

## ENTREPRENEURS' EDUCATION: CRITICAL AREAS FOR THE PEDAGOGIC-DIDACTIC AGENDA AND BEYOND

Herbert Grüner<sup>1</sup>, Lars Neuberger<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Applied Sciences, <sup>2</sup>University of Stuttgart,  
E-mail: herbert.gruener@fhtw-berlin.de

Received 22 August 2006; accepted 3 November 2006

**Abstract.** In the following article we aim to give the reader an insight into the problems we have encountered since we began developing a curriculum for entrepreneur education at university level. We have been able to find solutions to some of the problems faced. More interesting though seem to be the quandaries which crop up almost automatically when pedagogues attempt to formulate a programme of “Entrepreneur Education”. They give us occasion to critically reflect on some accepted standpoints, and should also open up interesting perspectives for the reader for his or her own consideration. As such we intend to spend more time on the quandaries whilst providing rather brief sketches of our solutions.

We hope to be able to offer a small contribution to the field in order to fuel critical debate in the discipline of Entrepreneurship Research and Education; debate whose aim is to effect critically constructive reflection on practice and existing knowledge, and forge innovative new paths towards the object of research.

**Keywords:** Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurship Education, start up, founding a business, curriculum development

### 1. Introduction: forging towards the entrepreneur

By setting ourselves the task of “Entrepreneur Education” we find ourselves in an area of pedagogic research which is not particularly well established. Accordingly, this is a place where a stiff breeze can blow up from the most unexpected of directions. This document as such represents a brief meteorological report for the reader concerning work undertaken as part of the project “Entrepreneurship as a long-term goal within tertiary education didactics” (in German: “Entrepreneurship als Nachhaltige Hochschuldidaktische Aufgabe” (ENHA)) at the University of Stuttgart, where, after a few months, we came across regions with the potential of serious turbulence.

Although Entrepreneurship Research and Education (this title refers to the discipline dedicated to the “Entrepreneur” and “Entrepreneurship”) definitely offers potential for the development of numerous scientific fields, the path forged to it by the field of economic sciences is by far the widest. Thereafter follows the psychological path, and far behind a so-

ciological, and a small – but attractively paved – pedagogical path. We aim to follow this pedagogical path and will primarily deal with those turbulences occurring at the windy crossroads on the path of economic sciences. Firstly, however, we wish to focus on those aspirations connected with “Entrepreneurship” which have brought research in this area forward, sometimes providing tailwind to accelerate our quest towards entrepreneurial training, sometimes providing side wind to knock us off course.

### 2. Aspirations

The term “Entrepreneur” has lost many of its negative connotations. This is only right, and is, if anything, years overdue. We do not intend to dwell in detail on employment opportunities hoped for from entrepreneurs and the founding of businesses. The literature available details many more positive consequences to be viewed in connection with entrepreneurship over and above this single aspect: effects concerning economic structure in the form of intensified competition; normative cultural aspirations in the form of a “cul-

ture of personal responsibility”; in management terms, the emergence of a different leadership culture no longer characterised by the restrained personal engagement of a manager or the short-term pecuniary rewards of a speculator, etc. – the list is endless.

We will, however, turn our attention to those aspirations which seem to us particularly meaningful in a university context: from a political perspective, the prospect of founding innovative businesses represents a significant enticement. We should proceed along the principle of positive effects on economic structure through future-oriented industries. Here, Silicon Valley can be seen as an agglomeration, SAP as a single concern. The mere coming into existence of a single hi-tech agglomeration or a single lean business à la SAP would in retrospect justify substantial foundation benefits! From the perspective of higher education, newly founded, technology-oriented businesses are bound with similarly concrete expectations. Universities are under increasing pressure to justify state spending on research and teaching by providing economic benefit. What would be more suitable for, on the one hand, challenging the legitimacy of this external threat, and, on the other, requiring no major changes to the system of university-based research, than innovative businesses which develop inventions from the sciences into sellable products and therewith enjoy market success? These most likely were the definitive aspirations as the mid-eighties saw a serious boom in technology and industry centres (in German: Technologie- und Gründerzentren - TGZ) sweep across the German republic. The spatial proximity between research and industry on the one hand and innovative businesses on the other was hoped to bring with it decreased transaction costs for exchanges and synergy in the field of technological innovation. And these sinking costs, it was hoped, would bring with them more transactions. Of course, the effects were not as resounding as had been desired: where the TGZ did enjoy success, this was not the result of technology transfer. It could be suggested that the definitive transfer of technology and the realisation of a business concept both take place and are concluded within one person's head. Technology transfer could as such be the aim of entrepreneurship training. This is an aspect which stands out on the path forged by the economic sciences towards the entrepreneur.

On the other hand, a pedagogue looking to justify his or her actions to individual learners may chiefly associate a programme of entrepreneurship education with the aim of enabling more learners to found sustainable businesses. This constitutes the core of the pedagogical path to entrepreneurship. A certain tur-

bulence should be expected at the point where both paths meet, while now and then quandaries emerge when an attempt is made to relate insights from both paths to each other.

### 3. Quandaries in training

Initially, we wish to explore one aspect of the quandary which results from following the pedagogical path and, when confronted with different findings, becomes problematic. From a pedagogical perspective we are obliged to justify our actions to the individual – every teacher would do well to bear this goal in mind in their day-to-day work. For the purposes of justification we characterise learners as community-bound individuals: ‘justifying’ oneself to the learner does not mean taking on his or her wishes without question. This type of hedonistic approach may be great, but a pedagogic approach should afford the learner moral development over and above egocentric hedonism. Furthermore, the community may place many demands on the individual. However, the learner's qualities as an individual obviously forbid the pedagogue from seeing these demands as absolute. It may be the case that people with specialised skills will always be required for certain vocational activities, but it should still be the goal of the pedagogue to offer a broad-based education presenting the individual with more professional options than one particular post at one particular firm. Believing in the community-bound nature of the individual at least provides a kind of safety barrier. This barrier protects individuals as they walk a fine – but indistinct – line and prevents them from being led astray and fully neglecting course fundamentals. On that note we wish to leave the topic and head on to the next quandaries.

#### 3.1. Being bound to a community

When we speak of “education” as a result, it manifests itself in the efforts of the educated to, (1) be correct in terms of content, (2) be independent (in the sense of being self-determining) and (3) act with responsibility to the task, fellow persons and the environment. With the concept of being bound to a community, we emphasise the last aspect. With “education” as a process, we aim to encourage such dispositions in the most sustainable form possible<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Schmiel, Martin / Sommer, Karl-Heinz (1992) Lehrbuch Berufs- und Wirtschaftspädagogik. 2. revised., current and extended edition. München, p. 14ff.

Taking this community-bound aspect into consideration for our entrepreneurship education, we could therefore say that the learner and possible future entrepreneur should understand his or her actions in terms of advancing the collective and that pedagogic intervention in the form of "Entrepreneur Training" can by all means take technology transfer into account. Consider, for example, an engineering student who takes an "ivory gadget" (invention) and makes it fit for the market (product development) and for the public (marketing). Now the invention is an innovation and the student can be happy to have contributed to society's collective benefit. Naturally, the student must conduct this activity in such a way that the task is not carried out in an amateurish manner, or that the environment, however defined, does not suffer unduly. Additionally, the student should conduct himself respectfully towards his or her fellows, for example, by avoiding their exploitation. As such we are able to – and right to – demand a responsible entrepreneur or a responsible personality with business competence<sup>2</sup>. This is the half of the quandary to which the pedagogical path leads.

A relatively well-established track down the economic sciences path leads us to the second half of the quandary, which in turn represents a barrier obstructing our progress. This is because the market success of at least innovative firms, in so far as they are relevant for entrepreneurship training at a university, cannot be reliably predicted. Will a market emerge at all for the entirely new product? Which conditions make possible the emergence of such a market and under which conditions can the product ultimately be sold?

Despite the intrusive pleading for market analysis etc, this assumption of uncertainty is still very much present. This gives rise to a whole range of varying theses: starting with the (finally rejected) assumption that all "entrepreneurs" must be particularly fond of risk, all the way to the Schumpeter's "Look", with which the metaphysically assumed skill of a person is designated to be one of action – without any particularly persuasive reasoning for their action – but resulting in decisions which, retrospectively, prove to be correct<sup>3</sup>. (He who does not have the "Look" but nevertheless

acts in an innovative or entrepreneurial manner, will work himself into insolvency). Innovative entrepreneurship means evolution and evolution means real uncertainty<sup>4</sup>. The positive aspect of this uncertainty, by the way, is that the innovative entrepreneur cannot, along with a group of other entrepreneurs, simply follow rational logic and chase another business idea following the same rational logic. Action of this nature, despite (!) uncertainty, is precisely that which marks out the innovative entrepreneur against all others. Alongside financiers and customers, an innovative entrepreneur might of course still require staff, and in terms of the collective, hope is maintained for job opportunities in "future industries". As the innovative entrepreneur is not able to rationally explain to other persons why he or she acts as they do, it is inferred that the entrepreneur must also be a "leader", able to motivate others. To make possible this leadership, business founders are often asked to attend rhetoric and motivation courses.

We are now left with a central (possibly inescapable) element in this quandary: since responsible, innovative, entrepreneurial action also means responsibility towards other people, but the reasoning behind such action cannot be particularly well explained rationally and as such requires leadership, an acute and constant danger emerges, namely that of exploiting other persons in the name of subjective convictions. Even when the hopes connected with innovative, entrepreneurial action are in most cases realised, it is nevertheless the case that some people will still be "dragged into bankruptcy". It may be correct from the abstract perspective that in the end a sense of consequential ethical responsibility is created for the majority of entrepreneurial actions under conditions of market-related processes<sup>5</sup>, but this argument is not valid for concrete, real-life examples. For if one considers less abstract concepts concerning the environment of the entrepreneur (e.g. colleagues and the entrepreneur's own family) in place of these abstract ones, innovative and entrepreneurial action is and remains eternally dependent on a belief in success in order to be considered acceptable. Knowledge of high instances of failure should, however, offer us – and

<sup>2</sup> Neugebauer, Udo (2002) *Unternehmerbild und Erziehung zum Unternehmer. Analyse und Synthese volks- und betriebswirtschaftlicher sowie berufs- und wirtschaftspädagogischer Positionen*. Stuttgart, p. 104ff.

<sup>3</sup> Schumpeter, Joseph Alois (1997) *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung: eine Untersuchung über Unternehmerrisiko, Kapital, Kredit, Zins und den Konjunkturzyklus*. Berlin. 9. unpublished edition. p. 125.

<sup>4</sup> Röpke, Jochen (2002) *Der lernende Unternehmer. Zur Evolution und Konstruktion unternehmerischer Kompetenz*. Marburg, p. 32.

<sup>5</sup> Barbier, Hans D. (2002) *Der Unternehmer: Getriebener und Treiber*. In: Eberhard von Kuenheim Stiftung (Hrsg.): *Die Werte des Unternehmers*. Stuttgart, p. 24f.

particularly prospective entrepreneurs – the occasion to put this belief into perspective<sup>6</sup>. At the moment we are busy with abstraction and ignore the fact that we are stuck in this quandary – this debate will therefore be dealt with in future papers. We recommend those involved in entrepreneurial education, if they (like us) are turning a blind eye: one should not forget on occasion to open that eye – not doing so renders pedagogic aims implausible. Furthermore, we recommend increased investigation of those areas in which entrepreneurs practice routine activities, and which are not hidden under a veil of ignorance. Unfortunately, in entrepreneurship literature these areas are constantly threatened with marginalisation. As such, a portion of the literature on entrepreneurship education focuses on the area of innovative entrepreneurial action most burdened with insecurity and risks neglecting other significant segments. Incidentally, Schumpeter has already pointed out that the actions of entrepreneurs do not just comprise innovation. A training programme which does not pursue an analytically stringent “entrepreneurial function” – “[...] that is essentially never encountered in reality [...]”<sup>7</sup> – but rather offers preparation for real vocational requirements with their attendant complexity of action has to markedly broaden its scope.

### 3.2 ... of the individual

We speak consciously of the community-bound nature of the individual, and not of a “being”. This refers us to the pedagogic aim mentioned above, namely not to make participants of an entrepreneurial education programme into mere fulfillers of a collective aspiration. But if one is to explore this direction, the tangible turbulences represent particular challenges. One could suggest that a heart filled with compassion for one’s fellow man (also a source of “cognitive interest”!) might demand more than the attendant spirit can actually provide. Obviously, an emphasis can be placed on “self-reliance” concerning the decisions and actions of entrepreneurs, but in future the entrepreneur will be seen increasingly as the means to an end than the end itself<sup>8</sup>: so far research has largely

been content to view the situation as being characterised by the socialisation of entrepreneurship’s benefits occurring at the same time as the privatisation of entrepreneurial risks<sup>9</sup>. With this we are hardly able to answer either the question of whether efforts to develop training programmes could take off, or which types of pedagogic intervention would be out of the question. If, for example, “wide-spread risk aversion” is the result of perceived risks of innovative entrepreneurial action and represents a disincentive to founding a business, one might want to work towards “risk tolerance”. In this case evidence must be presented proving the risk to be lower than believed (risk assessment instead of risk-phobia), or that risk tolerance in fact functions itself to minimise risks (e.g. via minimisation of the “Liability of Smallness”), in order to justify a corresponding pedagogic intervention. On the other hand, questioning the asymmetrical distribution of communal benefit and private cost outlined above could lead to changes in practice, which would then relativize “compassionate dissuasion”. Countries whose insolvency legislation attaches more importance to failed entrepreneurs and their needs than Germany could serve as an example.

#### 3.2.1. Risk, maturity and euphoric expectations

And so we come to a quandary of pedagogic aims and the prognosticity of success. With the economic sciences path in view, we assume that “entrepreneurial success” – here defined as the survival of a business – can only to some extent be explained. For individual cases this means that even in the presence of recognised strengths suggesting success, failure can still occur as a result of other influences. Reversed, the success of a business cannot be ruled out even if those characteristics regarded as relevant for success are not present. Viewed statistically, we can assume a survival rate of approx. 65 % of businesses in their first five years. A cautious assessment of existing knowledge regarding “success factors” makes possible the assumption that the chances of survival for newly founded businesses cannot be significantly raised. This considered, the demand often encountered that the aim of entrepreneurial education be to raise the quota of businesses founded is, at the very least, astonishing. As a matter of fact, bearing the pedagogical path in mind, our aim is to legitimate action to learners. To aspire to an increased number of new businesses would require considerably improved chanc-

<sup>6</sup> Brüderl, Josef / Preisendörfer, Peter / Ziegler, Rolf (1998) *Der Erfolg neugegründeter Betriebe. Eine empirische Studie zu den Chancen und Risiken von Unternehmensgründungen*. Berlin. 2. unpublished edition p. 96f.

<sup>7</sup> Schumpeter 1997, p. 115.

<sup>8</sup> Pursiainen, Terho (2001) Critique of the entrepreneurship movement. In: Miettinen, Asko / Klandt, Heinz (Hrsg.): *IntEnt2000: internationalizing entrepreneurship education and training*. Köln, p. 231ff.

<sup>9</sup> Neugebauer 2002, p. 36f.

es of predicting success than are available at the moment! We cannot reliably determine which learner will enjoy success, and should as such be encouraged where possible, and which learner will fail, and should be warned off where possible.

What differentiates this quandary from others is the fact that it has not arisen as a result of maintaining pedagogic aims, rather that the pedagogical path leads right through it! Due to the limited explainability of success and failure, pedagogues are discussing an escape route in the form of a “founder-maturity” construct. The aspiration over the course of this discussion is to minimise the danger of a manipulation of learners for or against (!) founding a business: learners should not only be enabled to found the most successful business possible according to the latest knowledge, but also be able to reach a reflective decision on whether to found a business or not. “Vocational competence” as the fulfilment of requirements is not the only aim of “vocational training”; such training must also endeavour to engender “vocational maturity”. Vocational maturity is here understood as reflection on the requirements brought upon individuals, in order to reject them, with reason where appropriate. Setting maturity as a goal in terms of entrepreneurial education, however, means adding another facet: founding businesses out of euphoria, actionism or a sense of disadvantage must be worked against<sup>10</sup>. In this case, the classic view of maturity as autonomy against external expectations is no longer assumed, rather a justified examination of the suitability of one's own expectations is aspired to.

There are thoroughly plausible reasons which speak for a consistent delegation of founding decisions to the individual level. Here, amongst others, count empirical findings which advocate that entrepreneurs can markedly better estimate their own potential for success than might be expected from economic knowledge regarding the entrepreneur's group. That said, this potential is nowhere near to being exhausted, as demonstrated by the relatively high rate of failure. If one considers that the decision for business founding is only taken when subjective certainty of success is present, it seems that a significant proportion of entrepreneurs simply overestimate themselves and misinterpret other factors.

<sup>10</sup> Braukmann, Ulrich (2000) Zur Entwicklung und programmatischen Ausrichtung einer Gründungsdidaktik an Hochschulen. In: Euler, Dieter / Jongebloed, Hans-Carl / Sloane, Peter F.E. (Hrsg.): Sozialökonomische Theorie – sozialökonomisches Handeln. Konturen und Perspektiven der Wirtschafts- und Sozialpädagogik. Kiel, p. 245ff.

We must therefore assume deficits both in the prognosis of success with scientific knowledge, and in individual cases. These deficits can, however, be encountered in entrepreneurship education, if one adopts an approach incorporating two fundamental modes of business behaviour which should be prepared for: successful entrepreneurship on the one hand, failed entrepreneurship on the other.

Concurrently, it appears worthwhile to us that any education for entrepreneurship should as a rule be developed with both basic modes of business behaviour in mind. This preparation for success and failure could also present an option worth considering for those developing entrepreneurship education aimed at multiple businesses being founded, as this approach reduces exaggerated fears stemming from business failure. Knowledge of a possible “coordinated retreat from self-employment” in advance of the founding of a business may strengthen trust in the founder's own competencies. In the event that failure does occur, this also facilitates a course of action which moderates the effects of this failure. Fear of failure currently represents a greater disincentive to founding a business in Germany than in other countries. Failed entrepreneurs tend to be “held in contempt” more often in Germany than elsewhere, whilst a widespread lack of knowledge regarding insolvency legislation often hampers a timely (and as such successful) rehabilitation. It is possible to explain this in terms of culture, and wonder about how cultural change can be brought about, or one can strive for compensation for culturally-generated deficits. Both are possible – but while the first option would be a mammoth project with an uncertain outcome, we can begin compensating cultural deficiencies tomorrow.

### 3.2.2. Requirements

One last quandary for us to mull over exists with limited resources on one side, and a whole host of requirements encountered by the entrepreneur in the course of his or her professional activities on the other. One could almost speak of a potential situation of over-requirement. The problem with this premise is not really the justification of programme content (that which definitely has to be learned), rather the justification of why one area or another can be neglected, that is, why one should receive rather superficial treatment.

We assume initially that in principle everyone (!) should receive training for entrepreneurship: vocational self-employment represents on the one hand a career option for everyone, and, due to the significance of situa-

tive factors as a catalyst for corresponding considerations<sup>11</sup>, a considerable portion of the population will in all likelihood be confronted with this over the course of their lives. Taking this into account, it appears that in certain circumstances the problematic wish to motivate others to take up self-employment should be partially replaced by the desire to broaden the possibilities for movement towards independence amongst the population, thus opening up the possibility of sustained, long term self-employment.

Here it should be borne in mind that an early training programme should be aspired to, which takes place immediately prior to the founding of a business, as it is here that suboptimal conditions dominate for many reasons: a “window of opportunity” may as such be the source of time pressure while the concrete preparation for the founding of a business also necessitates long periods of time. At the same time it can be assumed that the realisation of one’s own business will be to a certain extent (we of course don’t know to exactly what extent) dependent on one’s own competences in the pre-founding phase. Accordingly, qualification deficits, if they do not lead to failure, will definitely result in suboptimal outcomes. It is thus possible to state that entrepreneurial education should be performed as early as possible and open the widest possible scope for action in terms of founding decisions.

Naturally, at this early stage ideas concerning the eventual form of self-employment are so vague that it is impossible to predict which competences could, in individual cases, be neglected. In some circumstances uncertainty reigns regarding the sector and whether a corresponding product will take the form of a service or an actual product. The latter may, for example, affect finances. It is likewise impossible to see whether a founding team will be involved, where an engineer can leave economically-oriented tasks to a business expert, or whether corresponding competences will be accrued through the employment of staff or the engagement of external service agencies (e.g. subsidised services in the TGZ). Similarly, over the course of time the business can develop such that requirements are completely changed (cp. models for the development phases of businesses).

Pedagogical practice further complicates this quandary in several ways: on the one hand it is impossi-

ble to keep a training programme within reasonable boundaries without excessively curtailing course content. On the other, the uncertain time scale during which such course contents can actually be implemented also represents a less than ideal prerequisite for the corresponding learning processes. The approach should therefore be to undertake training early and make it as comprehensive as possible, while at the same time observing a realistic course framework and not placing unreasonable demands on participants in the form of excessively future-oriented learning of no relevance to them at the present time. A line of compromise is here unavoidable, and must, of course, be well justified.

Initially, one could be content with the additional demand that learners be enabled to reflectively plan their careers and implement the conclusions they draw therefrom. In the case of an imminent founding of a firm this at the same time would mean that the firm’s development planning should not only be performed along classic business administrative lines, rather than human resource development – including that of the entrepreneur him- or herself – should assume particular importance from the outset. Without an individual development plan, there is a threat of falling back on one’s own non-systematic needs at the cost of the systematic needs of the business. The consequence could be a mere “positioning” of one’s life style instead of its individualisation<sup>12</sup>.

#### 4. Desiderata

Finally we would like to present the reader six suggestions as pursued by us over the course of the ENHA project.

**(1) On account of the potential significance of founding a business for every individual, providing entrepreneur education for everyone would represent a logical approach!**

In this way it would be possible to open up the potential of sustained, successful self-employment to more people. Empirical findings show that this cannot proceed on simply a voluntary basis, but can be demanded out of concern for learners: situative factors accrue considerable importance as catalysts to considering the question of becoming self-employed. Strange as it may seem to occasionally train participants convinced of the arguments of Marx and Lenin, this should also

<sup>11</sup> Klandt, Heinz (1984) *Aktivität und Erfolg des Unternehmungsgründers. Eine empirische Analyse unter Einbeziehung des mikrosozialen Umfeldes.* Bergisch Gladbach, p. 346.

<sup>12</sup> Kohli, Martin (1999) *Institutionalisierung und Individualisierung der Erwerbsbiographie.* In: Lange, Ute et al. (Hrsg.): *Studienbuch Berufliche Sozialisation.* Bad Heilbrunn, p. 266.

be taken into consideration. If situative factors (incentives in the form of subsidies, the threat of unemployment etc.) force such a person to confront the possibility of founding a firm, he or she may become a very successful entrepreneur.

**(2) Entrepreneur education should be not results-oriented. Raising the numbers of businesses founded cannot be the goal of a learning process – even if this is nevertheless to be expected.**

We could view the achieving of entrepreneurial- and founder-maturity as an alternative goal. Although this has yet to gain explicit acceptance in the entrepreneurial community, it does seem to be enjoying increasing popularity. Taking the learners into consideration, this means making the option of a successful existence as an entrepreneur open to learners by (a) removing unreasoned barriers (e.g. irrational fear) and (b) increasing possibilities for action. An increased quota of businesses founded is not necessarily implied here. However, if the concept of Germany possessing a culture of risk aversion, which – as a product of non-rational development processes – represents an unjust obstacle to founding a business is correct, one can expect an increase in the number of successful new businesses founded to result from this rational debate (for which the university is essentially predestined). Irrational fear should not be an obstacle, nor should founding a business fail in account of easily-rectified qualification deficits.

**(3) Entrepreneur education cannot be content to offer a business-founding qualification, but must primarily offer an entrepreneur qualification over the course of which questions on how to become such an entrepreneur are answered.**

Founding a business, even if it takes place before the individual can be considered an entrepreneur and is itself an obstacle worthy of consideration, is, in logical terms as a means to an end, relatively unimportant when compared with the sustained, responsible management of a business. If learners can imagine making their way as an entrepreneur, they will – with the support of advice on how to found a business – cut a path through the undergrowth standing between them and this goal.

**(4) It should be constantly borne in mind that course participants may potentially have a large number of possible business ideas, but should not necessarily pursue the one that looks most attractive at a given moment.**

This could be assumed, as if the entrepreneur is not capable of further ideas, then the long-term prospects for the founding of a business are negligible unless the business idea at that moment has an extremely long life cycle. Only such a product would assure the entrepreneur's survival over many years or decades without significant changes being necessary ("cash cow enterprise"). The urgent desire to implement a business concept regularly witnessed often seems to have other reasons than one would expect from rational, pedagogically-oriented consideration: "retrospective" legitimization of research done or "retrospective" legitimization of training activities are here at the back of one's mind and should encourage participants to exercise caution.

**(5) It can be (somewhat cynically) demanded that a programme of training claiming to offer ways of connecting an individual to a particular organisation (i.e. founding his / her own business) should always at the same time offer another way by which the individual can also get rid of the organisation.**

This demand arises from the assumption that the process of founding a business connects one's own existence to a specific organisation which develops its own dynamics and transfers market dynamics to its "owner-worker", possibly overwhelming him or her. Here, "change of employer" is connected to much more than three months' notice. Education should not resemble a two lane one-way street into entrepreneurship and a rocky path of individual (creditor) advice back out.

**(6) A training programme should be designed such that course contents are still accessible and of use after years of dependent employment.**

We would propose suggesting ways to continuously utilise learnt competencies both in dependent occupation and / or as part of private life (e.g. for voluntary clubs or organisations), allowing these to be easily reactivated at the point a business is founded. This is – alongside the supposition of the "educational value" of occupying oneself with entrepreneurship and a rather coincidental applicability of course contents – the decisive factor turning the training programme from an "equipping of the mind" to a preparation for a situation of professional challenges. This also makes the vague term "intrapreneur" (a colleague who behaves in an innovative and entrepreneurial fashion) rather more accessible. So far we do not know – aside from the currently "hip" support of human resources depart-

ments – how large the actual demand for “intrapreneurs” is. This type of training programme is therefore always in danger of providing inappropriate qualifications as trends change<sup>13</sup>. If terms like “intrapreneurship” – and one could add “privatepreneurship” – are held to denote cocoons in which participants possibly ripen to entrepreneurs, they become manageable. In this way the tricky entrepreneur derivative “intrapreneur” could become the interdisciplinary core of teacher-learner-centred entrepreneurship research.

We hope to win over teaching staff engaged by universities in entrepreneurship education to the idea that knowledge (i.e. theory) be broadened not only by adding aspects of its application (i.e. practice), but at the same time by adding the aspect of the “possibilities of competence maintenance” (i.e. planning). At the same time we hope to have offered you stimulation for a critically constructive dialogue! We hope to have aroused the interest of the pedagogically-minded reader regarding this topic: the pedagogical path still needs widening, and plenty of minds, hands and hearts to get the job done!

## References

- Barbier, H. D. (2002) Der Unternehmer: Getriebener und Treiber. In: Eberhard von Kuenheim Stiftung (Hrsg.): Die Werte des Unternehmers. Stuttgart, p. 23–27.
- Braukmann, U. (2000) Zur Entwicklung und programmatischen Ausrichtung einer Gründungsdidaktik an Hochschulen. In: Euler, Dieter / Jongebloed, Hans-Carl / Sloane, Peter F.E. (Hrsg.): Sozialökonomische Theorie – sozialökonomisches Handeln. Konturen und Perspektiven der Wirtschafts- und Sozialpädagogik. Kiel.
- Brüderl, J.; Preisendörfer, P.; Ziegler, R. (1998) Der Erfolg neugegründeter Betriebe. Eine empirische Studie zu den Chancen und Risiken von Unternehmensgründungen. Berlin. 2. unpublished edition.
- Klandt, H. (1984) Aktivität und Erfolg des Unternehmungsgründers. Eine empirische Analyse unter Einbeziehung des mikrosozialen Umfeldes. Bergisch Gladbach.
- Kohli, M. (1999) Institutionalisierung und Individualisierung der Erwerbsbiographie. In: Lange, Ute et al. (Hrsg.): Studienbuch Berufliche Sozialisation. Bad Heilbrunn, p. 255–269.
- Nerdinger, F. W. (1999) Perspektiven der Erforschung des Unternehmertums. In: Rosenstiel, Lutz von / Lang-von Wins, Thomas (Hrsg.): Existenzgründung und Unternehmertum. Themen, Trends und Perspektiven. Stuttgart, p. 3–21.
- Neugebauer, U. (2002) Unternehmerbild und Erziehung zum Unternehmer. Analyse und Synthese volks- und betriebswirtschaftlicher sowie berufs- und wirtschaftspädagogischer Positionen. Stuttgart.
- Pursiainen, T. (2001) Critique of the entrepreneurship movement. In: Miettinen, Asko / Klandt, Heinz (Hrsg.): IntEnt2000: internationalizing entrepreneurship education and training. Köln, p. 222–234.
- Röpke, J. (2002) Der lernende Unternehmer. Zur Evolution und Konstruktion unternehmerischer Kompetenz. Marburg.
- Schmiel, M. / Sommer, K.-H. (1992) Lehrbuch Berufs- und Wirtschaftspädagogik. 2. revised., current and extended edition. München.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1997) Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung: eine Untersuchung über Unternehmergewinn, Kapital, Kredit, Zins und den Konjunkturzyklus. Berlin. 9. unpublished. edition.

---

<sup>13</sup> Nerdinger, Friedemann W. (1999) Perspektiven der Erforschung des Unternehmertums. In: Rosenstiel, Lutz von / Lang-von Wins, Thomas (Hrsg.): Existenzgründung und Unternehmertum. Themen, Trends und Perspektiven. Stuttgart, p. 16ff.