

Entrepreneurship in Public Policy Education: The Willy Brandt School as a Case



Heike M. Grimm

Abstract This contribution discusses entrepreneurship as an important asset and feature of policy making and education. Attention is drawn to the increasing role of entrepreneurship in public policy education for the training of innovative professionals in public and non-profit organizations. The paper highlights the rising prominence of policy entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship that have taken on particular importance for the curriculum of the first Master of Public Policy program, which has been offered at a public university in Germany since 2002. The Willy Brandt School of Public Policy at the University of Erfurt is selected as a case to describe the shift from a traditional public policy program to integrating new disciplines beyond just political, social, and administrative sciences, including an emphasis on entrepreneurship education. This paper is dedicated to David B. Audretsch whose unique, innovative, transformative, multidisciplinary approach to entrepreneurship research has had a very significant impact not only on academia, but also on public policy making and teaching, influencing, among others, the program development of the Brandt School.

Introduction

Reflecting on the last two decades of extraordinary global changes worldwide, we face pressing new challenges in policy making, which also affect the content and methods of teaching in the fields of public policy and political sciences. Due to new political parameters, threats to liberal democracies, the renaissance of populist parties and actors, financial crises, increased migration, climate changes, digitalization, and many more issues, the demand for interdisciplinary, transformative, application-oriented teaching has increased tremendously within a short time frame, generating the need for applying new technologies in the classroom, as well as modern pedagogical insights. This paper describes the transformations of a public policy

H. M. Grimm (✉)

Willy Brandt School of Public Policy, University of Erfurt, Erfurt, Germany

e-mail: heike.grimm@uni-erfurt.de

program which started-off in 2002 as the first graduate program of its kind in Germany. It looks specifically at the shift from a traditional public policy program incorporating methodologies, theories, and thoughts of the Anglo-American, but also continental Western European, model to integrating new disciplines beyond political, social, and administrative realities that have not been regarded as classic in the context of public policy education (Lasswell 1951, 1956). Attention is drawn to the importance of entrepreneurship as an essential asset and feature of innovative public policy making and entrepreneurship education, with the goal of promoting policy entrepreneurship, as well as the development and implementation of new solutions for local-global problems (Hynes 1996; Lackeus 2015; Volkmann and Audretsch 2017). The paper aims at filling a research gap, because knowledge about the interrelationships between entrepreneurship and public administrations, on one hand, and policy makers and entrepreneurs, on the other, is still rare, though essential to better understand the key challenges of societies and to design innovative policies for sustainable and inclusive development.

The classic term entrepreneurship has predominantly been used in an economic sense, referring to start-up activities in the private sector, and, therefore, has rarely been of any importance for public policy programs at higher educational institutions in the twentieth century. Meanwhile, the term has been defined in different ways across disciplines and applied to the public, social, and non-profit sectors. Audretsch et al. (2015) underline that constricting the field and meaning of entrepreneurship may be the wrong approach for future research and identify an emerging, eclectic view of entrepreneurship across disciplines. Following these thoughts, this paper will distinguish between economic, social, and policy entrepreneurship, which have taken on particular importance for the curriculum of the Master of Public Policy program (MPP) of the Willy Brandt School of Public Policy (Brandt School) at the University of Erfurt in Germany in recent years.

Although the activities of policy entrepreneurs have received some attention in several studies (Bernie and Hafsi 2007; Roberts and King 1996, 1998), the concept of policy entrepreneurship is currently only vaguely defined and, therefore, hardly integrated within analyses of change, problem solving, development, and, above all, education (Grimm 2019a). Silander (2016) points out that entrepreneurship research has focused on economic entrepreneurs, but is lacking in research on entrepreneurial activity in the public and political sector, which would contribute to the definition and theoretical grounding of policy entrepreneurship. To facilitate more integration of the concept, this paper offers a brief theoretical discussion of the typological classification of policy entrepreneurship with the goal of answering the question: Why should this concept be taken into consideration in a public policy program? In that context, what training do policy entrepreneurs need to promote change and innovation in public sector as well as non-profit organizations?

These questions are related to a research agenda presented by Audretsch et al. (2015, p. 709) who foresee "(...) the development of a dynamic theory of entrepreneurship to apply to decision making and behavior within the context of the public sector". This paper presents a case study for further investigating what educational program and curriculum is suitable for future policy entrepreneurs. It is hypothesized

that young academics with multifaceted learning experiences have a high potential for policy and institutional entrepreneurship but also for social entrepreneurship to promote development at various levels in bureaucracies and societies.

The interest in entrepreneurship education has increased significantly in recent years (Volkman and Audretsch 2017). Young people and academics see the need to learn and adopt entrepreneurial skills and develop creative mindsets to cope with challenges, design new policies and solutions, and promote transformations in the public sector. Future policy entrepreneurs have the potential to support attitudes and activities for developing and implementing creative, innovative ideas, and solutions for overcoming social and institutional challenges. Public entrepreneurs are motivated by diverse interests, including improving services to their own communities and increasing the level and quality of public goods – e.g. peace, safety, health etc. – available to citizens (Ostrom 2005; Mintrom and Norman 2009). Furthermore, economic and social entrepreneurship are regarded as alternatives to complement or even substitute traditional tools of development policy making, and as a trigger for promoting self-initiated, bottom-up development in lower and less developed countries (Koltai and Muspratt 2017).

Therefore, I hypothesize that it is crucial for future professionals in public bureaucracies to be familiar with the concepts of entrepreneurship and the tools and techniques to develop entrepreneurial ideas and innovations for sustainable growth. This paper will explain why the importance of incorporating entrepreneurship in the core curriculum of a public policy program has increased. In section “[Entrepreneurship as a Core Element of a Public Policy Curriculum](#)”, the concept of entrepreneurship will be explained with a conceptual differentiation between social and policy entrepreneurship, because both concepts play a crucial role for a public policy program. In section “[Profile of the Willy Brandt School of Public Policy at the University of Erfurt](#)”, the profile of the Brandt School will be presented. In the following, the concept of entrepreneurship education at the Brandt School will be introduced. The last Section wraps up the arguments why entrepreneurship is crucial for public policy education and provides an outlook.

Entrepreneurship as a Core Element of a Public Policy Curriculum

The reasons for the emerging role of entrepreneurship in a public policy program are manifold. First, entrepreneurship is important at the individual level with regard to certain skills and attitudes, including creativity and innovativeness, and a specific mindset characterized by a positive understanding of risk, action, and failure (Schumpeter 1934, 2008; Drucker 1985; Shane and Venkataraman 2000). Entrepreneurs perceive opportunities and exploit them. They contribute to transformations at all levels and contribute not only to economic, but also social and institutional development. The term entrepreneurship refers to professional independence,

on one hand, and to the “discovery and exploitation of profitable opportunities” (Shane and Venkataraman 2000, p. 217), on the other. The many definitions of the term highlight very significant aspects, including personality aspects, such as innovativeness, the willingness to take risks, the urge for action, the creative development of ideas and entrepreneurial implementation; furthermore, the functions and actions of entrepreneurial individuals, firms, or other organizations, traits and behaviors. Audretsch et al. (2015, p. 708) provide an extensive overview of the literature referring to variety of meanings of entrepreneurship and distinguish between status, behavior, and performance as main elements of an eclectic paradigm of entrepreneurship.

From the 1980s onwards, researchers put strong emphasis on investigating the relationship between businesses and economic growth in highly industrialized countries, as well as in this context, the role of size (small, medium, or big) and status (new or old) of firms with reference to their role in creating new jobs, promoting innovation, and economic development (Birch 1981). David Audretsch was one of the prominent scholars emphasizing the role of small companies for development, not only from an economic, but also a more comprehensive point of view. When I started writing my doctoral thesis about “Existenzgründungen in den neuen Bundesländern” (start-ups in the new German states) at the beginning of the 1990s, the Discussion Papers written by David Audretsch during his research period at the Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin (WZB) were a major source of inspiration. At that time, hardly any policies were developed for small firms in Germany, policy makers frequently spoke about the importance of the *Mittelstand*, but a strong policy to support the development of so-called small and medium-sized companies was rather lacking. David Audretsch further pursued his research by highlighting the importance of new firms and start-ups for regional development from the early 1990s onwards, emphasizing that entrepreneurship contributes to economic development, which is reflected by an abundant amount of literature and research about the role of new businesses for development and job creation (Audretsch et al. 2005b; Audretsch et al. 2015; GEM 2017).

The geographic focus of entrepreneurship research shifted slowly from industrialized countries to places in transition (such as the new German states) and to lower developed countries, evinced by the increasing interest of scholars, students and policy makers (Audretsch et al. 2005a; Mwasalwiba 2010). The emergence of entrepreneurship education and programs in developing countries and emerging markets is a recent consequence, which has also influenced the program development of the Brandt School in Erfurt, due to the high number of students from the Global South.

From a management perspective, Peter Drucker, economist and pioneer of a modern management theory, specified that entrepreneurs do not only act in private-sector organizations and start-ups, but also in public and non-profit organizations. Drucker focused his perspective on social organizations, such as schools, hospitals, churches, theatres, and others, and transferred instruments of innovative management to the third sector with the mission to improve inefficient administration (Drucker 1985). He associated entrepreneurship with the creation and implementation of new forms of management. In line with Schumpeter, he stressed that

innovation and creativity are definitely correlated with entrepreneurship and a precondition for professionally managing public and non-profit organizations. He underlined that entrepreneurship is a mindset that produces certain kinds of behavior. These include grasping opportunities, transferring and implementing new ideas, and the ability to change: "(...) the entrepreneur always searches for change, responds to it, and exploits it as an opportunity" (Drucker 1985, p. 28).

The urge for individual creativity and innovativeness is mainly determined by the inner motivation of an actor such, for example, his or her desire for self-realization and for improving the personal status quo (Shane and Venkataraman 2000, p. 138), but also by the micro- and macro-social environment which explains the growing focus on entrepreneurship ecosystems in the last years (Audretsch and Belitski 2016; O'Connor et al. 2018; Cohen 2006). David Audretsch emphasized already in the early 1990s that new firms play a crucial role for the strategic management of places and presented recommendations to promote entrepreneurial activity (Audretsch et al. 2005a, Audretsch 2015).

All these factors contributed to the rising importance of entrepreneurship as a specialization in academic study programs. Before specifying features and forms of entrepreneurship education and discussing them in the context of the classroom experience, I will first explain the terms policy entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship more thoroughly.

Policy Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurs contribute not only to economic progress, but also overall societal change through entrepreneurial activity. Policy entrepreneurs focus on political change and learning processes (Grimm 2019a). Such processes are driven by a type of actor who develops innovative and creative ideas for the solution of socio-political challenges, as well as tools and instruments to transfer and implement them in order to promote political and policy change. Policy entrepreneurs are frequently, in the Schumpeterian sense, visionaries who think the unthinkable (*Udenkbares denken*) and set in motion rather unimaginable ideas and political processes by mobilizing the public, forming new coalitions, and accepting, if necessary, considerable costs in the form of time or money to reach their mission (Mintrom and Norman 2009). "Policy entrepreneurs represent actors that are capable of bringing about the implementation of their political ideas, even if material distribution conflicts have gained the upper hand in the political process and lead to the organization of powerful oppositional interests" (Kingdon 1995, p. 5). The policy entrepreneur overcomes political stagnation and inertia caused by short-term, instrumentally rational, and even egoistic thinking of political actors who seek to maximize their own benefit in the political process. Consequently, the policy entrepreneur does not act according to routine (maximizing short-term interests), which would lead to political stagnation. He (or she) acts as a promoter of political change processes. He enters new paths, recognizes new political possibilities (windows of opportunities), and is not

afraid of any resistance in the implementation of innovative ideas. “In public policy a new technology, a new service, a new administrative process or procedure might be examples of such innovation” (Roberts and King 1996, p. 5). Osborne and Gaebler (1993) provide a wealth of examples on how it is possible for policy entrepreneurs to overcome bureaucratic red tape, promote civil society involvement, and convince government actors to pursue innovative actions. The result is the further development of an efficient and effective bureaucracy and the promotion of an innovative civil society that is subject to constant change and must adjust to a rapidly changing, globalized knowledge economy.

Link and Link (2007) regard government as entrepreneurial and dynamic in terms of the ability to act in new and innovative ways, and its willingness to undertake policy actions that have uncertain outcomes. They discuss various policy actions and programs (such as the U.S. Small Business Innovation Program) that contributed successfully to development.

In their research on the role of policy entrepreneurs in political change processes, Roberts and King (1998, p. 117) have created a typology of their activities, which can be divided into four categories: Creative/intellectual activities (such as developing and disseminating new policy ideas), strategic activities (such as formulating visions and developing political strategies and action plans), mobilization activities (such as building up lobby groups and media support and obtaining support from politicians), and administrative/evaluative activities (such as program evaluation).

Policy and social entrepreneurship often go hand in hand. One example is Wilhelm von Humboldt, who aligned the innovative ability of a policy and social entrepreneur and made a revolutionary contribution to reforming the education system in Germany (Grimm 2010, p. 446; Audretsch 2017).

Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship describes an old phenomenon with a new label (Grimm 2010, p. 449ff). The reasons for the renaissance in social entrepreneurship – in the broadest sense defined as social engagement or involvement – are diverse. Certainly, a permanent and lasting disappointment with governmental and philanthropic efforts that had only moderate or no success in decreasing socio-economic drawbacks played a crucial role. New, innovative ideas and initiatives for the solution of social and other problems were required. A growing number of actors accepted the challenge of developing and implementing creative solutions for urgent problems.

From the Brandt School’s perspective, the interest in social entrepreneurship increased significantly over the last few years. The reason is predominantly a dissatisfaction and exhaustion with traditional approaches to development in so-called developing countries that have not been successful after many years of governmental involvement, driven by both national and external actors. The desire to learn more about new tools, strategies, and approaches to promote bottom-up development is high, which explains the rising interest in social entrepreneurship as an

alternative to traditional development policy making. For implementing new social entrepreneurial ideas and policies, policy entrepreneurship as an attitude and mindset is needed. Both forms of entrepreneurship (policy and social) go hand in hand in practice when it comes to policy change. But what makes social entrepreneurship different from other forms of entrepreneurship?

“Social entrepreneurs are one species in the genus entrepreneur. They are entrepreneurs with a social mission”, stressed J. Gregory Dees in his treatise, which is still groundbreaking for research in this field (2001, p. 2). The clear, explicit formulation of a social mission as the purpose of action is central for social entrepreneurs. The primary goal of the social entrepreneur is not the generation of profits or prosperity, but rather the fulfillment of a social mission. Conversely, this does not mean that the social entrepreneur considers the generating of income to be a *quantité négligeable*. On the contrary, the social entrepreneur differs fundamentally from the traditional, purely altruistically-acting philanthropist because the generating of income for the financial security of a socially motivated project is recognized as an important means to an end. The financial security of his or her project may be critical for the success of a social entrepreneur who is interested in the sustainable fulfillment of his mission. “In this perspective, social entrepreneurs have used business skills and knowledge to create enterprises that accomplish social purposes in addition to being commercially viable” (Emerson and Twersky 1996).

It should be emphasized that social entrepreneurship is not synonymous with philanthropy. It is characterized by all kinds of activities and is, above all, replacing the antiquated image of selfless altruists as the main social actor with an excellently organized, assertive entrepreneurial type: “It combines the passion of a social mission with an image of business-like discipline, innovation, and determination commonly associated with, for instance, the high-tech pioneers of Silicon Valley” (Dees 2001, p. 1).

Dees provided an idealized characterization of the social entrepreneur (Dees 2001, p. 4). He emphasized that the specific mission, to create and primarily maintain social (and not individualistic or private) values, is the decisive criterion for social entrepreneurship. The social entrepreneur is – like Schumpeter’s entrepreneur – a reformer and innovator accomplishing something revolutionary in the social sector. “Making a profit, creating wealth, or serving the desires of customers may be part of the model, but these are means to a social end, not the end of itself” (Dees 2001). The social entrepreneur pursues his mission sustainably and systematically. Reaching a goal has a long-term perspective.

Furthermore, social entrepreneurs identify and seize innovative ideas and opportunities in order to achieving a social mission. The social entrepreneur is driven by a vision that there is a feasible solution for a certain socio-societal problem. Due to the complexity of socio-societal problems, however, it is assumed that there is no ideal solution for the achievement of the mission, but rather a creative and innovative process of experimenting, learning, and adjusting. There is a high probability that social entrepreneurs may fail which explains that social entrepreneurs are characterized by an above-average risk-taking attitude (Dees 2001, p. 5).

But what differentiates social and economic entrepreneurship in practice? “Social entrepreneurship is best understood as a multi-dimensional and dynamic construct moving across various intersecting points between the public, private and social sectors” explains Nicholls Alex from the Skoll Centre for Entrepreneurship at Oxford University. He defines it as “(...) the practice of responding to market failures with transformative, financially sustainable innovations aimed at solving social problems” (Nicholls 2006, p. 12).

The social entrepreneur is interested in the sustainable success of his engagement. “Instead of maximizing profits (...), the first premise is the maximizing of the social profit under the ancillary condition of economic sustainability” (Nicholls 2006). The social entrepreneur fulfills his mission (1) if he dissolves existing, inefficient structures through social innovation and replaces them with more efficient and effective ones; (2) if he implements new tools for problem-solving over the long term; and (3) generates change through social engagement. A successful social entrepreneur generates “positive results in all three dimensions” (Harbrecht 2010, p. 49).

Profile of the Willy Brandt School of Public Policy at the University of Erfurt

The Brandt School – founded as Erfurt School of Public Policy (ESPP) in 2002, and re-named in 2009 – was Germany’s first public institution to offer a two-year international graduate course of study in public policy. David Audretsch started serving as Director of a Max Planck research group in Jena two years later. Until today, I regard this coincidence as one of the greatest in my life. I received the privilege and honor to cooperate with Professor Audretsch and his team, and my knowledge about entrepreneurship advanced tremendously. Thanks to David Audretsch and his brilliant global network of experts in the field we have had a very inspiring and successful time; because of his excellent leadership skills and his creative and entrepreneurial mindset, we learned to think out of the box and to act as innovatively as possible. This period has certainly inspired me to believe in the professional school project, which has boldly been launched by Professor Dietmar Herz. The MPP, taught entirely in English, places students in a unique international and intercultural environment. Around 120 young people from more than 50 countries studied at the school in 2015, for example. Such a diverse setting offers the opportunity to experience and address the challenges and peculiarities of globalization at a comparatively small German university. Over the course of two years, students are given the opportunity to specialize in European public policy, international affairs, public and non-profit management, international political economy, or conflict studies and management.¹ The specialization on European public policy seemed obvious for the

¹ See www.brandtschool.de for more information.

founding members due to the setting of the Brandt School in one of the former East German states (Thuringia), the school's proximity to Central and East Europe (CEE) states, the high demand for education by young people from former socialist and communist countries, and the strong ties that still existed between the university and partners from those regions. Furthermore, the experience of living and studying in a state that finds itself in transition in economic, administrative, bureaucratic, social, and democratic terms, seemed highly attractive for applied learning and teaching. Next to students from CEE, students from fragile, emerging, and developing countries enrolled in the Brandt School. As a consequence, the program was complemented by a specialization in conflict management, incorporating theories and practical issues of transition, but also peace keeping. The aim of the program was and is to prepare students with international backgrounds to take on governmental and administrative leadership roles, as well as positions within non-government organizations in their respective home countries.

Furthermore, the Brandt School has developed a research profile over the past few years. In addition to addressing issues of good governance, the school's strategic and analytical expertise in conflict management in so-called fragile states has contributed to a remarkable reputation among decision makers in the realms of politics and administration. Moreover, the research area of entrepreneurship has flourished steadily. No longer merely defined by its significance for economic development, the study of entrepreneurship has also been acknowledged for acquiring practical and methodological competencies necessary for the promotion of transformative, progressive processes within public administrations and other organizations. Entrepreneurial, innovative, creative, and independent thinking and acting has become increasingly important for professionals in an innovation and knowledge society (Grimm 2009; Audretsch 2007; Karlsson et al. 2016). New forms of governance demand high social skills and the development of social capital to professionally and successfully act in polycentric systems (Ostrom 2005). As such, the focus on entrepreneurship in a public policy program – both in terms of teaching and research – has been a logical consequence for meeting high standards in education.

Transferring Entrepreneurship Education into a Public Policy Program

With the majority of students coming from countries of the Global South, the traditional approach in teaching public bureaucrats turned out to have severe limitations in the context of accelerated globalization. The concepts, methods, and tools in policy making known and applied in the Western hemisphere turned out to have shortcomings when transferred to developing or fragile contexts. The Independent Commission on International Development Issues chaired by Willy Brandt in 1980 pinpointed to the limitations of just transferring large-scale resources from North to

South, because only a restructuring of the global economy will allow developing countries to facilitate and walk own ways of economic and further development. “The courage to act” (Quilligan 2002, p. 62) is one of the main themes of the Brandt Report; and taking action is by definition linked to entrepreneurship. “The best way to predict the future is to create it”. This quote by Willy Brandt, the former German chancellor and Nobel peace prize laureate, along with his global perspectives in solving complex issues, became the leading theme of the Brandt School named after him. The vision was to create the future by developing, implementing, and assessing innovative policies rather than transferring policies without prior efforts in lesson learning and geographic, cultural, or political contextualization (Rose 1993). How can the future be created? How can local, national, and global problems be analyzed, addressed and solved? How can decision makers in policy making and politics be trained and supported in reaching goals while sticking to Willy Brandt’s vision? (Grimm 2019b).

Public policy tries to examine and answer these questions with the goal to consult and inform governments and political decision makers using scientific insights, and to help formulate a decision that is ideally suited to the needs of all interest groups involved. An academic discipline striving to master this challenge and develop consensus must inevitably build bridges between politics, administration, citizens, social groups, and science (Lasswell 1951, 1956; Ostrom 2005).

In the context of a public policy making, entrepreneurship serves as a driving force for a better quality and delivery of public goods and services, social change, and development. The policy entrepreneur is a type of actor who not only develops ideas for solutions to political and social challenges, but also designs measures and instruments for implementing and promoting change (Grimm 2010). The complexity and extent of political action taken by decision makers, as well as the demands they face, have increased drastically due to globalization and digitalization over the past two decades. This also explains the rapid emergence of new academic courses in public policy and governance and the incorporation of a specialization in entrepreneurship.

In the early years, the Brandt School focused on research and teaching in the context of entrepreneurship in a rather narrow, economic sense, and largely examined the role of entrepreneurship and start-up activity for regional growth, specifically concentrating on the transformation processes in the new German states (Grimm 2006; Audretsch et al. 2009). Due to the aforementioned reasons, entrepreneurship education was adapted in various ways to fit into a public policy program that aims to educate future professionals in the public and non-profit sector.

Entrepreneurship Education

Valerio et al. (2014) provide an overview about entrepreneurship education and training (EET) worldwide, therefore, only major characteristics will be highlighted in the following, with reference to the case presented in the paper. Although

entrepreneurship education became a pillar of business and management studies, there is an ongoing debate whether entrepreneurship can be learned, and which content and aspects should be taught (Lackeus 2015; Pittaway and Cope 2007). Traditionally, EET aimed at preparing future entrepreneurs to develop a new business idea or product and to exploit it in an entrepreneurial and profitable way. Akola and Heinonen (2006) underline that business and management skills which are, among others, regarded as the ‘science’ of entrepreneurship that can be learned. In this context, tools, such as writing a business plan or business canvas, are applied. Other entrepreneurial skills and competences are regarded as the ‘art’ of entrepreneurship and as difficult to be learned, including creative and innovative thinking, but also soft skills, such as negotiation, resilience, risk propensity, leadership, persistence, and ways of facing critical stages of development (Fayolle and Gailly 2015; World Bank 2010; Rauch and Frese 2007). The World Bank defines EET as an “(...) academic education or formal training interventions that share the broad objective of providing individuals with the entrepreneurial mindsets and skills to support participation and performance in a range of entrepreneurial activities” (Valerio et al. 2014, p. 21). Fayolle’s definition of EET is similar and also useful for further analysis in context of policy entrepreneurship: “(...) any (short or long term) pedagogical program or process of education for entrepreneurial attitudes and skills which involves developing certain personal qualities” (Fayolle et al. 2006, p. 702). Erkkilä (2000) has proposed a unitizing term for defining EET that incorporates business and entrepreneurship education.

Lackeus (2015) developed and applied three categories of EET that are useful for a better understanding on how to teach policy entrepreneurship: education for, about and through entrepreneurship. Whereas the first category highlights a very practical understanding and learning, the second category includes theoretical aspects and awareness education, and the third category goes beyond both other aspects by reflecting on entrepreneurial values and skills, problem-solving, conflict management, communication etc. and is, therefore, also important for the education of future policy entrepreneurs. By turning to practical and real-life experiences, including role plays, participation in business idea competitions, and interaction with real world practitioners, the processes and challenges of entrepreneurial activity, as well as a capability for overcoming obstacles and reaching high goals, can be taught, and the entrepreneurial mindset of the participants will be strengthened (Ramirez-Gonzalez 2017, p. 18). This form of entrepreneurship education is, therefore, most important for the education of policy entrepreneurs.

Teaching Policy Entrepreneurship

The role of entrepreneurship for policy making is not evident at first glance, but when reconsidering the shift from traditional public administration to new public management (NPM) reforms that evolved into new forms of governance, the role of entrepreneurship within a public sector context appears to have evolved slowly.

With their path seminal volume on re-inventing government, Osborne and Gaebler (1993) offered a variety of ideas on how to make bureaucracies more entrepreneurial without following the ideas of the NPM or the new steering model. Entrepreneurship is rather seen as an attitude and mindset promoting action to make bureaucracies more efficient, innovative, and attractive. Policy entrepreneurs are crucial to paving new paths for designing and implementing public policy. Examples and ideas from good practice approaches are integrated in lectures while drawing on experiences of diverse countries and places. Teaching public policy in a globalized world means to consider and carefully weigh to what context and in what way policies can and should be transferred across contexts. Future policy makers need competences to draw lessons, understand context, align bottom up and top down approaches, communicate professionally, build up trust, and engage with an entrepreneurial attitude, rather than to apply a one size fits all approach (Rose 1993).

Teaching Social Entrepreneurship

The Brandt School has been offering courses on social entrepreneurship since 2014. The approach has been a mix of theory and practice. The application-oriented part includes developing a social business idea, working with a business canvas, collaborating with practitioners and successful entrepreneurs, receiving support and advice from local start-up public and non-profit consultancies, and participating in competitions. These are all elements of a public policy program today that aim to enhance entrepreneurial skills. The success of this teaching approach has been impressive after a short time of application; several teams won start-up and business idea competitions at the local level and turned them into valuable social business ideas.

In this context, the Commitment Award Ceremony is a format specifically developed by the Brandt School to promote creative social ideas and turn knowledge into practice. The *Engagementpreis* Foundation has been sponsoring the Commitment Award at the Brandt School since 2012. It seeks to give students the opportunity to apply what they have learned at the Brandt School and to initiate new social initiatives in Erfurt and around the world. A jury of experts carefully evaluates the applications while considering the following questions: How charitable is the project? How much potential and sustainability is incorporated into the project? Will the prize money be used responsibly and effectively? Is the project likely to be actualized?

The successful cases highlighted above demonstrate that entrepreneurship capital defined as a type of social capital is conducive to entrepreneurship and that “diversity enhances entrepreneurship capital by injecting heterogeneity in both thinking and backgrounds into a place, which has been shown to fuel entrepreneurship” (Audretsch 2017, p. 9). This statement by David Audretsch materialized especially in context of the Brandt School, whose profile is coined by the diversity, heterogeneity, and entrepreneurial spirit of the student body. The examples further

show that (social) innovations emerge if creative people interact in a certain, supportive, open-minded context.

These are just a few examples that show that the transfer of ideas and knowledge plays an important role in the MPP curriculum. Willy Brandt himself put emphasis on the transfer of expertise and knowledge to bring about political and social change which is reflected by his social and political reform steps and policies that made his leadership unique in Germany's post war period. He believed that policies need a clear objective and focus and a strong will to be realized and put into practice; if policy makers do not have a specific goal and vision in mind when creating policies, there will be no effective policy outcome.

Conclusion and Outlook

This paper focuses on the role and importance of entrepreneurship as an important asset and feature of the Willy Brandt School's public policy program and curriculum at the University of Erfurt in Germany which is selected as a case study. In a knowledge-based society, entrepreneurial, innovative, creative, and independent thinking and action are crucial for the sustainable development, effectiveness, and efficiency not only of private, but also public and non-profit organizations. Future professionals in public administrations and governments need entrepreneurial, personal, organizational, and social skills to solve complex and multifaceted problems. Therefore, the integration of theories, methods and good practice cases in teaching economic, policy, and social entrepreneurship have become of major importance for a public policy program that started in a traditional manner.

The case study incorporates a reconsideration of the meaning and increasing importance of policy entrepreneurs for professional policy making in the context of local-global challenges. It can be assumed that the role of policy entrepreneurship will increase. The policy entrepreneur tends to operate at the intersection of the three classical sectors and takes action in areas where the government, private, and non-profit sectors are not yet active or effective. Due to financial limitations of state and municipal budgets, but also government failure, for example, in the areas of protecting global common goods or human rights, the engagement of policy entrepreneurs will rise. In this context, policy entrepreneurs can uphold an important role, since they create a balance between state and social-entrepreneurial action and make an important contribution to social change. The clear accentuation and support of transparent and effective social entrepreneurial projects could enable policy entrepreneurs to build a bridge across politics and society and serve as an important driver, but also control element, in the policy process. The potentials of policy, but also social entrepreneurs, lie in experimenting, developing, and implementing creative and innovative ideas and solutions for overcoming social (and also political) challenges, which is why he or she works as a provider of ideas to the government. Neither governments nor politicians have room for experiments; both can, however, benefit from the creativity and innovativeness of policy entrepreneurs. Additionally,

both have an interest in identifying efficient, sustainable solutions for social challenges. In this regard, the policy entrepreneur has the potential to serve as an important mediator and communicator promoting and impacting change sustainably.

References

- Akola, E., & Heinonen, J. (2006). How to support learning of entrepreneurs. A study of training programmes for entrepreneurs in five European countries. Paper presented at the RENT XX Conference, Research in Entrepreneurship and Small Business.
- Audretsch, D. B. (2007). *The entrepreneurial society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Audretsch, D. B. (2015). *Everything in its place. Entrepreneurship and the strategic management of cities, regions, and states*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Audretsch, D. B. (2017). Entrepreneurship and universities. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 31(1), 4–11.
- Audretsch, D. B., & Belitski, M. J. (2016). Entrepreneurial ecosystems in cities: establishing the framework conditions. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 41, 1–22.
- Audretsch, D. B., Grimm, H. M., & Wessner, C. (2005a). *Local heroes in the global village. Globalization and the new entrepreneurship policies*. New York: Springer.
- Audretsch, D. B., Keilbach, M., & Lehmann, E. (2005b). *Entrepreneurship and economic growth*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Audretsch, D. B., Grimm, H., & Schuetze, S. (2009). Local strategies within a European policy framework. *European Planning Studies*, 17(3), 463–486.
- Audretsch, D. B., Kuratko, D. F., & Link, A. N. (2015). Making sense of the elusive paradigm of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 45, 703–712.
- Bernie, L., & Hafsi, T. (2007). The changing nature of public entrepreneurship. *Public Administration Review*, 67, 488–503.
- Birch, D. L. (1981). Who creates jobs? *The Public Interest*, 65, 3–14.
- Cohen, B. (2006). Sustainable valley entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 15(1), 1–14.
- Dees, J. G. (2001). *The meaning of “social entrepreneurship”*. Durham: Centre for Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship (CASE), Fuqua School of Business, Duke University.
- Drucker, P. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship. Practice and principles*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Emerson, J., & Twersky, F. (1996). *New social entrepreneurs: The success, challenge and lessons of non-profit enterprise creation*. San Francisco: The Roberts Foundation, Homeless Economic Development Fund.
- Erkkilä, K. (2000). *Entrepreneurial education: Mapping the debates in the United States, the United Kingdom and Finland*. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis.
- Fayolle, A., & Gailly, B. (2015). The impact of entrepreneurship education in entrepreneurial attitudes and intention: Hysteresis and persistence. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(1), 75–93.
- Fayolle, A., Gailly, B., & Lassas-Clerc, N. (2006). Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes: A new methodology. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(9), 701–720.
- Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM). (2017). Global Report 2016/117. Global Entrepreneurship Research Association (GERA), Babson Park: Babson College.
- Grimm, H. (2006). Do public information and subsidies contribute to the entrepreneurial environment? An exploratory transatlantic study with local-global perspectives. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 39(13), 1167–1193.

- Grimm, H. (2009). Creating an entrepreneurial economy: The role of public policy. In D. B. Audretsch & R. Strom (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship, growth, and public policy* (pp. 299–318). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grimm, H. (2010). Entrepreneur – Social Entrepreneur – Policy Entrepreneur. Typologische Merkmale und Perspektiven. *Zeitschrift für Politikberatung*, 3(3–4), 441–456.
- Grimm (2019a). Chapter 7: Public and policy entrepreneurship research: A synthesis of the literature and future perspectives. In D.B. Audretsch, E. Lehmann and A. Link. A research agenda for entrepreneurship and innovation. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Grimm. (2019b). *Public policy research in the global south. Public policy research in the global south. A cross-country perspective* (Vol. 1). Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature.
- Harbrecht, A. (2010). *Social Entrepreneurship – Gewinn ist Mittel, nicht Zweck. Eine Untersuchung über Entstehung, Erscheinungsweisen und Umsetzung*. Karlsruhe: Karlsruher Institut für Technologie.
- Hynes, B. (1996). Entrepreneurship education and training – Introducing entrepreneurship in non-business disciplines. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 20(8), 10–17.
- Karlsson, C., Silander, C., & Silander, D. (2016). *Political entrepreneurship. Regional growth and entrepreneurial diversity in Sweden*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Kingdon, J. W. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2nd ed.). Boston: Little, Brown & Company.
- Koltai, S., & Muspratt, M. (2017). *Peace through entrepreneurship: Investing in startup culture for security and development*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press.
- Lackeus, M. (2015). *Entrepreneurship in education. What, why, when, how. Entrepreneurship360. Background Paper*. Paris: OECD.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1951). The policy orientation. In D. Lerner & H. D. Lasswell (Eds.), *The policy sciences* (pp. 3–15). Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1956). *The decision process: Seven categories of functional analysis*. College Park: University of Maryland Press.
- Link, A. N., & Link, J. R. (2007). *Government as entrepreneur*. New York: Oxford Press.
- Mintrom, M., & Norman, P. (2009). Policy entrepreneurship and policy change. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(4), 649–667.
- Mwasalwiba, E. S. (2010). Entrepreneurship education: A review of its objectives, teaching methods, and impact indicators. *Education + Training*, 52(1), 20–47.
- Nicholls, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Social entrepreneurship: New paradigms of sustainable social change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Connor, A., Stam, E., Sussan, F., & Audretsch, D. (2018). Entrepreneurial ecosystems: The foundations of place-based renewal. In A. O'Connor, E. Stam, F. Sussan, & D. B. Audretsch (Eds.), *Entrepreneurial ecosystems. Place-based transformations and transitions* (pp. 1–22). New York: Springer.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1993). *Reinventing government. How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Ostrom, E. (2005). Unlocking public entrepreneurship and public economies. Working Paper DP2005/01, World Institute for Development Economic Research (UNU-WIDER).
- Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). Entrepreneurship education: A systematic review of the evidence. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(5), 479–510.
- Quilligan, J. B. (2002). *The Brandt equation. Century blueprint for the new global economy*. Philadelphia: Brandt 21 Forum.
- Ramirez-Gonzalez, F. L. (2017). Entrepreneurship education and the promotion of small business. The case of Pilar, Paraguay. Master Thesis Submitted to the Willy Brandt School of Public Policy, University of Erfurt.
- Rauch, A., & Frese, M. (2007). Let's put the person back into entrepreneurship research: A meta-analysis on the relationship between business owners' personality traits, business creation and success. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16(4), 353–385.
- Roberts, N., & King, P. J. (1996). *Transforming public policy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Roberts, N., & King, P. J. (1998). Policy entrepreneurs: Their activity structure and function in the policy process. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 1, 147–175.
- Rose, R. (1993). *Lesson drawing in public policy: A guide to learning across time and space*. Chatham: Chatham House.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (2008). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle* (16th ed.). New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers. 1934.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226.
- Silander, D. (2016). The political entrepreneur. In C. Karlsson, C. Silander, & D. Silander (Eds.), *Political entrepreneurship. Regional growth and entrepreneurial diversity in Sweden* (pp. 7–20). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Valerio, A., Parton, B., & Robb, A. (2014). *Entrepreneurship education and training programs around the world: Dimensions for success. Directions in development-human development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Volkman, C. K., & Audretsch, D. B. (2017). *Entrepreneurship education at universities – Learning from twenty European cases*. Berlin: Springer.
- World Bank. (2010). *Stepping up skills: For more jobs and higher productivity*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.