the ends and consequences of entrepreneurial action, and to understand both the context in which entrepreneurs are operating and the change they seek to create.

The Undisciplined Discipline

Our history of entrepreneurship education also sheds light on the fraught relationship between entrepreneurship education and the modern university. Today, these tensions are often ascribed to entrepreneurship's status as a new field, and hence to uncertainty over if and how it fits within the classification system of disciplines and professions that constitute higher education. After all, entrepreneurship education today may be housed in a variety of different departments within a business school or at a variety of other schools within a university (Kuratko & Morris, 2018). Our historical narrative, however, highlights that entrepreneurship education can be seen to predate the modern research university and its disciplinary conventions. From this historical point of view, the issue of the relationship between entrepreneurship education and the university can be recast; rather than asking how entrepreneurship education can fit within the existing disciplinary structure of the university, we might ask instead how the modern research university evolved in such a way as to struggle to incorporate a robust conception of entrepreneurship education, and how contemporary entrepreneurship education might serve to reintegrate the disciplinary fragments that universities have created.

As our historical narrative demonstrates, efforts to incorporate entrepreneurship education into modern research universities beginning in the late 19th century faltered as universities themselves engaged in efforts to establish themselves as value-neutral institutions organized along specialized lines of scientific and professional knowledge (Reuben, 1996). For example, German higher polytechnical schools in the 19th century and higher trade schools in the 20th century jettisoned their initial visions of training entrepreneurs as a form of liberal education in favor of a much narrower, formalized, and value-free conception of engineering education and business economics. American universities likewise increasingly categorized business education as professional education founded in social scientific knowledge, separating it from the liberal arts and cutting off the possibility of a broadly conceived entrepreneurship education that considered entrepreneurial autonomy

and action in relationship to questions of the just exercise of freedom. In both cases, the disciplinary classification that came to constitute the modern university served to legitimize its identity as a place of highly specialized knowledge and learning at the cost of excluding a broad-minded vision of entrepreneurship education that integrated scientific, embodied, and moral inquiry. In doing so, the modern university seems to have repeatedly failed to create the foundations for a more broad-minded conception of entrepreneurship and its role in a free and just society.

From this historical perspective, entrepreneurship education's ongoing identity as an "undisciplined discipline" can be seen not as a problem to be overcome but an unfulfilled opportunity to be pursued. Disciplinary categories—like any system of classification—are not immutable structures but can be reconstituted through strategic and entrepreneurial action (Pontikes & Rindova, 2020). They are subject to change and reclassification by historically reflective actors over time (Khaire & Wadhwani, 2010). Unencumbered by the status quo of disciplinary categories, entrepreneurship education holds the potential to free the university of its conventions. Practical and theoretical, scientific and humanistic: entrepreneurship education's deeper roots provide it the historical stance to make the university into its own entrepreneurial project. That social imaginary for entrepreneurship education cannot be charted from the trajectory of its recent past, but requires a much more reflexive and critical examination of the time before modern university disciplines to understand the possibilities it creates for the future.

REFERENCES

Albach, H. 1979. Zur Wiederentdeckung des Unternehmers in der wirtschaftspolitischen Diskussion. Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft [Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics], 135: 533–552.

Aldrich, R. 1999. The apprentice in history. In P. Ainley & H. Rainbird (Eds.), Apprenticeship: Towards a new paradigm of learning: 14–24. London, U.K.: Kogan Page.

Alkhaled, S., & Berglund, K. 2018. "And now I'm free": Women's empowerment and emancipation through entrepreneurship in Saudi Arabia and Sweden. Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 30: 877–900.

Bean, J. 2014. ***Big government and affirmative action: The scandalous history of the Small Business Administration.*** Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Berghoff, H., & Moller, R. 1994. Tired pioneers and dynamic newcomers? A comparative essay on English and German entrepreneurial history. Economic History Review, 47: 262–287.

Bhatia, A. K., & Levina, N. 2020. Diverse rationalities of entrepreneurship education: An epistemic stance perspective. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 19: 323–344.

Bögenhold, D. (Ed.). 1999. Unternehmensgründung und Dezentralität: Renaissance der beruflichen Selbständigkeit in Europa? Opladen, Germany: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Böhmert, V. 1897. Handelshochschulen. Denkschrift zur Errichtung handelswissenschaftlicher Abteilungen an den technischen Hochschulen und Universitäten. Dresden, Germany: Verlag von D. B. Böhmert.

Calás, M. B., Smircich, L., & Bourne, K. A. 2009. Extending the boundaries: Reframing "Entrepreneurship as Social Change" through feminist perspectives. Academy of Management Review, 34: 552–569.

Carland, J. W., Hoy, F., Boulton, W. R., & Carland, J. A. C. 1984. Differentiating entrepreneurs from small business owners: A conceptualization. Academy of Management Review, 9: 354–359.

Conn, S. 2019. Nothing succeeds like failure: The sad history of American business schools. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Dana, L. P. 1992. Entrepreneurial education in Europe. Journal of Education for Business, 68: 74–78.

Deutsche Bank. 1981. [Entscheidungshilfe der deutschen Bank für Gründer] [Decision aid from Deutsche Bank for founders] (Box 788, Folder 2). Abt. 181, Deutscher Industrie- und Handelskammertag, Rheinisch-Westfälisches Wirtschaftsarchiv, Cologne, Germany.

Dewey, O. 1838. Moral views of commerce, society, and politics in twelve discourses. London, U.K.: Charles Fox.

Dewey, J., & Tufts, J. H. 1906. Ethics. New York, NY: Holt & Company.

Dey, P., & Mason, C. 2018. Overcoming constraints of collective imagination: An inquiry into activist entrepreneuring, disruptive truth-telling and the creation of "possible worlds." Journal of Business Venturing, 33: 84–99.

Eastman Business College. 1866. The student's guide though the theoretical department of Eastman National Business College. New York, NY: John A. Gray & Green.

Eastman Business College. 1875, December. ***A brief history of Eastman Business College, from its earliest conception to the present time***. Poughkeepsie, NY: Eastman National Business College.

Ehrenberg, R. 1897. [Präsentation "Die erste deutsche Handelshochschule zu Leipzig" gehalten auf dem Congresse des kaufmännischen Unterrichtswesen, 1897] [Presentation at the conference for merchant education on the

first higher trade school in Leipzig, Germany] (Box 63). HHS Sachakten, Universitätsarchiv Leipzig, Germany.

Emminghaus, A. 1868. Allgemeine Gewerkslehre. Berlin, Germany: Herbig.

Engwall, L. 2004. The Americanization of Nordic management education. Journal of Management Inquiry, 13: 109–117.

Engwall, L., Kipping, M., & Üsdiken, B. 2016. Defining management: Business schools, consultants, media. New York, NY: Routledge.

Fear, J. 1997. German capitalism. In T. K. McCraw (Ed.), Creating modern capitalism: How entrepreneurs, companies, and countries triumphed in three industrial revolutions: 135–182. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Finkle, T. A., & Deeds, D. 2001. Trends in the market for entrepreneurship faculty, 1989–1998. Journal of Business Venturing, 16: 613–630.

Foley, E. P. 1965. The UCC and the Small Business Administration. Howard Law Journal, 11: 1–7.

Frankin, B. 1748. Advice to a young tradesman. Philadelphia, PA: D. Humphreys.

Frankin, B. 1758. The way to wealth. Boston, MA: Benjamin Mecom.

Frankin, B. 1793. The works of the late Dr. Benjamin Franklin: Consisting of his life, written by himself, together with essays, humorous, moral & literary, chiefly in the manner of the Spectator. New York, NY: H. Gain.

Franz, H. 1998. Zwischen Markt und Profession: Betriebswirte in Deutschland im Spannungsfeld von Bildungs- und Wirtschaftsbürgertum (1900–1945). Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Giersch, H., Paqué, K.-H., & Schmieding, H. 1994. The fading miracle: Four decades of market economy in Germany. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Godley, A. C., & Hamilton, S. 2020. Different expectations: A comparative history of structure, experience, and strategic alliances in the U.S. and U.K. poultry sectors, 1920–1990. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 14: 89–104.

Gorman, G., Hanlon, D., & King, W. 1997. Some research perspectives on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education and education for small business management: A ten-year literature review. International Small Business Journal, 15: 56–77.

Gulski, N. T. 1973, February 16. A history of business education as seen by a Bryant College administrator. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.bryant.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1081&context=docu

Hägg, G., & Schölin, T. 2018. The policy influence on the development of entrepreneurship in higher education: A Swedish perspective. Education + Training, 60: 656–673.

Handelshochschule Leipzig. 1898. [Vorlesungsverzeichnis Handelshochschule Leipzig 1898/99–1904/05] [Course catalog of the higher trade school Leipzig 1898/99–1904/05] (Box 61). HHS Sachakten, Universitätsarchiv Leipzig, Germany.

Handelshochschule Leipzig. 1914. [Vorlesungsverzeichnis Handelshochschule Leipzig 1914–1930] [Course catalog of the higher trade school Leipzig 1914–1930] (Box 61). HHS Sachakten, Universitätsarchiv Leipzig, Germany.

Haushofer, M. 1874. Der Industriebetrieb: Ein Handbuch für Industrielle, Kaufleute etc. sowie zum Gebrauche an technischen Schulen. Stuttgart, Germany: Julius Maier.

Hodges, J. 1887. Commercial education. North American Review, 144: 462–470.

Hunt, F. (Ed.). 1854. Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review, 31. New York, NY: Freeman Hunt. Retrieved from https://fraser.stlouisfed.org/title/merchants-magazine-commercial-review-5733?browse=1830s

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology. 1999. [Vorlesungsverzeichnis KIT WS 99/00] [Course catalog Technical University Karlsruhe 1999/2000] (Box 206). Universitätsbibliothek Karlsruhe (28914), KIT Archive, Karlsruhe, Germany.

Katz, J. A. 2003. The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education. Journal of Business Venturing, 18: 283–300.

Kaufmann und fabrikant. 1856. Der Kaufmann - Zeitschrift Für Verbreitung Kaufmännischer Kenntnisse Unter Handlungsgehilfen Und Jungen Kaufleuten, 1: 41–43.

Khaire, M., & Wadhwani, R. D. 2010. Changing landscapes: The construction of meaning and value in a new market category—modern Indian art. Academy of Management Journal, 53: 1281–1304.

Khurana, R. 2007. From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kickul, J., Janssen-Selvadurai, C., & Griffiths, M. D. 2012. A blended value framework for educating the next cadre of social entrepreneurs. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11: 479–493.

Kieser, A. 2004. The Americanization of academic management education in Germany. Journal of Management Inquiry, 13: 90–97.

Kipping, M. 1998. The hidden business schools: Management training in Germany since 1945. In L. Engwall & V. Zamagni (Eds.), Management education in historical perspective: 95–110. New York, NY: Manchester University Press.

Kipping, M., Wadhwani, R. D., & Bucheli, M. 2013. Analyzing and interpreting historical sources: A basic methodology. In M. Bucheli & R. D. Wadhwani (Eds.), Organizations in time: 305–329. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Klandt, H. 2018. Überlegungen zu Entrepreneurship Research und Entrepreneurship Education. In G. Faltin (Ed.), Handbuch Entrepreneurship: 55–70. Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

Klein-Blenkers, F. 1996. Courcelle-Seneuil, Emminghaus, Lindwurm als Vorläufer der neuen Betriebswirtschaftslehre in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Cologne, Germany: Wirtschaftsverlag Bachem.

Klein-Blenkers, F., & Reiß, M. 1993. Geschichte der Betriebswirtschaftslehre. In W. Wittmann (Ed.), Handwörterbuch der Betriebswirtschaft, vol. 5: 1417–1433. Stuttgart, Germany: Schäffer-Poeschel.

Kocka, J. 1975. Unternehmer in der deutschen Industrialisierung. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

König, W. 1990. Technische Hochschule und Industrie—Ein Überblick zur Geschichte des Technologietransfers. In H. J. Schuster (Ed.), Handbuch des Wissenschaftstransfers: 29–41. Berlin, Germany: Springer Berlin.

Koselleck, R. 2017. Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten (10th ed.). Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp.

Koselleck, R., & Presner, T. S. 2002. The practice of conceptual history: Timing history, spacing concepts. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kuratko, D. F. 2005. The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 29: 577–598.

Kuratko, D. F., & Morris, M. H. 2018. Examining the future trajectory of entrepreneurship. Journal of Small Business Management, 56: 11–23.

Lackéus, M. 2017. Does entrepreneurial education trigger more or less neoliberalism in education? Education + Training, 59: 635–650.

Laine, L., & Kibler, E. 2020. The social imaginary of emancipation in entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice. Published online in advance. doi: 10.1177/1042258720959251

Lindenfeld, D. F. 1990. The professionalization of applied economics: German counterparts to business administration. In G. Cocks & K. H. Jarausch (Eds.), ***German professions, 1800–1950:*** 213–231. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Locke, R. R. 1984. The end of the practical man: Entrepreneurship and higher education in Germany, France, and Great Britain, 1880–1940. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Locke, R. R. 1985. Business education in Germany: Past systems and current practice. Business History Review, 59: 232–253.

Locke, R. R. 2008. Comparing the German and American systems. Business History Review, 82: 336–342.

Loos, I. A. 1903. The Ann Arbor Conference on the higher commercial education. Journal of Political Economy, 11: 457–466.

Lubinski, C. in press. Dynamische Fähigkeiten: Die Sparkassen und das Geschäft mit dem Mittelstand. In G. Schulz & T. Wehber (Eds.), Die Entstehung der modernen Sparkasse in der Nachkriegszeit: Von der "Ersparnisanstalt" zur modernen Sparkasse (1950er bis frühe 1980er Jahre). Bonn, Germany: Deutscher Sparkassen- und Giroverband.

Luchsinger, L. L., & Luchsinger, V. 1977. New trends in educational programs oriented towards small businesses. Journal of Small Business Management, 15: 43–47.

Lyons, T. S., Hamlin, R. E., & Hamlin, A. 2018. Using entrepreneurship and social innovation to mitigate wealth inequality. Boston, MA: De Gruyter.

McMullen, J. S. 2019. A wakeup call for the field of entrepreneurship and its evaluators. Journal of Business Venturing, 34: 413–417.

Meyer, H.-D. 1998. The German Handelshochschulen, 1898–1933: A new departure in management education and why it failed. In L. Engwall & V. Zamagni (Eds.), Management education in historical perspective: 19–33. New York, NY: Manchester University Press.

Mieck, I. 1965. Preussische Gewerbepolitik in Berlin 1806–1844: Staatshilfe und Privatinitiative zwischen Merkantilismus und Liberalismus. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Naujoks, W. 1978. [Brief von Dr. Naujoks an H. Putz bezüglich Schaffung und Förderung von mittelständischen Existenzen] [Letter from Dr. Naujoks to H. Pütz regarding creation and support of SMEs] (Box 787, Folder 3). Abt. 181, Deutscher Industrie- und Handelskammertag, Rheinisch-Westfälisches Wirtschaftsarchiv, Cologne, Germany.

Neck, H. M., & Greene, P. G. 2011. Entrepreneurship education: Known worlds and new frontiers. Journal of Small Business Management, 49: 55–70.

O'Neill, J. 2016. Social imaginaries: An overview. In M. A. Peters (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory: 1–6. Singapore, Singapore: Springer Singapore.

Pache, A.-C., & Chowdhury, I. 2012. Social entrepreneurs as institutionally embedded entrepreneurs: Toward a new model of social entrepreneurship education. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11: 494–510.

Passant, A. J.-G. 2016. Issues in European business education in the mid-nineteenth century: A comparative perspective. Business History, 58: 1118–1145.

Passant, A. J.-G. 2019. The early emergence of European commercial education in the nineteenth century: Insights from higher engineering schools. Business History, 61: 1051–1082.

Pocock, J. G. A. 1972. Virtue and commerce in the eighteenth century. Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 3: 119–134.

Polytechnische Hochschule Karlsruhe. 1832. [Programm der großherzoglich badischen polytechnischen Schule zu Carlsruhe 1832/33] [Course catalog of the higher polytechnical school Karlsruhe 1832/33] (Microfilm IV 0.1–0.27). Universitätsbibliothek Karlsruhe (92299001), KIT Archive, Karlsruhe, Germany.

Polytechnische Hochschule Karlsruhe. 1865. [Programm der großherzoglich badischen polytechnischen Schule zu Carlsruhe 1865/66–1873/74] [Course catalog of the higher polytechnical school Karlsruhe 1865/66–1873/74] (Microfilm IV 0.28–12). Universitätsbibliothek Karlsruhe (92299001), KIT Archive, Karlsruhe, Germany.

Pontikes, E. G., & Rindova, V. P. 2020. Shaping markets through temporal, constructive, and interactive agency. Strategy Science, 5: 149–159.

Redlich, F. 1957. Academic education for business: Its development and the contribution of Ignaz Jastrow (1856–1937)—in commemoration of the hundredth anniversary of Jastrow's birth. Business History Review, 31: 35–91.

Reinert, S. A. 2015. The way to wealth around the world: Benjamin Franklin and the globalization of American capitalism. American Historical Review, 120: 61–97.

Reuben, J. A. 1996. The making of the modern university: Intellectual transformation and the marginalization of morality. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Rindova, V., Barry, D., & Ketchen, D. J. 2009. Entrepreneuring as emancipation. Academy of Management Review, 34: 477–491.

Rorabaugh, W. J. 1986. The craft apprentice: From Franklin to the machine age in America. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rosellen, H.-P. 1984. [Brief der Zeitschrift die Bunte vom 9.4.1984] [Letter from the Magazine "Die Bunte"] (Box 788, Folder 3). Abt. 181, Deutscher Industrie- und Handelskammertag, Rheinisch-Westfälisches Wirtschaftsarchiv, Cologne, Germany.

Rowlinson, M., Hassard, J., & Decker, S. 2014. Research strategies for organizational history: A dialogue between historical theory and organization theory. Academy of Management Review, 39: 250–274.

Ruef, M. 2020. The household as a source of labor for entrepreneurs: Evidence from New York City during industrialization. ***Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal***, 14: 20–42.

Rüegg, W. (Ed.). 2004. Universities in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (1800–1945). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Sandel, M. J. 2013. Market reasoning as moral reasoning: Why economists should re-engage with political philosophy. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 27: 121–140.

Sass, S. A. 1982. The pragmatic imagination: A history of the Wharton School, 1881–1981. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Schmalenbach, E. 1920. Findeisen–Großmann Grundriß der Handelswissenschaften. Zeitschrift für handelswissenschaftliche Forschung, 14: 106.

Schoen, E., Jr., 1957. The Small Business Administration. Maryland Law Review, 17: 30–42.

Schumpeter, J. 1934. The theory of economic development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. Academy of Management Review, 25: 217–226.

Solomon, G. T., & Carney, M. 1985. United States Small Business Administration's role in small business training. International Small Business Journal, 4: 25–33.

Solomon, G. T., & Fernald, L. W. 1991. Trends in small business management and entrepreneurship education in the United States. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 15: 25–40.

Stutz, C., & Sachs, S. 2018. Facing the normative challenges: The potential of reflexive historical research. Business & Society, 57: 98–130.

Swedberg, R. 2006. Social entrepreneurship: The view of the young Schumpeter. In C. Steyaert & D. Hjorth (Eds.), Entrepreneurship as social change: 21–34. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Szyperski, N. 1980. [Projektantrag des Projekts PUNIS] [Project proposal for the PUNIS project] (Box 788, Folder 2, p. 6.). Abt. 181, Deutscher Industrie- und Handelskammertag, Rheinisch-Westfälisches Wirtschaftsarchiv, Cologne, Germany.

Taylor, C. 2004. Modern social imaginaries. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Thieß, K. 1914. Hochschulbildung für Unternehmer. In G. Schmoller (Ed.), Schmollers Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft im Deutschen Reiche: 43–114. Munich, Germany: Dunker & Humblot.

Tribe, K. 1994. Business education at the Mannheim Handelshochschule, 1907–1933. Minerva, 32: 158–185.

Uni- und Berufswahl. 1981. [Artikel im Magazin *Uni- und Berufswahl* mit dem Titel: 'Neues Fach mit dem Titel "Unternehmensgründung" an der Fachhochschule des Saarlands'] [Article in the magazine *Uni- und Berufswahl* with the title "New subject 'founding a company' at the university college Saarland"] (Box 3085, Folder 2). Abt. 181, Deutscher Industrie- und Handelskammertag, Rheinisch-Westfälisches Wirtschaftsarchiv, Cologne, Germany.

Vogel. 1979. [Übersicht über Gründungsseminar der Industrie und Handelskammer Hamburg] [Overview on the first founder seminar at the chamber of industry and commerce Hamburg] (Box 1027, Folder 3). Abt. 181, Deutscher Industrie- und Handelskammertag, Rheinisch-Westfälisches Wirtschaftsarchiv, Cologne, Germany.

von Saldern, A. 1979. Mittelstand im "Dritten Reich": Handwerker, Einzelhändler, Bauern. Frankfurt, Germany: Campus Verlag.

Wadhwani, R. D., & Decker, S. 2018. Clio's toolkit: The practice of historical methods in organization studies. In R. Mir & S. Jain (Eds.), Routledge companion to qualitative research in organization studies: 113–127. New York, NY: Routledge.

Wadhwani, R. D., Kirsch, D., Welter, F., Gartner, W. B., & Jones, G. G. 2020. Context, time, and change: Historical approaches to entrepreneurship research. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 14: 3–19.

Wakefield, A. 2009. The disordered police state: German cameralism as science and practice. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Welter, F. 2011. Contextualizing entrepreneurship-conceptual challenges and ways forward. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 35: 165–184.

Welter, F. 2018. The Mittelstand: A specific entrepreneurial profile of the social market economy. Journal for Markets and Ethics, 6: 99–106.

Wilentz, S. 2004. Chants democratic: New York City and the rise of the American working class, 1788–1850. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Yates, W. R. 1987. Joseph Wharton: Quaker Industrial Pioneer. Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press.

Zinke, G., Ferdinand, J.-P., Groß, W., Möring, J. L., Nögel, L., Petzolt, S., Richter, S., Robeck, M. S., & Wessels, J. 2018. Trends in der Unterstützungslandschaft von Start-ups – Inkubatoren, Akzeleratoren und andere. Berlin, Germany: Institut für Innovation und Technik. Retrieved from https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/DE/Publikationen/Studien/trends-in-der-unterstuetzungslandschaft-von-start-ups.pdf

Dan Wadhwani (dwadhwani@marshall.usc.edu) is a professor of entrepreneurship at University of Southern California and Copenhagen Business School. He received his PhD from University of Pennsylvania. His research interests include entrepreneurial creativity, disruption, and change; management and organizational history; and historical theory and methods.

Christoph Viebig (cvi.mpp@cbs.dk) is a PhD fellow at the Department of Management, Politics and Philosophy, Copenhagen Business School, (CBS). His PhD project focuses on the past, present, and future of entrepreneurship education. He is also part of the Center of Business History and the interdisciplinary Research in Blended Learning Project at CBS, where he is involved in research projects on business and management education, entrepreneurship, and entrepreneurial history.