

The **Entrepreneurial** **Shift**

Americanization in
European High-Technology
Management Education



**Robert R. Locke
and Katja Schöne**

CAMBRIDGE



The Entrepreneurial Shift

Americanization in European
High-Technology Management
Education

ROBERT R. LOCKE AND KATJA E. SCHÖNE



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK

40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Robert R. Locke and Katja E. Schöne 2004

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2004

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Sabon 10/13 pt. *System* L^AT_EX 2_ε [TB]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 521 84010 4 hardback

Acknowledgements

Nobody writes a book without assistance. Since this book is co-authored and each author had at times slightly different agendas, especially in the research phase, the lists of acknowledgements differ.

Robert Locke would like to thank the people in the School of Management, The Queens University, Belfast, for their generous support when the project began in 1999. He wishes especially to thank C. Anne Davies, former Head of the Queen's School of Management, and Professor Paul Jeffcutt for having made an Honorary Visiting Professorship there possible and, during the tenure of the professorship, for funding numerous research and lecturing trips in Europe plus a six-week research stay in Silicon Valley, May–June 2000. Dr. Davies and Mark Braly, of the US Department of Defense, not only participated in many of the interview sessions in Silicon Valley but also arranged for some of them to take place. Robert is very grateful. He would also like to thank people in the Department of Business Economics in the State University, Groningen (the Netherlands), and especially among them Luchien Karsten, for permitting him on numerous visits to use their lecture halls and seminars as a resource for his work. Special thanks are due too to the staff in the French Consulate in San Francisco, for organizing a session with Braly regarding French people in Silicon Valley.

Katja Schöne would like to thank the Stiftung der Deutschen Wirtschaft for its financial support and Alain Fayolle, Joseph Orlinski and people in the ESC Lille for their help in preparing the interviews in France. Both authors, moreover, send special thanks to the interviewees in France, Germany, the Czech Republic and California, for consenting to be interviewed. The book depends so much on their generous cooperation.

Several people have contributed to the actual preparation of the book. Peter J. van Baalen, of Rotterdam University, read an early draft of the manuscript, which was improved subsequently in the light of

his insightful comments. Vanessa Karam has proof-read the work with her usual sharp-eyed acumen. Katy Plowright, our editor, has not only shepherded the book through the acceptance and production process but has added constructively to its organization, thought content and style. We are grateful to all.

The authors also wish to acknowledge the support from family and friends that is so necessary to the fulfillment of a project. Robert Locke thanks Anja, Ivonka, Regina, Luba and Helene for housing him during the writing phase. Katja Schöne thanks her parents, and Sissi and Ulrich, for moral support, and Vera Locke, Robert's wife, for her loving understanding. Robert seconds this sentiment and adds much thanks to Vera for the time she granted him to work on the book. Her love and help, and that of Katja's parents, explain the book's dedication.

Finally, the authors would like to thank each other in this statement of appreciation. They have reached across the generation divide and bridged it in the most rewarding fashion. Neither thought at the beginning of the collaboration that it would be so rewarding personally. It was everything that – and even more than – an intellectual, co-venture should be.

“It was astonishing (and this is not too strong a word), our intellectual journey together, and we are grateful to each other for the intensity of the conversations and the joy of them as we worked our way through the intellectual problems the study presented. We both share equally in the good or bad of what we have done.”

ROBERT LOCKE

Görlitz, Germany, and Honolulu, Hawaii

KATJA SCHÖNE

Dresden, Germany

Abbreviations

AIE	Association of Innovative Entrepreneurship
ANVAR	Agence Nationale de Valorisation de la Recherche
ARP	Agentura pro Rozvoj Podnikání (business development agency)
ARPA	Advanced Research Projects Agency
Bac	Baccalauréat
BBA	Bachelor of Business Administration
BIC	Business innovation center
BMBF	Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (Federal Ministry for Education and Research)
BMWI	Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Innovation (Federal Ministry for Economics and Innovation)
BWL	Betriebswirtschaftslehre (business economics) – an academic discipline
CEO	Chief executive officer
CERAM	Centre d'Enseignement et de Recherche Appliquée au Management
CIBER	Center for International Business Education and Research
CIDEGEF	Conférence Internationale des Dirigeants des institutions d'Enseignement supérieur et de recherche de Gestion d'Expression Française
CNRS	Centre National de Recherche Scientifique
CREGE	Centre de Recherche Economique et de Gestion d'Entreprise
DEA	Diplôme d'Etudes Appliquées
DESS	Diplôme d'Etudes Supérieures Spécialisées
DEUG	Diplôme d'Etudes Universitaires Générales
DFG	Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Association)
Doc. Ing.	Doctor Ingenieur

DOD	Department of Defense
EBS	European Business School
EC	Ecole Centrale – a premier French engineering school
ECD	Ecole du Commerce et de la Distribution
EDP	Electronic data processing
EEC	European Economic Community
EM	Ecole de management
ENA	Ecole Nationale d'Administration
ENSAIT	Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Arts et Industries Textiles
ENST	Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Télécommunications
EOE	Experimentally organized economy
ESC	Ecole supérieure de commerce – the generic term for French schools of commerce
ESCP-EAP	Ecole Supérieure de Commerce de Paris-Ecole d'Administration de Paris – a premier French ESC
ESISAR	Ecole Supérieure d'Ingénieurs en Systèmes industriels Avancés Rhône-Alpes
ESMA	Escuela Superior de Marketing
ESSEC	Ecole supérieure des sciences économiques et commerciales – a premier French ESC
FH	Fachhochschule – a sub-university school
FHT	Fachhochschule für Technik
FNEGE	Fondation Nationale d'Education de Gestion d'Entreprises
GIP	Groupement d'intérêt public
HBS	Harvard Business School
HEC	Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales – a premier French ESC
HHL	Handelshochschule Leipzig
HRD	Human resource development
HU	Humboldt Universität
IAE	Institut d'administration d'entreprises
IMT	Innovation management techniques
INSA	Institut National des Sciences Appliquées
INPG	Institut National Polytechnique de Grenoble
INPL	Institut National Polytechnique de Lorraine
INSERM	Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale
IPO	Initial public offering
IR	Information revolution
IT	Information technology

IU	International university
IUT	Institut universitaire de technologie
LMU	Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (Munich)
MBA	Master of Business Administration
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
MOT	Management of technology
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NPVD	New product and venture development (Sloan School of Management)
NYU	New York University
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OR	Operations research
PARC	Palo Alto Research Center
PEI	Program of Entrepreneurship and Innovation (University of Washington)
PIMENT	Programme d'Initiation au Management de l'Entreprise
RAIC	Regional Advisory and Information Center
R&D	Research and development
RWTH	Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule
SAIC	Services d'Activités Industrielles et Commerciales
SARL	Société A Responsabilité Limitée (limited company)
SNCF	Société Nationale des Chemins de Fer
SME	Small and medium-sized enterprise
SPD	Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands
STPA	Science and Technology Parks Association
TGZ	Technologie- und Gründerzentren
TH	Technische Hochschule
TQM	Total quality management
TU	Technische Universität
UCLA	University of California, Los Angeles
UGH	Universität Gesamthochschule
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UTC	Université de Technologie Compiègne
VC	Venture capital
WHU	Wissenschaftliche Hochschule für Unternehmensführung
WZL	Werkzeugmaschinealabor
YEO	Young Entrepreneurs' Organization

Contents

<i>List of illustrations</i>	<i>page</i> viii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xi
Introduction	1
1 Phenomenal Silicon Valley and the second Americanization	16
2 American management education: adding the entrepreneurial dimension	51
3 Adjusting higher education in France and Germany to a post-1945 world	82
4 Creating German and French entrepreneurship studies	108
5 Networking for high-tech start-ups in Germany and France	144
6 The Czech Republic: an arrested development	183
7 Conclusions and policy recommendations	212
<i>References</i>	225
<i>Index</i>	241

Illustrations

Figures

3.1	German commercial and engineering education before 1940	page 88
3.2	French commercial and engineering education before 1940	89

Tables

1.1	Attributes of the classic enterprise and the new flexible model	38
2.1	Small business management entrepreneurship courses in the United States	62
2.2	Entrepreneurship courses in the United States, 1999	64
2.3	MIT enrollment in entrepreneurship	69
2.4	The development of topical areas in entrepreneurship research	71
3.1	University degrees in economics and management in France	96
4.1	List of interviewees in Germany	117
4.2	List of interviewees in France	118
4.3	Interview questionnaire for Germany and France	120
4.4	Interdisciplinarity in German entrepreneurship academia	124
5.1	Ranking of German universities in terms of entrepreneurship programs and networking activities	148
5.2	Results of EXIST	181
6.1	List of interviewees in the Czech Republic	185
6.2	Interview questionnaire for the Czech Republic	186
6.3	Business schools in the Czech Republic and their affiliations	192
6.4	Support of high-tech start-ups in the Czech Republic	210

Introduction

IN this introduction we wish to do three things: first, to discuss the subject and its importance; second, to look at how we, as historians, approach “Americanization”; and, finally, to sketch out our scheme of presentation.

The subject

This book investigates the impact of the information revolution on the form and content of management education, first in the United States of America, where IR initially flourished, and then in Europe, to where it – in varying different degrees – spread. We call the educational innovation “the entrepreneurial shift.”

The importance of the shift

In order to mark the significance of this shift, we seize on Friedrich Nietzsche’s mythopoetic vision of Dionysus and Apollo because their conflicting attributes sum up, in a powerful and timeless metaphor, the states of human consciousness that produced the striking transformation the book describes. In his study of *Young Nietzsche*, Carl Pletsch observed that, for Nietzsche, the Apollonian “is the principle of clearly delineated images, permanence, optimism, individuation, and rationality. It is striving for clarity.” This is the ethos of classical American corporate management. On the other hand, for Nietzsche, the Dionysian expresses “the principle of flux, impermanence, suffering, and pessimism . . . an irrational force, impulsive, wild, and instinctive.” This is the creative power behind entrepreneurialism. On a philosophic plain, while Nietzsche “affiliates Schopenhauer’s concept of the ‘idea’ or ‘representation’ with Apollo, he associates Dionysus with the ‘will.’” Accordingly, whereas the Apollonian vision is timeless and “responsible for the constant formulation and reformulation

of the forms of knowledge and rationality that order our everyday life, [thereby] concealing the underlying Dionysian reality from ourselves," the Dionysian urge, which is "momentary, exceptional, and counter-intuitive," is "dangerous to any structure of reality." It contains "the death wish and every other destructive instinct as well as the life instinct. It is the maelstrom of every impulse caught in the flux of time." It characterizes precisely the creative/destructive behavior of the great entrepreneur. For this reason, for us as well as for Nietzsche, "the Dionysian is the more profound of the two modes; it can only be ignored at the price of cultural sterility and ultimately [economic] extinction."¹

Such mythopoeticisms might seem far removed from corporate boardrooms, but they are not. Professor Gunnar Eliasson, of Stockholm's Royal Institute of Technology, although using economic phraseology, conjured up the same imagery of contrast when contemplating recent management change. He concluded from longitudinal surveys of management opinion in the changed economic environment of the late twentieth century that inherited systems of management behavior could no longer govern creatively. When he interviewed managers in fifty US and European firms between 1965 and 1975, he concluded that the predominant characteristics of management behavior for them were "short-term and long-range *planning* and a strong belief in repetitive environments, forecasting and centralized leadership of standardized production (Eliasson, 1976)." But when he interviewed managers in fifty firms between 1985 and 1995, fifteen of which were IT start-ups, he discovered that "out had gone reliance on detached analytical thinking in executive quarters, in had come experimental behavior . . . the distinction between uncertainty and risk." Eliasson called this second environment that of the "experimentally organized economy." It is experimental because entrepreneurs with several possible options never "know them all; even though they have stumbled upon the absolute best solution, they will never know it because the knowledge base is always insufficient. The business manager will never feel safe, and will have to recognize in his management practice the possibility of coming out as a loser." In this EOE, failure need not be attributed to managerial ineptitude, as it would in a "full information economy," but can come from unavoidable risk. Failure consequently has to be considered

¹ All quotes about Nietzsche are from Pletsch (1991), pp. 131–32.

a normal business experience – one from which entrepreneurs learn, as in any experiment (Eliasson, 1997).

In the EOE, then, management behavior has changed from that encountered by Eliasson in firms during his first interviews. Managers not only move from a “full information economy” to one of information “uncertainty,” but the kind of knowledge used in entrepreneurial decisions is obtained differently. In the “full information economy,” it is gained formally; in the EOE, it is more tacitly acquired skills and innate ability that count. Apollonian management in older firms might learn new methods of governance over time and become intrapreneurial but they would not be leaders in bringing change about. That would require Dionysian “will.”

The great events that transformed the American economy in the information revolution of the late twentieth century were brought about primarily by entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs in the Dionysian mode. They sparked the imagination of those who had lived under the control of the corporate managerial hierarchies after World War II, and the management schools that had trained them to be managerial Apollos, to create an education appropriate to the entrepreneurship of the “information age.” They strove, therefore, to include the entrepreneurial dimension in management education. This book examines this educational event, and covers the emergence of “entrepreneurship” in American management education and its subsequent impact on such education in three European countries in the high-tech era.

The book's scope

In the title we use the word “European.” It is, of course, an exaggeration to equate Europe with France, Germany and the Czech Republic, but we think it is a permissible one. France and Germany, two major European economies, with significant and influential management education establishments, occupy a large enough place on the continent to make their combined educational experiences “European.” France, moreover, represents Latin Europe, where its influence has particularly radiated, while Germany has traditionally exercised influence in Central, Northern and Eastern Europe. The Czech Republic's inclusion cannot, of course, be justified on similar grounds. But, we thought, to be European the book had to take into account the “New Europe” after 1990. We could not broaden the scope of the study to include

large numbers of countries. The research complexities evoked by linguistic, social and economic diversity in Eastern Europe made this too arduous a research task. Nor did we wish to include formerly peasant-based countries that would have shown little interest in phenomenal Silicon Valley and the American high-tech entrepreneurship that so much caught the attention of Western Europeans. We wanted to see how a mature industrial country that had been cut off from the United States and Western Europe since World War II had been able to absorb the whole range of American ideas about management education, including the latest ones on entrepreneurship studies. Within the previous Communist bloc, the Czech Republic stood out. It has been technically, industrially and educationally the most advanced of these countries for centuries and, therefore, offered the most fertile soil for an investigation. In different ways, then, these three country histories illustrate the changing practices of greater Europe in entrepreneurial education.

“Americanization”

Since it is the study's focus, something at the outset also needs to be said about US influence, or “Americanization.” It is not so much an historical phenomenon as a nomenclature that historians and others have applied to the developments in Europe that have been greatly affected by events in the United States. Specifically, in the case at hand, American events are seen to have greatly influenced management and management education in Europe. Such American influence has a long history. It began before World War I, when the “scientific management” movement caught Europe's attention. Its chief exponent, the American engineer Frederick Winslow Taylor, visited and was feted in Europe; Taylorism became familiar to Europe's industrial managers and engineers. There was nothing, despite the terminology, particularly “scientific” about Taylor's methods and aims; nor was there anything exclusively American about them. France had its pioneer in scientific management in Henry Fayol, Germany in Professor Georg Schlesinger of the Technical University at Charlottenburg. But scientific management or Taylorism came to represent a certain rationalization of production particularly espoused in America, which permitted the professional manager to replace the skilled worker as the arbitrator of shop-floor procedure: standardization of work through the

implementation of time and motion studies, control through budgeting and standard costing, etc.

Taylorism continued to influence European management after World War I. To it was added the rationalized mass production methods made famous at Henry Ford's new River Rouge plant. In Germany the word "Fordismus" signified mass production. In addition, certain features of American management education attracted attention in Europe during the 1920s. The index of the Harvard Business School, developed to forecast business cycles, was one, until it failed ignominiously to predict the stock market collapse of 1929. The collections of business cases developed as teaching tools at Harvard Business School were another. In France the Paris Chamber of Commerce created a center in 1932, which housed these Harvard-developed American cases for French consultation. But the collapse of market-driven American managerial capitalism in the Great Depression largely ended American influence in inter-war Europe, where each country turned in the 1930s to protectionism, the nationalization of industries, and corporatism to find a way out of the morass.

"Americanization" at the time was not used to describe collectively the influence of American scientific management, mass production or business schools on pre-war European management. But after World War II people increasingly used the word to cover the multiple and multiplying US influences on European management. The immediate post-war period indeed is the classic age of Americanization, and it has been dealt with extensively in the historical literature.² But Americanization, to use a phrase of Jonathan Zeitlin in the introduction to his work with Gary Herrigel on the subject, always remains a "contested historical project" (Zeitlin, 2000, p. 18). This means that scholars disagree about the content of Americanization, on how much it has influenced management in Europe, where and when. Still, as these scholars also attest, a consensus has emerged about the content of immediate post-war Americanization; it boils down to the spread of US-propagated, multi-divisional, international corporate structures and forms of governance, headed by managerial hierarchies and the managerial philosophies that went with them, and the continued Taylorization of management methods in factories and on the shop floor. This post-war Americanization also embraced a number of educational events that are of direct interest

² See the citations in Zeitlin (2000) for works on the subject.

to this study because they were designed to promote the creation of a management professional class and educate them to their corporate functions. This education included the fostering of a management press (*L'Expansion*, *Der Manager*, etc.) patterned on American business and management periodicals, the development of in-house corporate management training programs following American corporate examples, and the spawning of management schools with programs that leaned heavily on American institutional models.

If the post-war period can be called the classic age of Americanization, it is historically bounded because subsequently the content of Americanization changed. Some feel that this even happened in the era of "Japanization" – i.e. after what Locke has called the collapse, around 1980, of the American management mystique (Locke, 1996). Locke asserts that a Japanese management mystique replaced the American in the 1980s, but Professor Alfred Kieser of Mannheim University contends that this Japanization really amounted to a further expression of management's international Americanization (Kieser, 2002a). He argues, in effect, that because American management academics and consultants led the Japanization movement in America and in Europe, Japanization was an American version of Japan. Kieser makes a good point. Japanese management by its very nature was inward-looking, firm-centered. It, in contrast to management in the United States, had never developed the capacity to proselytize. When corporate Japan expanded dramatically in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, there were no graduate management schools in the country. The only academic business education that existed consisted of a few commercial courses taught by professors who were, like German BWL professors, alienated from praxis, and, unlike the Germans, without a research-driven scientific culture. Since few non-Japanese spoke their tongue, their language also hindered international interaction. American consultants and management academics got the job of spreading knowledge about Japan, then, partially by default but partially, too, by the fact that they had created a powerful teaching and research establishment in the post-war United States. Japan arrived in Europe through an American conduit and what the Americans reported was selective, and often misunderstood or even wrong.

But if Japanization was just another form of Americanization, in this form it not only differed from post-war Americanization but also directly challenged its content. This change in content was described

in books such as Kenney and Florida's *Beyond Mass Production: The Japanese System and its Transfer to the US* and Oliver and Wilkinson's *The Japanization of British Industry*,³ and a host of other works published for American and European audiences.⁴

Still another Americanization, the most recent, arrived with the "information revolution" (c. 1975–2000). There is no need in these preliminary remarks to outline the content shift that this Americanization has brought since it is, with special focus on management education, the subject of the book.⁵ Suffice it to say that this content shift amounted to changing the emphasis in management education from management per se to entrepreneurship – and to add that all these content shifts over the years make the study of Americanization a "contested historical project."

The historians' approach: contested historical project versus neutral analytical category

The investigation of Americanization as a "contested historical project" can be considered, one French management specialist noted, both as an expression of the historians' effort to "give birth to the forgotten past," ("faire naître l'histoire oubliée") and that of the social scientists' to use longitudinal studies in order to understand "the functions of organizations today and tomorrow" ("le fonctionnement des organisations aujourd'hui et demain"; Marmonier and Thiétart, 1988, p. 163). Because of their scientific ambition, most social scientists when they use historical examples are not content to leave them in an historical form. They abstract "neutral analytical concepts" from the historical record, proceeding from the purely historical level to higher levels of abstraction, where they slough off historical specificities and replace them with "neutral analytical concepts" unbound by time and space. Many works of this type exist. We choose one to illustrate this abstraction process, because it deals with a subject matter similar to ours – i.e. competitive advantages developed in the United States in

³ Kenney and Florida (1993) and Oliver and Wilkinson (1992).

⁴ Some examples are Abegglen and Stalk (1985), Fruin (1992), Holland (1989), Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), Taiichi (1988), Ozaki (1992), Kagone et al. (1981) and Aoki (1990).

⁵ See chapter 4 for definitions of Americanization specific to the context of this study.