UNIVERSITY OF HOHENHEIM

Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences

On and Off the Map - Scholarly Prospecting for Insightful Entrepreneurship Research

Andreas Kuckertz
University of Hohenheim

Institute of Marketing & Management

03-2026

wiso.uni-hohenheim.de

Discussion Paper 03-2026

On and Off the Map - Scholarly Prospecting for Insightful Entrepreneurship Research

Andreas Kuckertz

Download this Discussion Paper from our homepage:

https://wiso.uni-hohenheim.de/papers

ISSN 2364-2084

Die Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences dienen der schnellen Verbreitung von Forschungsarbeiten der Fakultät Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften. Die Beiträge liegen in alleiniger Verantwortung der Autoren und stellen nicht notwendigerweise die Meinung der Fakultät Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften dar.

Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences are intended to make results of the Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences research available to the public in order to encourage scientific discussion and suggestions for revisions. The authors are solely responsible for the contents which do not necessarily represent the opinion of the Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences.

On and Off the Map - Scholarly Prospecting for Insightful Entrepreneurship Research

Andreas Kuckertz

University of Hohenheim | Institute of Marketing & Management | Entrepreneurship Research Group (570c) | Wollgrasweg 49 | D-70599 Stuttgart, Germany | Email: andreas.kuckertz@uni-hohenheim.de | Phone: 0049 711 459 24821

Acknowledgements

I appreciate Elisabeth Berger, Bernd Ebersberger, Johanna Slowik and Fabian Seeger, as well as the participants of the 2026 JBVI Academy at EGADE in Mexico City, for challenging my thinking.

Declaration of Interests

The author declares no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Highlights

- Introduces the concept of scholarly prospecting
- Uses personal episodes to explore ambiguity in both emerging and familiar phenomena
- Develops five heuristics for attending to puzzling observations in entrepreneurial reality

On and Off the Map - Scholarly Prospecting for Insightful Entrepreneurship Research

Abstract

In a field shaped by non-trivial change, familiar ways of understanding entrepreneurship may leave consequential developments unexplained. In this reflexive scholarly essay, I propose scholarly prospecting as a practice of deliberately attending to and interpreting ambiguous observations from the world of entrepreneurship, whether they concern an emerging development or an aspect of a familiar phenomenon that we have yet to understand. Drawing on personally significant episodes, I develop five sensitizing heuristics around irritation, blind spots, contradictions, ruptures, and polarisation. These heuristics make an often tacit scholarly practice explicit and invite researchers to examine what puzzling observations might reveal about the limits of their current understanding. Scholarly prospecting may thereby provide a starting point for insightful research that changes how we understand entrepreneurship.

Keywords

Entrepreneurship research, insights, scholarly prospecting

Introduction

When entrepreneurship scholars consider starting a new research project, they surely hope the topic will yield relevant insights. Most of the time, two influential approaches frame how researchers identify and justify their research topics and questions: gap spotting (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2013) and problematization (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2011), often accompanied by assessments of whether a project has the potential to be "interesting" (Davis, 1971). Both approaches can generate relevant research. However, they usually begin only after researchers have recognized, named, and made a

phenomenon visible in the academic literature as a possible object of inquiry. This matters in a field such as entrepreneurship, which evolves rapidly in practice, where new approaches to developing entrepreneurial projects continually emerge, and innovations enable and reshape entrepreneurial action; in other words, a field largely defined by non-trivial change (Davidsson et al., 2025). Here, consequential developments may first appear not as identifiable research topics, but as ambiguous observations whose meaning and significance remain uncertain.

Such observations differ from visible trends (Abrahamson, 1996) that we could readily transfer into entrepreneurship research. If a topic is already being addressed in practice or in a related academic discipline, its transfer to entrepreneurship research can be promising and meaningful. However, in such cases, someone has already identified the research topic, the public has indications of its relevance, and a clear agenda is gradually emerging. A greater challenge arises when potentially meaningful developments first appear through isolated, puzzling observations of uncertain significance (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007). In such cases, it is often unclear what kind of phenomenon we are observing, how researchers might conceptualize it, or whether it warrants sustained scholarly attention (Van Veen and Ortt, 2021). How, then, can we cultivate the habit of pausing over such observations and asking what, if anything, they might tell us about entrepreneurship?

To address this conundrum, I have structured the present piece as a reflexive scholarly essay. I propose a practice I call 'scholarly prospecting': *deliberately attending to and interpreting ambiguous observations from the world of entrepreneurship*. Such observations may concern emerging developments, but they may equally arise from familiar phenomena whose significance we have not yet adequately understood. Its potential for insightful research lies in focusing on observations that our familiar ways of understanding entrepreneurship cannot readily account for, inviting us to reconsider what we think

we understand. Drawing on personally significant episodes, moments of confusion, and hindsight recognition of patterns, I argue for the value of scholarly prospecting and formulate five sensitizing heuristics around it. Deliberately searching for unfamiliar signals that do not align with one's mental model has been observed in managers' strategic work (Van Veen et al., 2019), suggesting that a similar approach might be useful in academic research. I aim to make this often tacit scholarly practice open to discussion, subject to criticism, and potentially useful to others.

Positioning scholarly prospecting

How does scholarly prospecting relate to gap-spotting and problematization? Gap-spotting (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2013) focuses on identifying ambiguities and contradictory explanations in the literature. It addresses under-covered topics or arguments that lack empirical support. It may also extend existing theories into contexts where they have not yet been applied. The key point here is that to identify a gap, there must already be something in the literature that defines it. Gap-spotting therefore contributes by responding to the existing literature; it is literature-driven. But entrepreneurship does not develop within the literature. Instead, the object of entrepreneurship research changes in practice (Davidsson et al., 2025), so research should focus on the problems that result from this change (Chen et al., 2023), especially when the literature has not yet incorporated those changes.

Problematization (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2011) offers a different way of engaging with the existing literature. Problematization steps back and asks not only what is missing, but also what assumptions, categories, and taken-for-granted premises an academic discourse presupposes. In doing so, it goes beyond gap-spotting and poses potentially more fundamental questions that challenge a discourse's underlying assumptions, whereas gap-spotting often favors incremental contributions. Scholarly prospecting can complement both approaches by highlighting observations whose scholarly

implications remain unclear. In turn, gap-spotting and problematization can help researchers connect these observations to existing knowledge and formulate questions for further inquiry.

Entrepreneurship researchers who adopt a scholarly prospecting perspective focus on potentially meaningful observations even before they can formulate a research problem. They are sensitive to developments in entrepreneurial reality and its institutional environment. Metaphorically speaking, gap-spotting, problematization, and the approach proposed here differ in how they relate to the research landscape. Gap-spotters work with the existing map. They identify visible gaps in the academic literature and aim to fill these gaps with their research. In contrast, problematisers take a step back. They question the assumptions that underpin the current map and strive to redraw it. Scholarly prospectors explore the terrain itself, attending to signs whose significance remains uncertain. Following such signs may take them beyond the map, towards developments in entrepreneurial practice that have yet to enter scholarly discourse, or prompt them to look again at territory they thought they knew.

This perspective relates to Merton's (1948) serendipity pattern, in which an unanticipated, anomalous empirical finding prompts a new direction of inquiry. Observations by the scholarly prospector may reveal aspects of entrepreneurial reality that familiar ways of understanding entrepreneurship do not adequately capture, even before the underlying phenomenon is recognized and established in the academic literature. In doing so, scholarly prospectors leave the current map behind and look for signs of territory whose exploration might change how we understand the landscape itself. Like prospectors, they do not know in advance what they will uncover. The promise of scholarly prospecting lies in taking such observations seriously enough to explore what they might mean for our understanding of entrepreneurship.

Here be Dragons - Five heuristics for scholarly prospecting

The five heuristics that follow describe situations in which we may be quite clear about what we have observed in entrepreneurial life and still be uncertain what to make of it. Each calls on us to look more closely. To my mind, scholarly prospecting carries a modest obligation here. Before setting such an observation aside, we ought at least ask what we find puzzling about it and how else we might understand what we have seen. That reflection may settle the matter. It may also give us a clearer sense of what remains unexplained and why it merits further inquiry, even when a research question is still some way off.

The Irritation Heuristic

Heuristic 1. Whenever smart people appear to be doing stupid things, look more closely.

Exposure to entrepreneurial reality is particularly valuable when it leaves researchers puzzled by what competent actors say or do. When apparently intelligent and experienced actors embrace something that at first sight seems implausible, the easiest response is to ignore or dismiss it. Scholarly prospecting resists this reflex. In these situations, researchers must suspend their initial judgment long enough to identify the question underlying the irritation.

> *Many years ago, I attended an event organized by a leading OEM. It was a networking and discussion forum where presenters introduced us to new technologies. At some point, someone came on stage to talk about blockchain. It wasn't clear what the technology was supposed to do, or how to turn it into a business. But the speaker was wildly enthusiastic and tried to convince us the whole world would change. My immediate reaction was not curiosity, but irritation. I couldn't quite see how this technology was supposed to create value, and much of it sounded economically half-baked. Looking back, that irritation proved instructive.*

When irritation arises, the key question is not who is right or wrong, but what makes an observed activity appear implausible in the first place. What assumptions about value creation or entrepreneurial action inform that judgment, and what might the observation reveal about their limits? Studies such as those by Chalmers et al. (2021) suggest that blockchain has indeed enabled new venture ideas. Fisch (2019) showed blockchain's potential for new funding mechanisms. Viewed in retrospect, these possibilities sharpen the question the episode raises: what was I taking for granted when I found the technology economically implausible? Of course, irritation is not limited to new technologies. Whenever our sense of what makes sense collides with the actions of entrepreneurial actors, closer examination may reveal something about both the activity and the understanding that made it seem implausible.

The Blind-Spot Heuristic

Heuristic 2. Whenever individual perspectives hinder recognition of a phenomenon or its parts, look more closely.

Individuals and organizations naturally perceive their environment from their own unique perspective. However, it is precisely those things that they are unable to perceive, that are hard to notice, or that they systematically or unconsciously ignore, that can be particularly interesting. Such blind spots may result from perspective or routine; sometimes certain aspects are even so unpleasant or cognitively demanding that they disappear from our attention (Kunda, 1990). When entrepreneurship researchers engage with entrepreneurial practice, their academic perspective can help uncover precisely such blind spots. It goes without saying that every academic has their own blind spots. They therefore bring not a superior, but an alternative perspective to the dialogue between academia and practice, and that is precisely what can be valuable.

At a World Café event attended by key players from the regional startup support scene, there was a session on aerospace and defense tech. Initially, our discussion was surprisingly conventional: defense tech as a new field, a new opportunity, and a new challenge for support structures. What was disconcerting was not that we discussed defense tech, but how matter-of-factly we discussed technologies that, a few years ago, almost everyone would have questioned. The participants treated defense tech as just another startup vertical. They did not see a field laden with moral, political, and institutional implications. Only when I highlighted the phenomenon's ethical dimension did the discussion change radically. Defense tech then emerged as a source of friction, presenting entirely new challenges for founders, support organizations, and the academic world alike.

Blind spots can therefore arise when one applies the usual categories, routines, or assumptions to a new phenomenon too quickly and mechanically. This is especially tempting when one has to grapple with potentially unpleasant consequences. If, for instance, generally positive assumptions about entrepreneurship (Keim et al., 2024) often found in startup support ('Entrepreneurs are problem-solvers; any potentially viable solution to a problem justifies our support') are called into question by entrepreneurial activities with ambiguous consequences, the unconscious tendency to neglect these ambiguities can create a blind spot. Such situations create fertile ground for scholarly prospectors. Consequently, researchers engaged in scholarly prospecting should not simply accept perspectives from practice, but deliberately look at what other actors, consciously or unconsciously, overlook.

The Contradiction Heuristic

Heuristic 3. If words do not match actions, look more closely.

Some words don't come easy, as the well-known 1980s song goes, but all too often words are cheap. What various stakeholders say is often shaped by established but outdated narratives, or by social desirability. What is said, therefore, does not necessarily correspond to their actions. When words and actions contradict one another, it is worth looking more closely at the reasons why. Does the contradiction stem from a lack of reflection? From hidden agendas? From rapid developments that

have not yet found their way into everyday language? Such observations may once again lead the scholarly prospector into uncharted territory.

> *During a visit by various politicians to a university startup center, we presented several startups before moving on to a general discussion on how policy could better support entrepreneurship. The visiting politicians' rhetoric was decidedly forward-looking: innovation, technology, networks, and building the entrepreneurial ecosystem. The ensuing discussion, however, revealed a different, concrete reality. Triggered by Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, funding had become scarce. Universities were now expected to jointly establish structures for which far fewer organizations had previously received similar resources. Less funding, the same output – all glossed over by the rhetoric that networking and cooperation were valuable in their own right. In this context, a former federal minister also remarked candidly on how striking it was that vast sums of public money flowed into backward-facing projects, while future-oriented projects ran dry. However, the generally positive rhetoric on innovation remained unchanged, despite political action taking a different direction.*

Notably, this heuristic is not about exposing liars. Whilst actors may indeed be aware of their contradictions, a wide variety of constraints can prevent individuals or organizations from acting in accordance with their stated or genuinely held priorities. Of course, contradictions may also be unconscious or due to delayed adaptation.

The Rupture Heuristic

Heuristic 4. Whenever what was previously considered unthinkable, unacceptable, or impossible becomes a real possibility, look more closely.

We usually associate the mean with acting appropriately. We can trace this view back to Aristotle's concept of *mesotes*, that is, the balance, which depends on the individual and the situation, between extreme courses of action (Aristotle, 2020). When actors nonetheless veer toward extremes, this opens a field of opportunity for the scholarly prospector. Movements toward extremes, regardless of where they occur (micro, meso, macro), might indicate non-trivial change. On the one hand, they are

interesting because they require explanation in their own right and lend themselves to theory-building (Clark et al., 2023); on the other hand, their visibility also shapes the expectations, goals, and behavior of other actors (Kuckertz et al., 2023) who are positioned more towards the center. Movements towards extremes thus offer scholarly prospectors at least two avenues for identifying potentially relevant research questions.

> *Shortly before the first COVID lockdown, I watched a television interview with Germany's then Federal Minister for Economic Affairs. A journalist repeatedly asked him which economic support measures he would rule out. Each time, he refused to draw a line, essentially saying they would do everything possible to keep the economy going. Obviously, something important was changing. A powerful institution had publicly suspended the usual limits on economic intervention. The very next day, we began working on COVID and entrepreneurship.*

In hindsight, the COVID lockdowns proved to be a global rupture with extraordinary consequences for entrepreneurship (Kuckertz et al., 2020) and beyond. Scholarly prospectors, however, need not wait for such historically unique events. For the rupture heuristic, what matters is that a change is radical relative to the previous state of affairs. A rupture may affect a single organization, a particular industry, a region, or even an entire society; its relevance lies in the distance from the previous state, not in the size of its reach. Even limited-scope ruptures can help scholarly prospectors formulate new questions. When the unthinkable becomes thinkable, when the unacceptable becomes acceptable, when the impossible becomes possible – that is when the scholarly prospector's work begins.

The Polarisation Heuristic

Heuristic 5. Whenever the same phenomenon triggers strongly contrasting reactions among different actors, look more closely.

Friction suggests potential. When different actors look at the same phenomenon, the same facts, or the same evidence, yet react very differently, fertile ground opens for the scholarly prospector. For

instance, in entrepreneurship, different audiences might evaluate a specific venture's legitimacy very differently (Fisher et al., 2017). These different reactions may reflect different assumptions, interests, experiences, or values. When these collide, they create room for explanation. The aim here is not so much to resolve these tensions through research, but to harness them productively to understand their underlying causes, the conditions under which they arise, and the consequences they may have for other actors. Recognizing conflicting perspectives can reveal previously unseen questions worth addressing.

> *When we presented our first study on women in entrepreneurial ecosystems at a practitioner conference, several women from government departments responded immediately and with unusual enthusiasm. They clearly recognized in the study both an academic vocabulary and evidence for a problem they were already grappling with in their day-to-day work, and were keen to collaborate. Shortly afterward, outside the venue, a male venture capitalist approached me, dismissed the topic in openly derogatory terms—language too disparaging to reproduce here—and questioned why we would devote research attention to it. The same study elicited recognition and a desire to build alliances in one group, while provoking overt dismissal from a high-status actor in another.*

Whilst consensus is pleasant, it does not generate the necessary friction. It is conflicting perspectives that call for closer examination of whether there is hidden potential. Examining and acknowledging these tensions is particularly promising because disagreement can create dissonance (Matz and Wood, 2005), which we often resolve by aligning with one position. Doing justice to different perspectives by taking them seriously and analyzing them before reaching conclusions appears to be a necessary prerequisite for benefiting from polarisation as scholarly prospectors. Therein lies the value of conflict, a value that would not exist with a consensual response to a phenomenon.

Discussion

Taken together, the five proposed heuristics for scholarly prospecting highlight frictions in how entrepreneurial reality is perceived, described, and understood. Something appears implausible, a relevant aspect goes unnoticed, words and actions diverge, established boundaries shift, or the same phenomenon provokes sharply different reactions. These observations are not insights in themselves. They become potentially instructive when closer examination reveals why an apparently adequate understanding leaves something consequential unexplained. Scholarly prospecting encourages us to stay with that difficulty long enough to consider what we might have to understand differently.

We should not understand the heuristics as concrete instruments; they are not decision-making rules, validation procedures, or proof that a particular phenomenon must automatically be research-worthy. They do not even guarantee, for example, that every source of irritation will give rise to a research question. „Insights as such, needn't be" (Carter, 2017: 540), but if we do not at least strive for them, then we cannot expect them either. Rather, we should understand heuristics as part of a mindset that tolerates and embraces ambiguity. They raise awareness of potential research areas, but they do not guarantee success. They are explicitly not intended to identify the next trend or even hype, so we can be the first to jump on the next bandwagon. Needless to say, the heuristics are not mutually exclusive, and even when a situation satisfies several heuristics at once, it does not necessarily yield the most interesting research questions. Scholarly prospecting remains, by its very nature, subjective. What one observer perceives as friction depends on who is observing. However, this subjectivity need not be a weakness. In the discovery phase, researchers' individual experiences and perspectives can reveal phenomena others may overlook (Shepherd et al., 2021).

Of course, I developed the heuristics retrospectively, so looking back, various vignettes may seem clearer and more significant than they did at the time. This hindsight bias limits what the vignettes

themselves can demonstrate. However, their purpose is not to establish the predictive validity of the heuristics, but to make previously tacit patterns of scholarly attention explicit and thereby available for prospective use. Scholarly prospecting certainly benefits from greater exposure to entrepreneurial reality, as this increases the likelihood of encountering potentially meaningful observations. However, direct access to the field is neither essential nor sufficient. What matters is engaging with entrepreneurial reality in a way that lets us recognize frictions between observations, expectations, or perspectives and use them productively.

AI-assisted Tool Use

While preparing this manuscript, I used DeepL for translation and Grammarly Pro for language editing. LeapSpace helped identify potentially relevant literature supporting the paper's arguments. I used OpenAI's ChatGPT as an interactive research and writing assistant to critically examine arguments, refine the paper's conceptual positioning and structure, develop and assess alternative formulations, and discuss potentially relevant literature. I developed and evaluated the underlying ideas, examples, conceptual choices, and arguments. All AI-assisted outputs were critically reviewed and, where appropriate, revised or rejected by me. I am responsible for the final content of the manuscript.

References

Abrahamson, E., 1996. Management Fashion. The Academy of Management Review 21, 254. https://doi.org/10.2307/258636

Alvesson, M., Kärreman, D., 2007. Constructing mystery: Empirical matters in theory development. Academy of Management Review 32, 1265–1281. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.26586822

Alvesson, M., Sandberg, J., 2013. Has Management Studies Lost Its Way? Ideas for More Imaginative and Innovative Research. Journal of Management Studies 50, 128–152. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01070.x

Alvesson, M., Sandberg, J., 2011. Generating Research Questions Through Problematization. Academy of Management Review 36, 247–271. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.0188

Aristotle, 2020. Nicomachean ethics, Oxford scholarly editions online. Oxford University Press, Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780198752714.book.1

Carter, J.A., 2017. Virtuous Insightfulness. Episteme 14, 539–554. https://doi.org/10.1017/epi.2016.37

Chalmers, D., Matthews, R., Hyslop, A., 2021. Blockchain as an external enabler of new venture ideas: Digital entrepreneurs and the disintermediation of the global music industry. Journal of Business Research 125, 577–591. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.002

Chen, S., Sharma, G., Muñoz, P., 2023. In Pursuit of Impact: From Research Questions to Problem Formulation in Entrepreneurship Research. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 47, 232–264. https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587221111736

Clark, D.R., Crawford, G.C., Pidduck, R.J., 2023. Exceptionality in entrepreneurship: Systematically investigating outlier outcomes. Journal of Business Venturing Insights 20, e00422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2023.e00422

Davidsson, P., Recker, J., Von Briel, F., 2025. External Enablement of Entrepreneurial Actions and Outcomes: Extension, Review and Research Agenda. Foundations and Trends® in Entrepreneurship 21, 172–343. https://doi.org/10.1561/0300000117

Davis, M.S., 1971. That's Interesting!: Towards a Phenomenology of Sociology and a Sociology of Phenomenology. Philosophy of the Social Sciences 1, 309–344. https://doi.org/10.1177/004839317100100211

Fisch, C., 2019. Initial coin offerings (ICOs) to finance new ventures. Journal of Business Venturing 34, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2018.09.007

Fisher, G., Kuratko, D.F., Bloodgood, J.M., Hornsby, J.S., 2017. Legitimate to whom? The challenge of audience diversity and new venture legitimacy. Journal of Business Venturing 32, 52–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2016.10.005

Keim, J., Müller, S., Dey, P., 2024. Whatever the problem, entrepreneurship is the solution! Confronting the panacea myth of entrepreneurship with structural injustice. Journal of Business Venturing Insights 21, e00440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2023.e00440

Kuckertz, A., Brändle, L., Gaudig, A., Hinderer, S., Morales Reyes, C.A., Prochotta, A., Steinbrink, K.M., Berger, E.S.C., 2020. Startups in times of crisis – A rapid response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Business Venturing Insights 13, e00169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2020.e00169

Kuckertz, A., Scheu, M., Davidsson, P., 2023. Chasing mythical creatures – A (not-so-sympathetic) critique of entrepreneurship's obsession with unicorn startups. Journal of Business Venturing Insights 19, e00365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2022.e00365

Kunda, Z., 1990. The case for motivated reasoning. Psychological Bulletin 108, 480–498. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.480

Matz, D.C., Wood, W., 2005. Cognitive Dissonance in Groups: The Consequences of Disagreement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 88, 22–37. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.22

Merton, R.K., 1948. The Bearing of Empirical Research upon the Development of Social Theory. American Sociological Review 13, 505. https://doi.org/10.2307/2087142

Shepherd, D.A., Wiklund, J., Dimov, D., 2021. Envisioning Entrepreneurship's Future: Introducing Me-Search and Research Agendas. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 45, 955–966. https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587211026872

Van Veen, B.L., Ortt, J.R., 2021. Unifying weak signals definitions to improve construct understanding. Futures 134, 102837. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102837

Van Veen, B.L., Roland Ortt, J., Badke-Schaub, P.G., 2019. Compensating for perceptual filters in weak signal assessments. Futures 108, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2019.02.018

IMPRINT

University of Hohenheim
Dean's Office of the Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences
Palace Hohenheim 1 B
70593 Stuttgart | Germany
Fon +49 (0)711 459 22488
Fax +49 (0)711 459 22785
wiso@uni-hohenheim.de
wiso.uni-hohenheim.de