

# Entrepreneurship: The Ideas of J.A. Schumpeter and R.A. Dahl

Tor Helge Pedersen

Inland University College of Applied Sciences, Lillehammer, Norway

[Tor.Helge.Pedersen@inn.no](mailto:Tor.Helge.Pedersen@inn.no)

**Abstract:** The concepts of public and political entrepreneurship were introduced in relation to public administration in the 1960s. Early examples were constructed in relation to institutional change (Eisenstadt 1964; 1980), the bridging role of the entrepreneur between different spheres in local communities (Barth 1972), and the carrying out of urban redevelopment and social programs in local government (Dahl 1961; Murphy 1971). Although the concepts of entrepreneurship were used later to describe a variety of phenomena (Sheingate 2003), there are few comparisons of the differences and similarities between early contributions on public- and private-sector entrepreneurship. Motivated by few comparisons, this paper compares the contributions of Joseph A. Schumpeter and Robert A. Dahl as early examples by asking the following guiding question: What are the important similarities and differences in their ideas—and what is the relevance of their work today? While Schumpeter is seen as a main figure in the literature on entrepreneurship, Dahl's very early contributions are less well known. Schumpeter treated the entrepreneur and the entrepreneurial function in at least 15 publications, whereas Dahl (1961) used the concept in his case study of power in the Mayor Lee-era of the city of New Haven. The theoretical discussion is based on key publications by Schumpeter (15 publications) and from the New Haven case (4 publications). The discussion and comparison have at least two implications for research and practice. Schumpeter's conception of entrepreneurship was broader than expected and also relevant in studying entrepreneurship in the public sector. Future studies should still explore Schumpeter's ideas in other contexts to enhance our knowledge of what ideas should be developed further. Dahl's conception of political entrepreneurship may inform policy makers and researchers regarding entrepreneurship in a political context, which is not easy. Future case studies and practical efforts should therefore be aware that many contemporary entrepreneurs may only be partially political entrepreneurs compared to those in Dahl's conception.

**Keywords:** public entrepreneurship, private entrepreneurship, Schumpeter, R.A. Dahl, theoretical comparison

---

## 1. Introduction

Over the last 50 years, the concept of entrepreneurship has been used in different ways and in different contexts (Windrum 2008; Klein et al, 2010; Leyden and Link 2015). Schumpeter and Dahl both made early contributions to and formed early conceptions of entrepreneurship, although Schumpeter is more known in the literature on entrepreneurship. Between 1908 and 1949, Schumpeter mentioned or discussed the term in at least 15 publications. Within the public-sector context and public administration, Dahl was early to introduce and use the term "political entrepreneur" in a study of local power, stating, "Although a gifted political entrepreneur might not exist in every political system, whenever he appeared, he would make himself felt" (1961, p. 6). Dahl used the first part (1950s) of the Mayor Lee era in New Haven (1954–1970) as an example of the rise of an entrepreneur who managed to establish a coalition of different community forces, carry out an urban development program, and increase his power through reorganizing and the creation of a new organization. Since Dahl's introduction of the term "political entrepreneur," several have followed his example and used it in their work, though not necessarily directly referring to his contributions (Sheingate 2003). Today, the field of entrepreneurship is diverse, with studies on different types of entrepreneurship, including public-sector entrepreneurship (Klein et al, 2010; Mazzucato 2013; Leyden and Link 2015; Dhliwayo 2017), from various theoretical positions.

This paper takes a historical approach to comparing Schumpeter and Dahl's ideas of entrepreneurship. The objective of the paper is to contribute to the discourse on public- and private-sector entrepreneurship by focusing on these two early scholars. The comparison highlights how entrepreneurship was understood, including conceptions of entrepreneurship, contexts of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial activities, resources of the entrepreneur, drivers of entrepreneurial activities, and the nature of leadership.

Methodologically, this theoretical discussion is based on a selection of key publications by Schumpeter and Dahl on entrepreneurship. Instead of discussing the variety of contributions being published today, this paper limits its attention to two classics within the field of entrepreneurship. Between 1908 and 1949, Schumpeter had at least 15 publications discussing innovation (e.g., 1927, 1935) and/or entrepreneurship (e.g., 1908, p. 351; 1912, pp. 158-9; 1918, pp. 113, 116; 1928b, 1928c). However, some of Schumpeter's publications are more centrally related to the term and theory of entrepreneurship (1912, 1928b, 1928c, 1934, 1939, 1947,

1949), and are therefore concentrated on here. Among different early contributions to the field of public entrepreneurship (Eisenstadt, 1964, 1980; Ostrom 1965; Barth 1972), Dahl's (1961) was selected for this theoretical discussion. Initially connected to community power discourse, Dahl's study came first within public sector entrepreneurship and looked more deeply into the entrepreneurial activities of a political entrepreneur in local government. The redevelopment program and the organizational innovations Mayor Lee set up were innovations (Polsby 1963; Murphy 1971) in terms of novelty, radical change, and economic and social impact—for example, many new local jobs were made available for low-income citizens, and the tax bases were strengthened due to municipal finance programs (Wolfinger 1974, p. 195). Including Dahl (1961) in a comparison with Schumpeter is, on the one hand, part of the originality of this paper. Except for Sheingate (2003), Dahl's important work is not mentioned in the other included literature. On the other hand, this entails less literature on Dahl. In addition to Dahl's study, the present discussion is based on four publications on Mayor Lee—era New Haven (Dahl 1961; Polsby 1963; Murphy 1971; Wolfinger 1974). These studies from the same Yale milieu have been useful in providing additional insights. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: first, Schumpeter's and Dahl's contributions are presented. Then, these contributions are discussed in relation to the different dimensions outlined above.

## **2. Joseph A. Schumpeter**

Schumpeter's idea of entrepreneurship as a crucial factor in economic development was included in his early German writings in both 1908 and 1912. Schumpeter's approach to entrepreneurship has been understood in several ways. On the one hand, it has been understood as a macro-economic concept or macro-level approach to innovation and entrepreneurship (Ruttan 1959), seeing entrepreneurship and innovation from the perspective of the economy (Penrose 1959). This approach can further be understood in terms of the system perspective. Schumpeter uses the term "economic system" when discussing "new combinations" (Schumpeter 1934, p. 68). For example, Fagerberg argues that the notion of "entrepreneurial function" points to a system perspective wherein capitalist society might be seen as a system in which the introduction of new combinations is one among several important functions (2003, p. 131). Through this, he is talking about internal factors of change. Those who perform the entrepreneurial function—that is, carry out innovations—set in motion activities such as introducing new combinations (novelties), which other entrepreneurs follow, and thus upsetting the economic system's equilibrium. For example, "depression is nothing more than the economic system's reaction to the boom" (1934, p. 224).

Moreover, Schumpeter's framework operates on different levels (Dopfer 2012). At the micro-level is the entrepreneur who carries out innovations (entrepreneurial activities) and thus removes obstacles for the other entrepreneurs (1934, p. 229; 1935, p. 6). The meso-level refers to the swarming of entrepreneurs and followers imitating the original innovation: "The appearance of one or few entrepreneurs facilitates the appearance of others" (1934, p. 228). Finally, this leads to changes, or more specifically, economic impacts on certain industries or the economy as a whole from within (macro-level). While the meso-level can be studied as the spread of innovations and the swarming of entrepreneurs, the micro-level can be studied as the initial entrepreneurial activities.

### **Conception of entrepreneurship**

Schumpeter treated entrepreneurship primarily as an economic phenomenon. Three features characterize this entrepreneur and his motivations—he dreamed about building something up, he was competitive, and he had "the will to conquer" (Schumpeter, 1934, p. 93). Finally, Schumpeter discusses "the joy of creating, of getting things done" (1934, p. 93). Schumpeter did not see the desire to make money as a driving force for the entrepreneur (Swedberg 2021).

Schumpeter emphasized the term "entrepreneurial function," which entails making a new combination or carrying out innovations (1939, p. 102). The defining characteristic of the entrepreneur and their function "is simply the doing of new things or the doing of things that are already being done in a new way" (Schumpeter 1947, p. 151). The basic idea of Schumpeter's (1934) theory is that entrepreneurship consists of putting together a new combination (one of the five types of innovation) of already existing elements within the economy: "The new combinations must draw the necessary means of production from some old combinations" (1934, p. 68). He stressed that innovation should be separated from invention, which he saw as economically irrelevant (1934, p. 81). Schumpeter (1942) also said that "the function of entrepreneurs is to

reform or revolutionize the pattern of production” (1942, p. 132). Thus, the entrepreneur innovates in the following five ways (new combinations):

*[...] by exploiting an invention or, more generally, an untried technological possibility for producing a new commodity or producing an old one in a new way, by opening up a new source of supply of materials or a new outlet for products, by reorganizing an industry and so on. (p. 132)*

He mentions examples such as railroad construction, electric-power production, steam and steel, and the motorcar, but also colonial ventures and successful products (p. 132).

Schumpeter saw setting up new firms as a central part of entrepreneurship: “New combinations are, as a rule, embodied, as it were, in new firms which generally do not arise out of the old ones but start producing beside them” (1934, p. 66). He said that the “typical industrial entrepreneur of the nineteenth century was perhaps the man who put into practice a novel method of production by embodying it in a new firm” (1947, p. 154), but he also noted there had been changes (e.g., type of entrepreneur) over the years (1928a, 1939, 1942).

Schumpeter concluded later that every “social environment has its own ways of filling the entrepreneurial function” (1949, p. 52) and that it also “may be and often is filled co-operatively” (1949, p. 53). He described entrepreneurs, such as John Law and the Pereire brothers, who added the function of the banker to the entrepreneurial function, carrying out their respective ventures (1939). He said that in times of great concern, the entrepreneur may be a salaried employee, a manager, the owner of controlling parcels of shares (1939: 103), and sometimes a company promoter (1939, p. 103; 1947, p. 154). Schumpeter remarked that in many cases, “it is difficult or even impossible to name an individual that acts as ‘the entrepreneur’ in a concern” (1949, p. 53). Schumpeter had a broad conception of entrepreneurship, saying, “The entrepreneurial function itself is not confined to capitalist society” (1939, p. 223). He also mentioned examples from socialist societies (1939, pp. 111, 118). Schumpeter identified historical examples of public entrepreneurship (e.g., 1939, pp. 118, 301, 346), such as the public servants in the German states after the Thirty Years’ War (1939, p. 235; 1947, p. 153) who “directly filled the entrepreneurial function, particularly in mining” (1939, p. 235). A later example involves a state department:

*[T]he practice of farmers in this country has been revolutionized again and again by the introduction of methods worked out in the Department of Agriculture and by the Department of Agriculture’s success in teaching these methods. In this case then it was the Department of Agriculture that acted as an entrepreneur. (Schumpeter 1949, pp. 52–3)*

Over time, Schumpeter changed his ideas regarding how entrepreneurship should be studied. For example, he proposed a historical investigation into entrepreneurship in his later publications (1946, 1947, 1949). Schumpeter also concluded that the entrepreneurial function could be performed in several ways. Finally, Schumpeter (1942, p. 132) observed and predicted that the social function of entrepreneurship was losing importance: “innovation itself is being reduced to routine” (1942, p. 132).

### **3. Robert A. Dahl**

Robert A. Dahl was a political scientist particularly connected to topics like democratic theory and community power. In the New Haven study, Dahl (1961) attempted to identify those who governed in New Haven by seeking answers to various formulated questions; he used three broad research strategies. First, he carried out a historical analysis of the transformations of New Haven’s ruling groups. Second, he conducted case analyses of three arenas of policy making—party nominations to public office, urban redevelopment, and public education—based on detailed interviews and participant observations of actual decisions. These cases provide information about the distribution and use of influence. Third, he carried out a cross-sectional analysis of the distribution of resources among New Haven’s citizenry. As Dahl was conducting his field research about the city, Democrat Richard C. Lee had recently defeated New Haven’s previous Republican mayor in the election of 1953. Before Lee took office in 1953, he had lost two races for mayor in 1949 and 1951, but during the latter campaign, the need for urban redevelopment came to his attention. He was aware of federal aid in the Housing Act of 1949 that was part of Truman’s Fair Deal and established the federal urban renewal program (Polsby 1963; Wolfinger 1974). Redevelopment became his positive issue in the 1953 campaign; he emphasized the importance of improving the condition of New Haven and proposed new institutions. The redevelopment program is especially relevant as an example here as an example of entrepreneurship.

### **Conception of entrepreneurship**

When Dahl (1961) introduced the term “political entrepreneur,” he was referring to Machiavelli and *The Prince* rather than Schumpeter. He wrote the following in his introduction of his study, commenting on earlier studies on the topic of community power: “One difficulty with all these explanations was that they left very little room for the politician. He was usually regarded merely as an agent—of majority will, the political parties, interest groups or the elite. He had no independent influence” (Dahl 1961, p. 6). He argued that Machiavelli “stressed the enormous political potential of the cunning, resourceful, masterful leader” (p. 6). He explained: “In this view, majorities, parties, interest groups, elites, even political systems are all to some extent pliable; a leader who knows how to use his resources to the maximum is not so much the agent of others as others are his agents” (p. 6). Dahl’s entrepreneur is an independent actor in the political system.

Dahl’s (1961) political entrepreneur reorganizes and sets up programs and organizations. The first organization or governance organ Mayor Lee set up after much effort was a representative non-partisan commission, the Citizen Action Commission (CAC), in 1954 to identify solutions to address the city’s decline. It had 24 members (in total more than 400 with subcommittees), including leading business and civic personalities, among others (Dahl 1961). Dahl claimed that, “The importance of the CAC in assuring acceptability for the redevelopment program can hardly be overestimated” (p. 133). The CAC “endorsed the proposals of the city administration made the program appear nonpartisan, virtually nullified the effectiveness of partisan attacks” (p. 133). The CAC helped to sell (or speak up on behalf of) the urban redevelopment program and gave the program an aura of having been endorsed by the people (Polsby 1963). Not only did Lee co-opt business leaders in this fashion, but he informally attached the new organization to his command post. The CAC also attracted much positive attention, as well as many had many visitors and followers from other cities, which increased the legitimacy of the program.

In Mayor Lee’s first two years in power, he also reorganized the existing fragmented agencies, departments, and units under a new office—the Office of the Development Administrator. The creation of this office represented the centralization of redevelopment “in the hands of the mayor and his redevelopment team” (Dahl 1961, p. 200). Lee had deep knowledge of the city government and was sensitive to potential obstacles. He established his authority over the organizations that might be obstacles to his purposes. He recruited dedicated people from outside (e.g., Edward Logue) who coordinated the work of all the units and agencies that were involved in redevelopment (p. 121). The development administrator was powerful because of Lee’s commitment to the redevelopment issue (Polsby 1963). The office and four agencies became a bureaucracy operating independently of the city’s traditional agencies (Murphy 1971). The CAC and the new redevelopment apparatus were important in carrying out the redevelopment program. Mayor Lee later oversaw the creation of a public antipoverty organization in 1962 to coordinate and deliver a wide range of new services, many of them delivered in a new way, to the poor. This attracted Ford Foundation and federal funding and became a prototype for the federal Community Action Program (Wolfinger 1974; Murphy 1971). Both the redevelopment program and the later antipoverty program involved the creation of new or better services, and both programs were carried out by coalitions of public, private, and voluntary local and federal actors.

Mayor Lee managed to convert a formally weak mayor’s position into one of strength (Dahl 1961). However, like those who attempted to do so before him, Mayor Lee did not manage to change or revise the form of government in New Haven. He tried in 1954 and 1958 but was defeated by a “tacit coalition” of Democrats and Republicans (Wolfinger 1974). However, his informal methods were more successful—for example, during his period in power, the office of the mayor became increasingly central to the city’s political and governmental life (Murphy 1971). Therefore, Dahl concluded that this mayor changed the local political order. A political order is about a “pattern of influence” (Dahl 1961, 102) and the overall arrangement rather than individual institutions. It refers to an institutionalized and relatively stable distribution of tasks, way of operation, authority, power, and responsibility among institutions and actors. Dahl focused on how the political entrepreneur Mayor Lee changed the political order two times—first, into “a coalition of chieftains” and thereafter into an “executive-centered coalition” (1961, p. 200). Urban development provided the key to more centralized control: “In effect, then, Lee converted support for redevelopment into acquiescence in a new pattern of influence, the executive-centered order” (p. 202). The executive-centered order was legitimized by the need to coordinate decisions on redevelopment.

#### 4. Similarities and differences

This section compares Schumpeter’s and Dahl’s ideas on entrepreneurship. Table 1 highlights keywords in relation to the dimensions introduced in part 1.

**Table 1:** Similarities and differences between Schumpeter and Dahl

	<b>Schumpeter</b>	<b>Dahl</b>
<b>Conception</b>	Economic phenomenon  Create new combinations (innovations) that are carried out	Social/political phenomenon  Carry out changes, impact on context, opportunity identification
<b>Context and entrepreneurial activities</b>	Mostly private sector, but not limited to it  Create/carry out innovation	Local government Broad range of activities, not only carry out innovations
<b>Resources</b>	Existing elements and ideas	Slack, political and financial resources
<b>Drivers</b>	Not demand, the entrepreneur initiates change	Not demand, the entrepreneur initiates change
<b>Leadership</b>	Special type of (change) management	No agent of others or interests, highly independent actor  Special type of (change) management

##### Conception

Schumpeter contrasted the entrepreneur with the manager; he distinguished between “the entrepreneurial and managerial function” (1939, p. 102). Later, he also distinguished between adaptive and creative responses (1947), connecting entrepreneurship to the latter. Schumpeter said that one is an entrepreneur, whatever the type, only when one actually “carries out new combinations” (1934, p. 78; 1939, p. 103). Schumpeter discussed different types of modern entrepreneurship (1928b) in different economic contexts, such as competitive and trustified economies (1928c), as well as cases where the state serves the entrepreneurial function (e.g., 1939, 1949). Entrepreneurial activities and function may be individual, collective, and even split between several individuals, as Schumpeter observed of the railroad industry: “This entrepreneurship was split between several individuals and not always easy to attribute to any single one” (1939, p. 327). Entrepreneurship is dependent on context (1949, p. 52). Therefore, Schumpeter saw entrepreneurship as context dependent—for example, in trustified capitalism, it became “increasingly impersonal and decreasingly [a] matter of leadership and individual initiative” (1928a, p. 385). Dahl built his conception on Machiavelli rather than Schumpeter. In contrast to Schumpeter, who treated the entrepreneur as an economic phenomenon, Dahl’s political entrepreneur is a mixed political and social phenomenon. Schumpeter emphasized the term “entrepreneurial function,” while Dahl focused on the idea of one entrepreneur knowing how to utilize their resources to the maximum and function as an independent leader. As mentioned above, the new redevelopment administration became independent of city politics. As also noted, this was the case with other new organizations, such as the CAC and the antipoverty organization of 1962 (Community Progress Inc.).

##### Contexts of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial activities

Despite several Schumpeter examples from the public sector, in contrast to Dahl, Schumpeter’s entrepreneur is largely related to the economic sphere (economic system). Schumpeter’s entrepreneur disrupts this economic system. Schumpeter’s point of departure is the static economy, where production and consumption are both organized in specific combinations that work relatively well and according to well-known methods (Swedberg 2021). The entrepreneur is the one who breaks up one of the existing combinations and recombines its parts in a new, profitable manner (p. xii).

Dahl’s (1961) entrepreneur is “a disrupter” but is clearly related to the public sector. Dahl also sees in the entrepreneur “an investment banker’s willingness to take risks that held the promise of large-run payoffs” (p. 119). The New Haven case is about an entrepreneurial mayor who carried out changes, as well as set up organs and organizations to carry out new programs with social and economic impact. Lee created a unified and centralized redevelopment administration, carried out programs, set up novel organizations, and changed the political order. When Dahl encountered changes in the political order, he adopted a pluralist and dynamic

view of city politics, assuming that “the political system itself” is not an immutable product “of democratic ideas, belief, and institutions inherited from the past” (p. 325). It can be changed (p. 325).

### **Resources of the entrepreneur**

While Schumpeter discussed combining existing resources in a new way (1934, p. 68), Dahl portrayed a leader who knows how to maximize their resources (slack and political). Mayor Lee drew on the unused resources of his office to create new institutions and involve new groups in his administration (Wolfinger 1974). He managed to convert latent agreement into active support (Dahl 1961, p. 202). Lee had detailed knowledge of the city and its people, gathered local support, and mobilized latent support. Political slack is a condition that the political entrepreneur can exploit. Dahl likely knew that there was a gap between actual and potential citizen influence and that citizens’ “political resources are, so to speak, slack in the system” (p. 305), since “in liberal societies, politics is a sideshow in the great circus of life” (p. 305). In addition to this, he exploited other resources from outside. He attracted funding from outside (Ford Foundation, federal government), and he recruited talented managers (often from outside, who were not bound by local traditions). While Schumpeter’s entrepreneur excels at thinking up new combinations and carrying them out, Dahl’s entrepreneur identifies a positive issue (political opportunity) and seeks to carry it out.

### **Drivers of entrepreneurial activities**

Schumpeter argued that it is usually the producer (entrepreneur) who initiates economic change (1934, p. 65; 1939, p. 73). Some entrepreneurs are more “pioneers” than others, and “those who follow the pioneers are still entrepreneurs, though to a degree that continuously decreases to zero” (1939, p. 414). Redevelopment in New Haven did not come from citizen demand. It was due to an entrepreneurial push (Dahl 1961, p. 115). The entrepreneurial mayor put redevelopment on the agenda and understood that political and administrative support had to be organized, structured, and given specific purpose and direction. Mayor Lee created an executive-centered coalition of three political forces—partisan politicians, the business community (CAC), and bureaucratic departments and agencies. Dahl (1961) said, “It was the need for redevelopment that created the need for an executive-centered order” (p. 200). Mayor Lee came to power by addressing the issue of urban renewal: “The evident need for a high degree of coordination among city agencies if re-development were to be carried out” (p. 310). This increased the position of Development Administrator’s power over redevelopment.

### **Nature of leadership**

Schumpeter saw entrepreneurial leadership as a special case of leadership—entrepreneurial (Schumpeter 1928a, p. 379; 1934, p. 89; 1949, pp. 51–52). Moreover, in New Haven, entrepreneurial leadership was an instrument of organizational and political change (Dahl 1961). Dahl perceived Lee as a “gifted political entrepreneur” (p. 6) and as a mayor with a large repertoire of political skills and an unusual ability to perform a variety of different roles. The redevelopment issue depended upon broadly based community consensus that was systematically built and nurtured by the mayor (Polsby 1963). When there was uncertainty during the first two years, Lee managed with great effort to gather local support for the plans and new organizations/organs. Dahl (1961) thus described the entrepreneur as a change leader and coalition-builder. Dahl (1961) saw Mayor Lee as standing at “the center of intersecting circles” and noted that Lee “could not command, he had to bargain” (p. 204). Lee was able to find areas of agreement and managed to “dampen down potential disagreements” (p. 310). Dahl also discussed the necessary conditions for transformation into an executive-centered political order, such as slack resources, avoiding counter-mobilization (p. 309), and the need for coordination “among city agencies if redevelopment were to be carried out” (p. 310). Dahl (1961) focused most on the political entrepreneur. Mayor Lee carried out organizational changes (within redevelopment), carried out social programs, set up new governance organs, set up new organizations, recruited key personnel, and attracted funding from outside. Both Schumpeter and Dahl saw entrepreneurship as a type of change, initiated by entrepreneurs (not by demand) management that had economic or social impact.

## **5. Conclusion**

### **Concluding remarks and limitations**

In this paper, I have compared two early conceptions of entrepreneurship to shed light on the similarities and differences between public and private entrepreneurship. Therefore, this paper is limited to Schumpeter and Dahl's ideas and not the variety of approaches and forms that are available today. However, this has allowed for more in-depth exploration of Schumpeter and Dahl—for example, looking at a significant number of Schumpeter publications and several sources on the Mayor Lee case (e.g., Polsby 1963; Wolfinger 1974). Overall, some notable differences between the two theorists (e.g., context, type of resources, entrepreneurial activities) were found, but not as significantly as expected. The political entrepreneur carries out changes in a political-sector or more complex public-sector context (many different organizations and interests) and uses a broad repertoire of skills and resources. The next section exemplifies the relevance of Schumpeter's and Dahl's ideas today.

### **Future studies**

The Schumpeter case, though mostly connected to the economic sphere, opens up entrepreneurship for study in the public-sector context. Although there exists work in this direction (e.g., Mazzucato 2013; Mazzucato and Penna 2016), future studies could follow up and explore more of Schumpeter's ideas. Today, the entrepreneurial function may be carried out in many different parts of public administration in different countries. In some of these cases, Schumpeter's ideas might be relevant. Dahl's Mayor Lee is an example of carrying out new programs with economic, social, and political impact. The Mayor Lee study, especially together with Murphy's (1971) and Wolfinger's (1974), provides an analysis of what political and policy entrepreneurship might be and how it might not be found in every political context (Dahl 1961, p. 6). However, this should not exclude future in-depth case studies of entrepreneurship today. Dahl's (1961) study could be an inspiration or example of what entrepreneurship means in a public sector context. Even though many contemporary entrepreneurs may only partly be political entrepreneurs, they may still be worth a study.

### **References**

- Barth, F (1972) "Introduction" in Barth, F (ed.) *The role of the entrepreneur in social change in Northern Norway* (pp 5-18), Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Dahl, RA (1961) *Who governs? Democracy and power in an American City*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dhliwayo, S (2017) "Defining public-sector entrepreneurship: A conceptual operational construct," *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, Vol 18, No 3, pp 153-163.
- Dopfer, K (2012) "The origins of meso economics: Schumpeter's legacy and beyond," *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, Vol 22, No 1, pp 133–160.
- Eisenstadt, SN (1964) "Institutionalization and change," *American Sociological Review*, Vol 29, No 2, pp 235–247.
- Eisenstadt, SN (1980) "Cultural orientations, institutional entrepreneurs, and social change: Comparative analysis of traditional civilisations," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol 85, pp 406–454.
- Fagerberg, J (2003) "Schumpeter and the revival of evolutionary economics: An appraisal of the literature," *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, Vol 13, pp 125–159.
- Klein, PG, Mahoney, JT, McGahan, AM, & Pitelis, CN (2010) "Toward a theory of public entrepreneurship," *European Management Review*, Vol 7, No 1, pp 1-15.
- Leyden, DP and Link, AN (2015) *Public sector entrepreneurship: US technology and innovation policy*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Mazzucato, M (2013) *The entrepreneurial state*, Anthem Press, London.
- Mazzucato, M and Penna, CCR (2016) "Beyond market failures: The market creating and shaping roles of state investment banks," *Journal of Economic Policy Reform*, Vol 19, No 4, pp 305-326.
- Murphy, RD (1971) *Political entrepreneurs and urban poverty: The strategies of policy innovation in New Haven's model anti-poverty project*, Heath Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
- Ostrom, E (1965) *Public entrepreneurship: A case study in ground water basin management*, doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Penrose, E (1959) *The theory of the growth of the firm*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Polsby, NW (1963) *Community power and political theory*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Ruttan, VW (1959) "Usher and Schumpeter on invention, innovation, and technological change," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol 73, No 4, pp 596–606.
- Santarelli, E & Pesciarelli, E (1990) "The emergence of a vision: The development of Schumpeter's theory of entrepreneurship," *History of Political Economy*, Vol 22, No 4, pp 677–696.
- Schumpeter, JA (1908) *Das Wesen und der Hauptinhalt der theoretischen Nationalökonomie*, Duncker & Humblot, Leipzig.
- Schumpeter, JA (1912) *Theorie der Wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin.
- Schumpeter, JA (1918/1991) "The crisis of the tax state" [*Die Krise der Steuerstaates*], in Swedberg, R (ed.) (1991) *Joseph A. Schumpeter: The economics and sociology of capitalism* (pp 99–140), Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

### **Tor Helge Pedersen**

- Schumpeter, J.A. (1919/1951) "The sociology of imperialism," in Sweezy, PM (ed.) (1951) *Imperialism and social classes by Joseph A. Schumpeter* (pp 3–130), Augustus M. Kelley, Inc, New York.
- Schumpeter, JA (1927) "Explanation of the business cycle," *Economica*, Vol 7, pp 286–311.
- Schumpeter, JA (1928a) "The instability of capitalism," *The Economic Journal*, Vol 38, pp 361–386.
- Schumpeter, JA (1928b) "Entrepreneur [*Unternehmer*]" in Becker, MC, Knudsen, T & Swedberg, R (eds.) (2011) *The entrepreneur: Classic texts by Joseph A. Schumpeter* (pp 227–260), Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Schumpeter, JA (1928c) "The entrepreneur in today's economy [*Der Unternehmer in der Volkswirtschaft von heute*]," in Becker, MC, Knudsen, T & Swedberg, R (eds.) (2011) *The entrepreneur: Classic texts by Joseph A. Schumpeter* (pp 261–285), Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Schumpeter, JA (1934/1983) *Theory of economic development*, Transactions Publishers, New Brunswick & London.
- Schumpeter, JA (1935) "The analysis of economic change," *The Review of Economic Statistics*, Vol 17, No 4, pp 2–10.
- Schumpeter, JA (1939) *Business cycles* (vols. 1–2), McGraw Hill Company, New York.
- Schumpeter, JA (1942) *Capitalism, socialism and democracy* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1947), Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York.
- Schumpeter, JA (1946/1991) "Comments on a plan for the study of entrepreneurship" in Swedberg, R (ed.) (1991) *Joseph A. Schumpeter: The economics and sociology of capitalism* (pp 406–428), Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Schumpeter, JA (1947) "The creative response in economic history," *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol 7, No 2, pp 149–159.
- Schumpeter, JA (1949/1967) "Economic theory and entrepreneurial history," in Aitken, HGJ (ed.) *Explorations in enterprise* (pp 45–64), Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.
- Sheingate, AD (2003) "Political entrepreneurship, institutional change, and American political development," *Studies in American Political Development*, Vol 17, pp 185–203.
- Swedberg, R (2021) "Introduction to the Routledge Classics edition," in Schumpeter, JA (2021) *Theory of Economic Development* (pp viii–xv), Routledge, London & New York.
- Windrum, P (2008) "Innovation and entrepreneurship in public services," in Windrum, P & Koch, P (eds.) *Innovation in public sector services*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Wolfinger, R. (1974) *The Politics of Progress*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.