Essays in Economic & Business History
2024, 42 (1): 59-89
Published December 21, 2024

Apprenticeships and Formal Business Schooling in Late Imperial Russia (1880-1917): A Gendered Perspective

Valeria Peshko, University of Helsinki, valeriia.peshko@helsinki.fi

Abstract

Commercial education emerged when women's rights were limited and single-gender schools dominated. Inevitably this system created differences in educational attainment and contributed to unequal gender roles in business organizations. This article examines an alternative trajectory in the rise of business education by focusing on a developing country, where women had economic rights—prerevolutionary Russia. It finds that in the traditional merchant apprenticeship system women were typically family members, so ownership was more important for their authority than expertise. In commercial schools, men and women received similar training, but different assumptions about female education and professional life made it much harder for women to claim authority based on their qualifications.

JEL Classifications: N33, I21, J16.

Key Words: business education, gender, specialized knowledge, authority, business ownership, clerical work.

ISSN 2376-9459 (online) LCC 79-91616 HC12.E2

Introduction

Despite ample evidence that managerial and lower white-collar work are segregated by gender (for example, Gregory Anderson 1989; Margery Davies 1993; Angel Kwolek-Folland 1994; Deborah Simonton 1998) and the persistence of masculine tropes in business discourse (Eleanor Hamilton 2013; Frida Jernberg, Anna Lindbäck, and Annie Roos 2020; Christian Johnsen and Bent Sørensen 2017), only a few studies have interrogated the emergence and practice of business education from a gendered perspective (Allison Elias 2020; Eirinn Larsen 2011; Kristin Williams and Albert Mills 2019). The fact that the emergence of formal business schooling in the nineteenth century occurred when single-gender schooling was still dominant in Europe has often been overlooked in historical studies.[1] However, this system inevitably created differences in educational attainment between men and women, which contributed to unequal gender roles in in business organizations.

The emergence of these gender inequalities in business pre-dates the nineteenth century. In the majority of European cities women were barred from entering apprenticeships and guilds, although some still had access to vocational training through their family connections and schools (Sheilagh Ogilvie 2003, 80-99, 2019 ch. 5). In France from the 1650s, women had access to vocational training in parish schools and special professional schools—much earlier than formal schooling reached boys (Clare Crowston 2008, 30-34). However, these opportunities extended only to trades and occupations considered appropriate for their class and gender, such as sewing and needlework. Training within family firms for centuries represented the major way both men and women developed appropriate business skills, but the institutionalization of education in the nineteenth century reduced the significance of this channel. As Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall remarked in their seminal study on family firms in early-nineteenth century Britain, lack of specialized knowledge made it more difficult for women to command authority on the shop floor, as the scale of manufacturing and complexity of market operations increased (Davidoff and Hall 1987, 304). Considering other factors restricting women's economic agency such as coverture or limitations on practicing certain trades, it is not surprising that business training available to women often prepared them only for low-level clerical jobs. Even today when women are much more represented among business school students, researchers observe significant disparities in academic achievement attributed to gender stereotypes (Aradnha Krishna and Yeşim Orhun 2022). But how would an alternative history of the business school look like, if it developed in a society with less economic development but more rights for women?

This case study of the development of commercial education in Imperial Russia offers an opportunity to examine this question. Whereas in Europe trained women entered clerical positions in enterprises, where top executive positions were dominated by men, in Russia this division was less strong due to the unique position of women in Russian law. Although the patriarchal family structure was enshrined in Russian civil law, economic activities of women had almost no limitations even after marriage. Women had full property rights and were able to establish or inherit businesses. As a result, Russia had a relatively high rate of female business ownership. Being a late-industrializing country, the Russian Empire relied on technology and expertise developed earlier elsewhere. So, when the Ministry of Finance started to create a commercial school system in the 1890s, it looked to existing European

[1] The rise of formal business schooling in the late nineteenth century and its spread throughout the twentieth was primarily viewed in the context of changing corporate structures, industrialization, and crystallization of management science as a distinct academic discipline (Alfred Chandler 1971; Robert Locke 1984; Malcolm Warner 1987). Meanwhile, formation of national business school models in the US, Japan and Europe became the main framework for histories of business and management education (Lars Engwall, Matthias Kipping, and Behlül Üsdiken 2016; Engwall and Vera Zamagni 1998; Susanna Fellman 2001; Andreas Kaplan 2018; Locke 1984).

models, in particular the German one. As in Western Europe, the Russian educational system was largely single-gender with girls' schools having shorter and less challenging programs. Russian officials were generally skeptical about granting women full access to university-level training, making concessions under pressure from the feminist movement and rolling them back in times of political instability. However, the special status of commercial schools allowed the establishment of more equal programs at the secondary level and even inclusion of women in higher education.

These circumstances prompt new questions about gender and business knowledge. What access to business knowledge and training did women have before the emergence of a formal commercial school system? How was their competence perceived and valued? How did the implementation of commercial schools impact the construction of masculinities and femininities in business? I argue that while under the apprenticeship system women were not entirely excluded from accessing specialized knowledge, commercial schools significantly broadened that access, creating a fairly equal footing between men and women. However, the premises under which female education and professional life were conceived were markedly different, making it much harder for women to claim positions of authority based on their education and expertise.

Although Russian scholarship has produced considerable research on merchant apprenticeship practices (Svetlana Filatova 2016; I͡Urii͡ Goncharov 2004; Natal'i͡a Koreeva 2018), the development of commercial education (Aleksandr Bessolitsyn 2012, 2014; Mikhail Bri͡antsev 1999; 2000; I͡Urii͡ Maslov 2001; Oksana Vakhromeeva 2009) and women's professional education (Elena Kosetchenkova 2007), these issues were treated separately. Another growing body of literature on female entrepreneurship has revealed the significant presence of businesswomen and presented evidence of gender segmentation of the market (see, for example, Tanya Byker and Amanda Gregg 2019; Filatova 2016; Johannes Raschka 2006; Galina Ulianova 2009, 2022a, 2022b; see also the overview of this literature in Konstantin Abdrakhmanov 2017). How and why notions of gender were shaping the markets in this way remain underexplored. This article focuses on links between business, gender and class, but I acknowledge that these were far from the only structuring factors in the Russian Empire, with regional differences, ethnic and religious distinctions being the most prominent. This complexity motivates me to narrow the scope of investigation to the two largest cities—Saint Petersburg, the capital at the time, and Moscow; however, references to Ukrainian and Baltic examples are made for additional context.

The article is divided into five main sections. Following this introduction, the next section discusses theoretical perspectives on the role of specialized knowledge and gender in business organizations and introduces my methodological approach and sources. Following this, I set the stage for the main argument by expanding on the character of Russian business organization and different modes of training, namely apprenticeship and formal schools. Finally, my empirical analysis is presented, followed by the concluding discussion.

Specialized Knowledge and Gender

Ever since Alfred Chandler's influential research on the rise of the modern corporation, business enterprise has been understood as an organization with a fixed hierarchy where the distribution of tasks requires its members to possess (or develop) specialist knowledge (Chandler 1971). As theorized by Max Weber and later by Heinz Hartmann, specialist knowledge underpins the authority of managers, justifying their decisions and commands to their subordinates (Hartmann 1959a, 6, 1959b, 436-441; Weber 2019). In this respect institutions and practices that supply this knowledge, such as apprenticeships and business schools, play a crucial role in the making of the manager. There is a dynamic relationship between educational institutions and businesses: schools supply qualified workers, while

businesses directly and indirectly inform schools about the kind of workers they need. In other words, educational institutions reproduce and reinforce the norms and practices of business organizations.

Although the importance of gender for organization and managerial authority is hard to overstate (Joan Acker 1990; Susan Halford, Mike Savage, and Anne Witz 1997), its role in management education remains underexplored (Elias 2020, 126). Previous research largely treated the appearance of gendered commercial education as a feature of the larger process of change in the formulation of masculine and feminine occupations (Gladys Carnaffan 1989; Kwolek-Folland 1994). While concurring with this view, I follow Larsen's approach to studying the history of business education "not simply as a supporting part of industrialization and bureaucratization of corporate life at the fin de siècle, but more as a socio-cultural construct that surfaced in response to these very same processes" (Larsen 2011, 26). Thus, the development of commercial education is interesting both as a channel for ideas on masculine and feminine work but also as a ground where these notions were conceptualized, (re)formulated and challenged. Through a dynamic relationship between educational institutions and businesses, specialized knowledge and skills themselves are gendered based on the characteristic of the knowledge and its host. Not only does their gendered categorization derive from perception of its properties as more appropriate for men or women (for example, accounting is complex and thus masculine, typing is easy and feminine), but also the skill itself gains or loses value based on who possesses it.

My analysis relies on a combination of close and distant reading methods. My close reading approach is informed by examination of the historical construction of masculinities and femininities through the study of discourses (Joan Scott 1988). To reconstruct the discourse surrounding business education I rely on texts intended for the public eye, which can be divided into several groups: 1) materials directly related to commercial schools, such as school charters and reports produced by schools, voluntary organizations and alumni associations; 2) discussions among experts and professional educators, which appeared in professional conference materials, books and essays; 3) journalistic accounts related to commercial education and white-collar work and women's work more generally as well as letters from the general public on these topics, which were published in newspapers; 4) memoirs and fictional accounts from observers intimately familiar with the business community. To contextualize my findings, I use distant reading of statistical sources such as urban censuses and data on commercial schools.

Background

Businessowners and their Employees

Trade legislation in the Russian Empire was rather liberal in terms of general access to commercial activity. Over the course of the nineteenth and into the early twentieth century, despite changes in taxation, the main principle remained the same: to conduct business, one had to purchase a fixed-term license, the price of which was determined by the scale and type of operation. In general, both men and women had the right to purchase these licenses. Even when married, most lawyers of the time agreed, they had no limitations on commercial activity (Nikita Bilenko 2018, 419).[2]

[2] The only contentious issue was the interpretation of the issue of the ability of women to give bills of exchange (*veksel'*)—a crucial financial instrument at the time. According to the law, women, whether married or not, could not give nor transfer bills of exchange without their husband's or parents' permission, "unless they trade in their own name" (*Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoĭ Imperii. Sobranie II. Vol. VII* 1832 № 5462, 407). Despite this latter clause some contemporaries argued that married women still needed their husband's permission to give bills of exchange and had limited trading

Moreover, in the Russian legal tradition women's property was separated much earlier than in other European countries. As early as the seventeenth century, the property of husbands and wives was distinguished by law and custom (Vakhromeeva 2008, 82-83). In the eighteenth century noble women's property rights were clarified and extended, and women of all social classes acquired the same protections after the Emancipation of the Serfs in 1861 (Michelle Marrese 2002, 46-70, 241; see also William Wagner 1994).

White-collar employees in industry and commerce were also required to purchase licenses and sign employment contracts. In this case limitations for married women were minimal: the husband could demand termination of the contract, but lack of his permission did not nullify it (Vakhromeeva 2008, 87). The most common term to describe these workers in official documents and everyday usage—*prikazchik* for men, *prikazchi͡tsa* for women—had a fairly broad meaning (see Alexander Kaplunovskiy 2006). Briefly, a *prikazchik* was an assistant to a businessowner, to whom some managerial and clerical tasks were delegated. The degree of responsibility of *prikazchiki* varied, but usually involved tending to customers in the shop, bookkeeping and business correspondence, which makes them largely equivalent to clerks. In the early twentieth century the term began to be associated more strongly with retail trade, while office work was referred to in more specific occupational terms, for example, office clerk (*kontorshchik/kontorshchi͡tsa*), bookkeeper or cashier.

The period from the 1850s to the early twentieth century was marked by mass entry of women into white-collar occupations, and the Russian Empire followed this trend, albeit with some delay. By the end of the 1900s women comprised 38.9 percent of commercial workers in France, 37.6 percent in the US, 30.5 percent in Germany and 17.5 percent in Britain (Kwolek-Folland 1994, 4; Simonton 1998, 236). Meanwhile, in Saint Petersburg the rate of women's participation in these jobs demonstrated a steady growth from 4.6 percent in 1881 to 21.1 percent in 1910; in Moscow it rose from 9.1 percent to 13.2 percent (see Table 1). In comparison to the overall female employment, the trade, services and transport sector, although being far from the largest, demonstrated dramatic growth in both cities (Anastasiya Shinova 2020). These female employment rates could be considered even rather high in comparison to Western counterparts, considering the gender literacy gap. Whereas in England and Wales by 1913 illiteracy rates for both men and women were estimated to be around 1 percent (R.S. Schofield 1973, 443), in Saint Petersburg around the same time only 65 percent of women older than sixteen were literate, in contrast to 88 percent of men.[3]

Despite the considerable rise of women's share in commercial white-collar occupations since the 1880s, the share of female businessowners remained stable in the capital and increased only moderately in Moscow (see Table 2). The Moscow population census of 1912 also provides evidence of the gender balance in various commercial occupations (see Table 3). The highest number of women in absolute terms and second highest as share of total were proprietors, whereas the number of employed women was much lower, but divisions between different kinds of white-collar work are evident. Women's share was the highest among family members employed in clerical positions (almost 40 percent), but the overall number of workers in this category was quite small. Women comprised around 7 percent of directors and *prikazchik*-clerks, while in more specialized occupations such as accounting and office work their share is closer to 20 percent. Moscow's example serves as a good illustration of Simonton's critique of describing women's participation in white-collar work as "feminization",

capacity as a result (Bilenko 2018, 419). Others, meanwhile, believed that in trade marital status played no role (see, for example, Alekseĭ Gulʹi͡aev 1912, 13-14).

[3] My calculations are based on the 1910 Saint Petersburg population census (*Petrograd po perepisi naseleni͡ia 15 dekabri͡a 1910 goda. Ch. 1. Chislennost' i sostav naseleni͡ia po polu, vozrastu, gramotnosti, stepeni obrazovani͡ia, mestu rozhdeni͡ia, vremeni poseleni͡ia v Petrograde, semeĭnomu sostoi͡ani͡iu, veroispovedani͡iu, sosloviiu i rodnomu i͡azyku* n.d., 5 table II).

which implies substitution of male by female workers. In the developing tertiary sector a lot of the jobs were new, and the division of labor between men and women was not clear yet (Simonton 1998, 235). In Moscow the “old work” of the *prikazchik* remained male-dominated, while women had more access to “newer” white-collar occupations that required formal training, like bookkeeping.

Table 1

White-collar commercial workers in Saint Petersburg and Moscow, 1880s-1910s

City	Year	Men	Women	Women, percentage of total (%)
Saint Petersburg	1881	8,752	427	4.65
	1890	9,352	1,001	9.67
	1900	21,517	4,164	16.21
	1910	28,727	7,697	21.13
Moscow	1882	18,199	1,823	9.10
	1902	61,723	8,703	12.36
	1912	84,612	12,870	13.20

Note: Numbers for white-collar commercial workers in Saint Petersburg represent *administratsiia* (administration) category. Numbers for white-collar commercial workers in Moscow represent *prikazchiki* in 1882; a sum of *sluzhashchie fabrik i zavodov* (white-collar workers in factories), *sluzhashchie prochikh vidov promyshlennosti* (white-collar workers in other enterprises), *sluzhashchie transportnykh predpriiatiĭ* (white-collar workers in transportation) *sluzhashchie domovladeniia i traktirnogo promysla* (employees of landlords and innkeepers), *sluzhashchie torgovykh zavedeniĭ i kreditnykh uchrezhdeniĭ* (white-collar workers in commerce and banking) and *pomogaiushchie v promysle chleny sem’i* (family members assisting with business) in 1902; and a sum of *sluzhashchie torgovo-promyshlennykh predpriiatiĭ* and *prikazchiki i rabochie v torgovle* among family members aiding with business in 1912.

Sources:

Saint Petersburg: Author’s calculations based on population census aggregated statistics for 1881 (*S.-Peterburg po perepisi 15-go dekabria 1881 goda. T. 1: Naselenie* 1884, 308 table I), 1890 (*S.-Peterburg po perepisi 15 dekabria 1890 goda. Ch. 1. Naselenie. Vyp. 2: Raspredelenie naseleniia po zaniatiiam* 1892, 50 table IV), 1900 (*S.-Peterburg po perepisi 15 dekabria 1900 goda. Naselenie. Vyp. 2. Raspredelenie naseleniia po zaniatiiam* 1903, 88 table II-A), 1910 (*Petrograd po perepisi naseleniia 15 dekabria 1910 goda. Ch. 2. Raspredelenie naseleniia po gruppam zaniatiĭ* n.d., 23 table I).

Moscow: Author’s calculations based on population census aggregated statistics for 1882 (1885, 68 table XI), 1902 (*Perepis' Moskvy 1902 goda. Ch. 1 : Naselenie. Vyp. 2 Naselenie g. Moskvy (bez prigorodov) po zaniatiiam, veroispovedaniiu i rodnomu iazyku. Bezrabotnye i uvechnye* 1906, 2-5 table I), 1912 (*Statisticheskiĭ ezhegodnik goroda Moskvy i Moskovskoĭ gubernii. Statisticheskie dannye po gorodu Moskve za 1914-1925 g.g* 1927, 69 table 14).

Table 2

Proprietors with employees in Saint Petersburg and Moscow, 1880s-1910s

City	Year	Men	Women	Women, percentage of total (%)
Saint Petersburg	1881	21,296	7,148	25.13
	1890	22,506	9,268	29.17
	1900	27,086	11,694	30.15
	1910	27,031	10,934	28.80
Moscow	1882	22,133	6,533	22.79
	1902	28,355	9,653	25.40
	1912	37,647	13,371	26.21

Note: Numbers for proprietors with employees in Saint Petersburg are given for the category of *khoz͡iaeva* (proprietors). Numbers for proprietors in Moscow represent *khoz͡iaeva s naemnymi rabochimi* (proprietors with employees) in 1882 and a sum of *khoz͡iaeva s naemnymi rabochimi* and *khoz͡iaeva, rabotai͡ushchie tol'ko pri pomoshchi chlenov sem'i* (proprietors, who employ only family members) in 1902 and 1912.

Sources:

Saint Petersburg: Author's calculations based on population census aggregated statistics for 1881 (*S.-Peterburg po perepisi 15-go dekabri͡a 1881 goda. T. 1: Naselenie* 1884, 308 table I), 1890 (*S.-Peterburg po perepisi 15 dekabri͡a 1890 goda. Ch. 1. Naselenie. Vyp. 2: Raspredelenie naseleni͡ia po zani͡atii͡am* 1892, 50 table IV), 1900 (*S.-Peterburg po perepisi 15 dekabri͡a 1900 goda. Naselenie. Vyp. 2. Raspredelenie naseleni͡ia po zani͡atii͡am* 1903, 86 table II-A), 1910 (*Petrograd po perepisi naseleni͡ia 15 dekabri͡a 1910 goda. Ch. 2. Raspredelenie naseleni͡ia po gruppam zani͡atiĭ* n.d., 22 table I).

Moscow: Author's calculations based on population census aggregated statistics for 1882 (*Perepis' Moskvy 1882 goda. Naselenie i zani͡atii͡a* 1885, 60 table IX), 1902 (*Perepis' Moskvy 1902 goda. Ch. 1: Naselenie. Vyp. 2 Naselenie g. Moskvy (bez prigorodov) po zani͡atii͡am, veroispovedani͡iu i rodnomu i͡azyku. Bezrabotnye i uvechnye* 1906, 3-5 table I), 1912 (*Statisticheskiĭ ezhegodnik goroda Moskvy i Moskovskoĭ gubernii. Statisticheskie dannye po gorodu Moskve za 1914-1925 g.g* 1927, 68 table 14).

Table 3

Proprietors and white-collar occupations in Moscow, 1912

Occupation	Men	Women	Women, percentage of total (%)
Proprietors with employees	37,647	13,371	26.21
Employed family members (*prikazchiki* and other commercial employees)	3,071	2,036	39.87
Bookkeepers, cashiers	4,376	1,268	22.47
Directors	3,516	256	6.79
Clerks / Retail clerks (*prikazchiki*)	31,478	2,407	7.10
Office clerks (*kontorshchiki*, etc.)	16,074	3,130	16.30
Agents, brokers etc.	1,954	28	1.41
Employed artisans	4,442	7	0.16

Sources: Moscow 1912 population census results (*Statisticheskiĭ ezhegodnik goroda Moskvy i Moskovskoĭ gubernii. Statisticheskie dannye po gorodu Moskve za 1914-1925 g.g* 1927, 68-69 table 14).

Apprenticeships and Formal Commercial Education

Apprenticeship did not have formal ties to a merchant guild structure, but was still perceived as a step toward acquiring merchant status. As mentioned above, entering the merchant estate in the nineteenth century required the purchase of a license, irrespective of training. At the age of sixteen (from 1863, seventeen) apprentices were legally considered to be second-level clerks, and thus required a special license (Kaplunovskiy 2006, 383). Hiring an apprentice also required a contract with specified terms and duration of service, but most apprenticeships were probably arranged informally (*Otkhozhie promysly* 1907, 9; see examples of contracts in Koreeva 2018, 121). They were not limited to boys, but urban censuses suggest that the number of girls undergoing a trade apprenticeship was extremely small (see Tables 4 and 5). Apprenticeships usually began at the age of fifteen or sixteen and lasted from two to six years, but apprentices as young as twelve were not uncommon. Underage apprentices were the most vulnerable category of workers: the law limited the value of goods an underage apprentice could oversee (and thus be liable for) to thirty rubles, but there were no restrictions on working hours or corporal punishment (Grigoriĭ Bertgoldt 1900, XXVIII).[4] Merchants often apprenticed their own sons, but also accepted children of other merchants or members of lower estates. After finishing their service apprentices could become clerks in the same firm or seek employment elsewhere. Young men who worked in their family business were expected to assume the leadership position once the leader of the firm passed away or stepped down. Many members of Moscow merchant elites worked as apprentices and clerks before becoming full owners (Ulianova 2000, 447). However, clerks from a non-merchant background aspired to become partners in the firm of their boss or to establish their own business.[5] According to contemporary observers, for many urban residents and peasants, securing merchant apprenticeships for their children meant giving them a chance at improving their fortunes (see, for example, A. Kolychev 1905, 164).

Even so, especially toward the end of the nineteenth century, many observers spoke about the inefficiencies of apprenticeships as a means of training. They argued that apprentices were mostly engaged in menial tasks such as cleaning and running errands, leaving no time for any meaningful training (see, for example, Kolychev 1905, 165; *Otkhozhie promysly* 1907, 9). The low educational quality of apprenticeships and incompetence of apprenticed clerks became one of the main arguments for establishment of formal commercial schools (Mikhail Kechedzhi-Shapovalov 1911, 258).

The first wave of formal commercial schools (largely equivalent to secondary schools) occurred in Europe in the second half of the eighteenth century (Hans Bödeker 2012; Lúcia Lima Rodrigues, Russell Craig, and Delfina Gomes 2007), and the Russian Empire was not an exception. Its first formal institution oriented to providing commerce-specific knowledge was founded as early as 1772 in Moscow by Ivan Betskoĭ, Catherine II's adviser on education, and prominent industrialist Prokofiĭ Demidov (Maslov 2001, 45-46). This school was supposed to inspire merchants across the Empire to open similar institutions (*Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoĭ Imperii. Sobranie I. Vol. XIX* 1830 № 13916, 673), but its effect was rather modest. By the end of the nineteenth century only about ten schools were founded (Bessolitsyn 2012, 16; see also Briantsev 2000, 272-288), and only under Witte's leadership (see below) did schools of commerce become more widespread.

[4] Not surprisingly, in the 1900s, when tensions between employers and workers were high, professional white-collar unions demanded a ban on the employment of children younger than sixteen and put a six-hour workday limit on employees under eighteen (Belin 1906, 30).

[5] Detailed consideration of how a clerk could become a merchant can be found in Ksenofont Polevoĭ's advice book (1847, 274-282; see also *Otkhozhie promysly* 1907, 10; Abram Gudvan 1925, 122-123).

Table 4
Commercial education in the Russian Empire, 1903 and 1913

City	Year	Schools	Total graduates	Current students	Female students, percentage of total (%)
Saint Petersburg	1903	15	-	2,202	-
	1913	49	17,424	10,076	24.39
Moscow	1903	14	-	8,824	-
	1913	36	16,930	12,023	22.23
Russian Empire	1903	147		29,439	7.02
	1913	462		95,645	21.07*

Sources: Author's calculations based on school statistics ("Kratkie svedeniia o kommercheskikh uchebnykh zavedeniiakh Ministerstva finansov v 1902-1903 uchebnom godu. Vyrezka iz zhurnala 'Tekhnicheskoe obrazovanie,' 1903." 1903, 110-118; *Statisticheskie svedeniia o sostoianii uchebnykh zavedenii, podvedomstvennykh Uchebnomu otdelu Ministerstva torgovli i promyshlennosti 1912-1913 uch. god.* 1914; Maslov 2001, 69,127). * Commercial Institutes of Moscow and Kyiv were excluded due to lack of gender-specific data.

Table 5
Children in commercial training in Moscow, 1882-1913

Student type	Year	Total	Female students, percentage of total (%)
Apprentices	1882	4,299	0.44
Apprentices	1902	7,128	0.74
Commercial school students	1903	1,695	1.77
Trade school students	1903	901	-
Apprentices	1912	10,604	1.66
Commercial school students	1913	3,373	16.16
Trade school students	1913	2,439	32.60

Note: Numbers of apprentices are *ucheniki* (apprentices) among workers in trade in 1882, *ucheniki torgovykh i kreditnykh uchrezhdenii* (apprentices in commerce and banks) in 1902, and *ucheniki torgovykh zavedenii i prochie* (apprentices in commerce and other [enterprises]) in 1912.
Sources: For apprentices: Author's calculations based on Moscow population census statistics (*Perepis' Moskvy 1902 goda. Ch. 1 : Naselenie. Vyp. 2 Naselenie g. Moskvy (bez prigorodov) po zaniatiiam, veroispovedaniiu i rodnomu iazyku. Bezrabotnye i uvechnye* 1906, 72-73, 104-105 table VI; *Statisticheskii ezhegodnik goroda Moskvy i Moskovskoĭ gubernii. Statisticheskie dannye po gorodu Moskve za 1914-1925 g.g* 1927, 72 table 14); for schools, see Table 4.

Commercial education at the highest level began to be offered relatively early in Europe, but for a long time it could not compete with other schools in respectability (Larsen 2011, 32-34). Training in natural sciences and engineering was seen as more scientific, and hence more relevant and prestigious for the bourgeois elite than more practice-oriented courses in commercial schools. Still, during the nineteenth century courses concerning economic life began to be integrated into these schools as well (Eric Godelier 2020, 222-223). This influence was first evident in the West of the Russian Empire: when the Polytechnic School was established in Riga in 1861, it had a department of commerce (Maslov 2001, 47). Later, a

newspaper, aligned with the interests of Moscow industrialists, stated the necessity of advanced knowledge of technical sciences for the formation of future leaders, capable of developing the country's industry.[6] Indeed, by the end of the nineteenth century it became common among affluent merchants to send their children to universities (Ulianova 2000, 445).

Similarly, discussions about commercial education were a part a of a larger conversation on the dissemination of technical knowledge and skills. After the Crimean War defeat, the lack of skilled labor became apparent, and traditional forms of professional training like apprenticeships and on-the-job training began to be viewed as outdated and inefficient (Joseph Bradley 2009, 169, 177). Thus, formal technical education came to be seen as a remedy for Russian backwardness, and several influential voluntary organizations promoting this cause were created, for example, the Russian Technical Society (*Imperatorskoe russkoe tekhnicheskoe obshchestvo*, est. 1866) and Society for the Dissemination of Technical Knowledge (*Obshchestvo rasprostraneni͡ia tekhnicheskikh znanii͡*, est. 1869). The state also supported the founding of technical schools. These schools were divided into three levels: the lowest prepared skilled workers for a certain industry, while mid-level schools trained technicians to act as intermediaries. At the highest level, technical education was recommended only for high-skilled professionals and executives (Ol'ga Kuzmina 2010, 114). Considering the division of education along the estate (*soslovie*) hierarchy, technical schools mostly targeted students of lower estates—low-income merchants, urban dwellers (*meshchane*) and former peasants.[7]

During the 1890s commercial education became more distinct from technical education and assumed a special role. In 1893 the new Minister of Finance, S.Yu. Witte, started an ambitious reform program to speed up Russian economic development. One of his policies was to transform entrepreneurship from custom-based ways of the old merchantry to a profession through a network of commercial schools. Previously schools of commerce were divided between three ministries—the Ministry of Enlightenment, Ministry of Empress Mary Institutes and Ministry of Finance. Witte transferred all schools to the authority of his own ministry. Then in 1896 the right to establish new commerce schools was granted to local governments, *soslovie* societies,[8] partnerships and private persons. This opened a path to the private commercial education sector (Bessolitsyn 2012; see also Maslov 2001). From the onset women had access to commercial education at all levels, and there was no distinction between men's and women's schools in the mandatory curricula. In addition to general subjects, schools were required to give courses on specialized subjects, depending on the school type (see below). These subjects included bookkeeping, commercial arithmetic, commercial correspondence in Russian and foreign languages, political economy, trade and industrial law, and knowledge of commodities (*Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoĭ Imperii. Sobranie III. Vol. XVI* 1899 № 12774, 281-288).

Voluntary organizations and societies played a crucial role in the development of commercial education. Societies for the Dissemination of Commercial Knowledge (*Obshchestvo rasprostraneni͡ia kommercheskih znanii*) were established in Saint Petersburg,

[6] See *Moskvich*. 1868. "Moskva, 27-go i͡anvari͡a." ["Moscow, January 27."] January 27.

[7] *Soslovie* is a Russian social category, which is notoriously difficult to define, due to its multitude of meanings and their evolution over time. But more broadly, *soslovie* membership regulated one's obligations to the state and their local communities, the kinds of rights and services one was entitled to, and their economic and educational opportunities (see Alison Smith 2014, ch. 1). In practice, membership in a *soslovie* meant an ascription to a local *obshchestvo*, literally society. These societies oversaw the collection of taxes and provision of certain social services. Distinction between "higher" (with most rights and privileges) and "lower" estates (with most obligations) persisted in legal codes and public discourse more generally until the fall of the tsarist regime.

[8] See footnote 6.

Moscow, Kyiv, Simbirsk, Odesa, and other cities across the Empire. One of the most active was the Society in Moscow (commonly referred to by its abbreviation MORKO),[9] founded in 1897 by Alekseĭ Vishn͡iakov, a wealthy businessman from a prominent merchant family. Not only businessowners organized in this way. One of the first commercial schools for women was established by the Moscow Society of Merchant Clerks in 1900 and explicitly targeted daughters and sisters of the Society's members (*Ocherk p͡iatidesi͡atiletneĭ de͡iatel'nosti* 1913, 50-51). Graduates of this school were qualified to become primary school teachers, needlework teachers and low-level commercial clerks.

The German system of commercial education became a model, but not all types of schools succeeded in the Russian context (Bessolitsyn 2014). The new system of commercial education inherited the social status divisions of the earlier schools. Children of lower estates—peasants, urban dwellers, craftsmen, servants, shopkeepers—usually entered trade schools (*torgovye shkoly*). They enrolled children older than twelve and required some basic level of schooling. The curricula lasted from one to three years. Commercial schools with programs of three, seven and eight years (*kommercheskie uchilishcha*), that served as a step toward higher education, had a hierarchy of their own. While schools with the cheapest tuition fees were accessible to urban dwellers and domestic servants, the middle level was preferred by merchants and low-ranking civil servants. The most prestigious institutions with big budgets and high fees attracted children of the highest officials and wealthy businessowners (Vakhromeeva 2009, 151-152).

As in general education, the majority of secondary commercial schools were single-gender. Although the law mandated schools to offer the same special subjects to boys and girls, specialists in commercial education debated whether girls were capable of studying on the same level as boys and whether changes should be made to the curricula to alleviate their study load.[10] Even though the side favoring parity in boys' and girls' education had more support, curricula of boys' and girls' schools still reflected the expected difference in their life trajectories. Schools introduced additional subjects that were "in their students' interest" such as woodwork for boys but sewing, pedagogy and hygiene for girls—subjects that were meant to prepare them for marriage and motherhood (*Materialy* 1902, 423; Sakulin 1907, 40).

The network of commercial education included courses and evening classes which were often aimed at practitioners who wished to increase their qualifications (Vakhromeeva 2009, 151). In addition to courses run by non-profit organizations, there were private for-profit short-term courses. Run as businesses, they relied heavily on advertising in newspapers and charged students not only for tuition but also for study materials (Kechedzhi-Shapovalov 1911, 224). Interestingly, the first private courses in commercial disciplines for women were established by women themselves. In Saint Petersburg M.M. Krasnova opened the first-ever such course in bookkeeping, and year later P.O. Ivashint͡seva started a course on commerce (Vakhromeeva 2009, 149-150).

The highest commercial education was provided within polytechnics, but in the late 1800s specialized commerce institutes opened across the Empire. The first institute of this kind was also founded by MORKO. From the onset the school accepted both men and women, and the tuition was mixed, which was almost unprecedented for higher education in the Russian Empire. In 1912 it had 820 female students, who comprised 22 percent of all students.[11] Another major commercial institute in Kyiv was also mixed, though initially

[9] MORKO stands for *Moskovskoe Ocshchestvo Rasprostranen͡iia Kommercheskogo Obrazovan͡iia*, that is, the Moscow Society for the Dissemination of Commercial Education.

[10] See transcripts of the commercial school principal's meetings (*Materialy* 1901, 35-36; *Materialy* 1902, 42; see also P.N. Sakulin 1907, 40).

[11] My calculation based on Otd. 9, Table 28 in Statistical Yearbook of Moscow (*Statisticheskiĭ ezhegodnik goroda Moskvy. God tretiĭ. 1909/1910* 1913, 206).

conceived as a women-only school (A.L. Kishtymov 2017, 76). In 1910 357 women studied there; this amounted to 15 percent of students (Kishtymov 2017, 78).

Can the higher proportion of women among office workers (Table 3) be attributed to the introduction of formal commercial education? Although it would be difficult to test this relationship with available data, statistics on commercial education for Saint Petersburg and Moscow reveal that women benefited from the formal commercial school system (see Tables 4 and 5). Over ten years from 1903 to 1913, the number of commercial schools tripled in the capital, and more than doubled in Moscow. By the 1910s in both Saint Petersburg and Moscow women comprised more than 20 percent of students in commercial schools at all levels and only 1 percent of trade apprentices. However, overall apprentices still constituted a significant share of youth receiving business training.

Women's Competence before and after the Rise of Commercial Schools

Women Learning by Doing: Taking Over the Family Business

Prior to the inclusion of women in the commercial education system, most women in white-collar positions were businessowners themselves. As discussed above, although trade apprenticeships were not formally restricted to girls, in practice families preferred girls to learn crafts at home or to be placed with a mistress, usually in the garment or food industry (Boris Gorshkov 2009, 21-23; Vakhromeeva 2014). Nevertheless, like their male relatives, women who were born into merchant families or entered the merchant estate through marriage could learn through practice. In some cases when the male head of the business became seriously ill or died, his wife took full control of the company. Although there is ample evidence of female succession (see literature review in Abdrakhmanov 2017), it is difficult to say how much women's skill levels differed from those of men. Like men, they often relied on the assistance of their head clerks or other relatives, which could have compensated for their lack of knowledge and experience.

It would be wrong to suggest that women who employed head clerks or their sons had less control of their business. One account of female leadership in the early 1860s suggests that authority did not rest on expertise. Alekseĭ Vikulovich Morozov (1857-1934), descendant of a prominent textile manufacturing dynasty, left a memoir about his grandmother Evdokiia Demidovna Morozova (1797-1866). His father Eliseĭ Savvich Morozov founded a dyeworks factory in 1837, but later distanced himself from the business.[12] According to Alekseĭ Morozov, when his grandmother stepped in, she managed the factory "uncontrolledly and haphazardly" (Nataliia Filatkina and Morozov 2004, 552). His account of her competence is quite damning:

> She had very little regard for the rules of trade, and often set production targets on a whim. … Dressed like a peasant with a black cotton headscarf, she waddled around the house or the office always carrying a big scrappy bag, where she kept all the factory's cash. … No transaction records were kept, and all [my] father's attempts to start keeping books were unsuccessful. "Earn your own [fortune]", my grandmother said, "and keep your records". (Filatkina and Morozov 2004, 552)

The intellectual and emotional distance between Evdokiia Morozova and her far more refined and better educated grandson is evident in his description and its accuracy perhaps should be taken with a grain of salt. After all, Morozov conceded that under her "primitive" leadership, their factory generated profits (Filatkina and Morozov 2004, 552). Nevertheless,

[12] While Alekseĭ Morozov maintained that his grandfather was not involved in running the factory due to illness, later scholars point towards his devotion to Old Belief and desire to dedicate himself to religious study as a potential reason (see, for example, Bowman 2003, 324).

his account suggests that despite the more expert criticisms of her son, and possibly of other men around her, Morozova's authority was not challenged.

In many respects, women's business leadership was very similar to men's. One of the most significant traits of Russian entrepreneurs and executives was a paternalistic attitude toward workers (see, for example, Alfred Rieber 1991; Jo Ann Ruckman 1984; Mark Steinberg 1992, 56-61). On the progressive side, this paternalistic attitude took the form of institutional improvements, such as equipping factory sites with hospitals, schools and even theaters. More traditional charitable efforts included personalized acts of benevolence, gifts or small trade-offs. For instance, Mariia Morozova of Nikolskaia Manufacturing, another Morozov family company, was known to exhibit both traits, making substantial investments in social care for her workers but also giving all brides-to-be a small piece of fabric as a wedding present (Linda Bowman 2003, 329; Irina Potkina 2004). Characteristic of male and female executives alike, women's paternalism was represented with a special emphasis on their extraordinary sincerity and compassion. An obituary for Evdokiia Maksimovich, a Saint Petersburg chocolate factory executive, described her as "the most big-hearted proprietress" (*serdechneishaia knoziaika*), whose life was dedicated "to the *service* of her factory workers".[13]

Generations of female executives who followed Evdokiia Morozova had a better reputation due to their higher expertise. Often, they were born into wealth and were home-schooled. For instance, Rozaliia Polyakova—the wife of prominent Jewish banker and industrialist Lazar Polyakov and daughter of well-off Moscow merchant Peĭsakh Vydrin—was deeply involved in the family business and was known to advise her husband on financial matters (Gregory Freeze and ChaeRan Freeze 2019, 29-30). In some cases, mothers passed on their business knowledge to their daughters. For instance, Mariia Morozova assumed the role of Nikolskaia Manufacturing's main creditor from the early 1880s. She financed the factory out of her own capital through bills of exchange, which after the death of her husband in 1889 became the main source of credit (Potkina 2004, 64-65). Her mother M.K. Simonova, who discounted bills of exchange on a regular basis, was said to have told her how to do this (T.P. Morozova and I.V. Potkina 1998, 115). Another prominent merchant, shoe-factory owner Nataliia Andreeva, hired university lecturers as private tutors for her daughters. One of them, Alexandra Andreeva, later became her right hand in business, assuming the role of head accountant (Ulianova 2022b, 305-314). The Morozov dynasty provides yet another example. Varvara Morozova inherited the majority stake in Tverskaia Manufacturing from her husband Abram Morozov in 1882 and served on the board of directors until her own death in 1917. A daughter of another prominent textile entrepreneur Alekseĭ Khludov, Morozova was home-schooled and according to her diaries, was very passionate about learning (Ulianova 2022a, 470). Later memoirists and former business associates like Nikolaĭ Varentsov or Pavel Buryshkin praised her progressive views and leadership qualities (Buryshkin 1990, 121-123; Varentsov 1999, 672). The latter also believed that Morozova became the inspiration for Anna Stanitsyna, a character from Pyotr Boborykin's most well-known novel *Kitay-gorod* (Buryshkin 1990, 122). Boborykin's representation of merchantry stands in stark contrast to his better-known colleague, playwright Alexander Ostrovsky, who depicted the world of 1850s' and 1860s' merchants as one of greediness, intellectual backwardness and cruelty. Boborykin captured the next generation of Moscow merchants, who not only oversaw large enterprises and amassed considerable wealth, but also acquired refined habits and the lifestyle of the nobility. A follower of the French naturalist school and Émile Zola in particular, he left very detailed observations on the operational and private side of Moscow's business world, which some contemporaries regarded as "gossip" (Anna Volkova 1913, 122).

[13] Impressionist. 1903. "Serdechneishaia khoziaika." ["The Most Big-Hearted Proprietress."] *Novosti*, April 9. Emphasis in the original.

Although the narrative of Boborykin's *Kitay-gorod* is not centered around female characters, their story arcs provide a very insightful perspective on women's position within the business world. Varvara Morozova's alleged fictional double Anna Stanit͡syna is portrayed as a confident executive of a large textile manufacturing enterprise, who knows her market, her product and her factories' operations very well (Boborykin 1883a, 97-98). However, the novel makes clear that she had to assume this leadership role because of her husband's utter incompetence. Opportunity and charisma are perceived by other characters as the recipe for Stanit͡syna's success. As one of them remarks comparing Stanit͡syna and her younger relative:

> Even this Li͡ubasha, no need to say she is vulgar, but she does have character … [Like Stanit͡syna] she too must have a hundred thousand [rubles as] dowry, and so will she be in charge of a big trading house or a factory, if her husband turns out to be rather bad. (Boborykin 1883b, 166-167)

Scholars of the Moscow business elite remarked that women's participation in the family business should have become less likely as enterprises grew larger and more complex with their administration requiring specialized education (Muriel Joffe and Adele Lindemeyr 1998, 104). Indeed, adoption of a refined lifestyle prompted some merchant families to raise their daughters as cultured socialites rather than business practitioners (Freeze and Freeze 2019, 22, 30, 32, 37; Joffe and Lindemeyr 1998). Meanwhile, women who were active in the family business were sometimes treated with contempt by male professionals.[14] Census results in Saint Petersburg and Moscow reveal that the share of women proprietors with employees, i.e., organizations with a degree of complexity, remained relatively stable from the 1880s (see Table 1).

Although merchant apprenticeships were not intended for women, this did not prevent them from acquiring business authority and competence in other ways. However, women's claim over property and their place in family hierarchy played a more decisive role. Meanwhile, men without such claims could use apprenticeship to achieve merchant status by gradually developing skill and merit. The spread of formal commercial education changed the status quo by providing equal training opportunities to women and men, but it also developed new conceptualizations of masculine and feminine identities in business organization.

Masculinity as a Source of Legitimacy in Commercial Education

Despite governmental support and many grassroots initiatives, the legitimacy and prestige of commercial education in the eyes of the business community was not certain. This situation is reflected in the memoirs of a prominent member of Moscow's business elite, Pavel Buryshkin, who graduated from the Moscow Commercial Institute in 1911. A year later the institute received the right to award official degrees, and MORKO founder Alekseĭ Vishni͡akov urged Buryshkin to pass the exams once again and write a dissertation to benefit from this privilege. Buryshkin agreed, although, as he pointed out, by then he was already a member of the Moscow City Duma and the Stock Exchange Committee, so he did not need a degree to advance his standing (Buryshkin 1990, 93-95). By persuading a person like Buryshkin to obtain the degree, Vishni͡akov probably sought to elevate the prestige of the institution within the business community. As Buryshkin recalled, despite commercial institutes having had extensive curricula, excellent professorial staff and modern facilities, the business community at large considered such in-depth theoretical training unnecessary: "[E]ven in the large [commercial] hubs like Moscow and Kharkiv, it was easier to get a job at a trade firm for young

[14] A factory inspector Aleksandr Klepikov thus characterised a mother of one industrialist in his memoir as "mama (*mamasha*), meddling with factory affairs" (Klepikov 1911, 13).

men with lower commercial education … than for those with specialist degrees" (Buryshkin 1990, 93). Although Buryshkin concluded that the highest commercial education had very limited impact on the business world, his remark about the success of middle-level candidates can be regarded as a testimony of the appreciation for basic commercial training among businessowners.

Attempts to elevate the status of business education conformed with a larger agenda of restoring the reputation of the commercial classes in society in general. In her research on retail culture in late Imperial Russia, Marjorie Hilton observed a conceptual shift instigated by activist merchants and allied journalists, who formulated an ideal of modernized commerce run by refined businessmen—*kommersanty* (Hilton 2012, 110-115). A loan word from French, it signaled an orientation toward Western norms and practices. *Kommersanty* was often contrasted with Russian words for merchants (*kupt͡sy, kupechestvo*), which were associated with the old ways of doing business, where cheating, rudeness and authoritarianism were supposedly commonplace. Discourse on commercial education contributed to that shift. The need for some level of specialized training was frequently mentioned by journalists and education experts in the early twentieth century. As one critic in the daily *Golos Moskvy* noted:

> Some members of merchantry [*kupechestvo*] and the press consider ... commercial education to be a luxury, unjustified by the circumstances of our trade and industry; however, they forget that an executive of large enterprise should be familiar with issues of global significance … [they forget that] contemporary merchant [*kommersant*] needs the knowledge that neither city schools, nor apprenticeship can provide.[15]

Similarly, another critic argued that special training in commerce had become indispensable to success in business, as world trade became more globalized and commerce operations more complex. To him, the traditional learning through practice was obsolete: "the merchant (*kommersant*) of the future will no longer learn the necessary skills at the cashier's or clerk's desk, nor at the counter of his own trade house" (Kechedzhi-Shapovalov 1905, 4). Considering the accessibility of commercial education, this discourse may seem gender neutral. A closer look at discussions around commercial education and its application reveals a significant gendered difference.

Undoubtedly, educated white-collar specialists were more immediate products of the commercial school system than entrepreneurs. Nevertheless, discursively commercial education for boys held a similar promise of elevation to positions of authority as trade apprenticeship. One commentator remarked: "when [boys] move from the countryside into the city to be apprenticed, under favorable circumstances they could rise [above the crowd] and become *independent* [business] owners. Attending a trade school is one of these circumstances".[16] An occupational survey conducted by a male commercial school alumni organization in 1913 reveals that around 20 percent of respondents oversaw their own businesses, not that far behind civil service and commercial white-collar work, which comprised around 30 percent each (see Table 6). Even in the group that graduated less than a decade earlier, the share of businessowners was as high as 16 percent. This gives reason to believe that commercial schools were not only intended for but indeed produced professional businessmen, the *kommersant*.

[15] G. 1908. "Torgovye muzei." ["Trade Museums."] *Golos Moskvy*, March 21.

[16] Kiuntsel' V. 1910. "Razvitie nashego kommercheskogo obrazovaniia." ["Development of Our Commercial Education."] *Promyshlennost' i Torgovlia*, August 15. Emphasis in the original.

Table 6
Occupations of Saint Petersburg Imperial Commercial School graduates in 1913

Occupational group	Total graduates since 1850	Sector Share (%)	Graduated since 1903	Sector Share (%)
State service	432	30.95	87	22.72
Private sector	420	30.09	100	26.11
Proprietors	274	19.63	61	15.93
Public service	62	4.44	10	2.61
Liberal professions	61	4.37	7	1.83
Continuing education	114	8.17	108	28.2
Military service	9	0.64	9	2.35
No occupation	24	1.72	1	0.26
Total	1396	100	383	100
Occupation not specified	136			
Did not respond	457			
Dead	629			
Grand total	2618			

Sources: Alumni survey results (*Pamiatnaia knizhka vospitannikov Imperatorskogo S.-Peterburgskogo kommercheskogo uchilishcha, okonchivshikh kurs v 1850-1913 gg* 1913, 193-194).

Commercial Education for Women: Future Millionaires or Ideal Employees?

Before the introduction of women's commercial schools in the late 1890s, options to obtain specialized training for women were limited. Most technical skills were meant to be studied only by men. Women's technical education in the form of apprenticeships and classes at special schools primarily consisted of sewing and needlework. This limitation was criticized from different positions. Educational specialists were concerned with seamstresses' low pay and argued that women could and should earn a better living doing other jobs (Ia. T Mikhailovskiĭ 1890, 2). Others remarked on the lack of opportunities for women of higher statuses. One specialist noted that "there are plenty of young women who will not be content being a seamstress even for a decent pay, as they recognize their estate status [*soslovnost'*] and have pride" (V.I. Sreznevskiĭ 1890, 229). At the same time, conservative critics were worried that lack of professional schools open to girls, would lead to oversaturation of gymnasia—secondary schools aimed at the nobility and intelligentsia—with students of lower estates.[17] Gymnasium curricula for girls were shorter than for boys and did not include subjects necessary to continue on to higher education. Women were not allowed to enter Russian universities, but to pursue a liberal profession they could obtain qualifications at special university-level courses for women or abroad. Finding employment presented another set of difficulties. A gymnasium diploma was sufficient, however, to become a primary school teacher or a governess, but for higher levels of teaching a special course in pedagogy was required. Conservatives emphasized the difficulties female graduates faced in securing teaching

[17] Conservatives had even bigger concerns about the presence of lower-class boys and Jews in elite schools. See, for example, *Rus'*. 1884. "Moskva, 15 avgusta". ["Moscow, August 15."] August 15.

positions as well as the alienation from their parents that educated women from lower estates were believed to experience.[18]

These conservative arguments inspired possibly the first project for a women's technical school with a commercial component. In 1880 Paulina Piotrowska, a well-known activist for women's professional education,[19] published a project of a school charter, accompanied by a long essay elaborating her vision for the school and the overall aim of technical education for women. Her proposal is a valuable insight into the elite's conception of the middle-estate working woman. Similarly to other conservative critics, she lamented the increasing demand for gymnasia schooling among middle-estate families, stressing the difficulty in finding employment and general uselessness of such education for "common women in need of work" (Piotrowska 1880, 4, 31). In Piotrowska's opinion, the most desirable career for them lay in trade and industry as administrative employees, such as cashiers and bookkeepers, but also as businessowners. Special qualities like "exceptional talent in commerce, quick-thinking, precision, arithmetic, attention to detail, diligence and ability to compromise" gave women particular advantages over men (Piotrowska 1880, 8).[20] But rather than a potential for financial independence, Piotrowska viewed them as homemakers' virtues. Referring to a successful German example, she believed that appropriate schooling should include household management skills, such as cooking, cleaning, sewing, etc. These skills combined with training in accounting, business correspondence, knowledge of commodities, currencies and foreign language would allow any woman to succeed in business, Piotrowska (1880, 23-28) argued; businesses with the most potential for women correspond to traditional feminine segments, for example, hospitality, food and dressmaking. Among positive examples of female entrepreneurship Piotrowska (1880, 46-49) referred to the success of Finnish dairy manufacturers and a noblewoman who established a glove factory.

No less importantly, these schools were supposed to educate young women about the best practices of motherhood. In line with the idea of pedagogical motherhood, Piotrowska (1880, 35) claimed that raising children is women's essential "civic duty" and women need adequate knowledge to succeed in it. Piotrowska (1880, 24) considered motherhood to be a full-time job and regarded business skills as a kind of insurance in case a woman stays unmarried or becomes a widow. Thus, Piotrowska (1880, 21) proposed the notion of smart, elevated domesticity, which prioritized motherhood, but where pursuit of financial gains was regarded as an appropriate channel for agency and ambition: "[if male] industrialists and merchants [*kommersanty*] earn millions, why shouldn't women try improving their fortunes in the same way…".

It Is difficult to say how widely Piotrowska's pamphlet was circulated, but she popularized her ideas on women's professional education in a series of public lectures held in various towns across the Russian Empire.[21] Furthermore, similar interpretations of middle-estate

[18] See, for example, M. Katkov 1884. "K voprosu o zhenskom obrazovanii. Progimnazii ili rukodel'nye shkoly." ["On the Question of Women's Education. Pro-gymnasia or Artisanal Schools."] *Moskovskie vedomosti*. April 7. See also M. U. 1884. "Zhenskoe slovo o vospitanii zhenshchin." ["A Woman's Word on Women's Upbringing."] *Rus'*. April 15.

[19] Also known as Paulina Korwin-Piotrowska. See Piotrowska's short biography with description of her accomplishments in promoting women's professional education in *Penzenskie gubernskie vedomosti*. 1892. "P.K. Korvin-Piotrovskai͡a." October 21.

[20] This belief in women's practical minds had probably stemmed from J.S. Mill, whose work *The Subjection of Women* was well-known in Russia.

[21] See reports about her lectures given in Moscow, Kazan, Penza, Perm and Kharkiv in *Penzenskie gubernskie vedomosti*. 1892. "P.K. Korvin-Piotrovskai͡a." October 21; *Penzenskie gubernskie vedomosti*. 1892. "Lekt͡sii͡a P.K. Korvin-Piotrovskoĭ." ["Lecture by P.K. Korwin-Piotrowska."] October 25; *Permskie gubernskie vedomosti*. 1892. "Khronika." ["Chronicle."] December 2; *I͡Uzhnyĭ kraĭ*. 1895. "Lekt͡sii͡a g-zhi Korvin-Piotrovskoĭ." ["Lecture by Mrs. P.K. Korwin-Piotrowska."] November 21.

domesticity gained prominence at the time. For instance, new popular advice literature on consumption and household management was addressed primarily to women (Catriona Kelly 2001, 160-166, 171-172). Almost two decades after Piotrowska's publication, another pamphlet entitled *Family and Women's Labor* (1897) echoed her arguments. The author—L. A. Zolotarev—disapproved of married women working, referring to its detrimental impact on household, family life and happiness. Entrepreneurship, on the other hand, was regarded there as an appropriate channel for women's "creativity", which could "benefit our industry" (Zolotarev 1897, 55). The author gave two positive examples: the first, a woman who developed a production of artificial flowers, after studying the craft in Paris; the second, a woman who learned to dry fruits and vegetables and organized the manufacturing of these goods (ibid.). Thus, women's entrepreneurial success is illustrated by businesses associated with a homemaker's tasks like decoration or food preservation.

When the reform of commercial education began in the early 1890s, schools for women also received more attention in public discourse and rose in prestige. While Piotrowska considered her school to be suitable for women of lower estates, in the 1890s educational specialists argued that higher commercial education was needed to provide respectable earning opportunities for women of more privileged backgrounds. A congress for specialists in technical education featured a presentation by Aleksandr Strannoli͡ubskiĭ, professor of mathematics and a staunch advocate for women's education, who served in various positions at several schools for women.[22] This presentation outlined his view on upper-secondary professional education suitable for "women of the intelligentsia". While most space in his speech was devoted to teaching, the suitability of commercial white-collar work for women was also discussed. Similarly to Piotrowska, he stressed inherent female qualities that gave women an advantage over men in these occupations: "conscientiousness, thoroughness and in particular … lack of neglect and truancy" (Strannoli͡ubskiĭ 1890, 224-225). However, in contrast to Piotrowska, who envisioned women's success as entrepreneurs, Strannoli͡ubskiĭ considered women only as employees: cashiers, bookkeepers, and clerks. To strengthen his argument, he pointed toward appreciation of these female specialists, expressed by "a respectable and well-known Russian businessman [*kommercheskiĭ dei͡atel'*]" who said that women were better employees than men because they "do not drink nor party [*ne kuti͡at*]" (Strannoli͡ubskiĭ 1890, 224). Strannoli͡ubskiĭ considered professional skills and employment not only as insurance for non-marriageable women, but as a necessary step before marriage. In his view, professional life allowed women to mature intellectually and physically and, when married, increased the chances for a harmonious union between spouses (Strannoli͡ubskiĭ 1890, 204). This view also prescribed the appropriate age—from late teens to mid-twenties—for female clerical work. Thus, for Strannoli͡ubskiĭ women's entry into the labor market was a temporary occupation, and not a career that implied upward mobility.

Overall, if the dominant issues in early debates on the "woman question" revolved around women's right for spiritual and intellectual growth and ability to succeed in certain professions, in the early twentieth century the focus shifted more strongly to employment.[23] As one commentator put it, the old question "can women have jobs?" was replaced by "*should* women compete with men for their jobs?"[24] One of the most vocal supporters of women's integration into the labor market was commercial school teacher Mikhail Kechedzhi-Shapovalov, who published extensively on commercial education, economics and women's

[22] See biographical sketch on Strannoli͡ubskiĭ in *Obrazovanie*. 1893. "Aleksandr Nikolaevich Strannoli͡ubskiĭ." № 7-8.

[23] One author who argued in the early 1860s that women's liberation is impossible without financial independence was economist Mari͡a Vernadskaia (Vernadskai͡a 1862).

[24] I.M. Stremovskiĭ 1903. "Zhenskiĭ trud." ["Women's Labor."] *Novosti*, March 24. This essay provoked numerous reactions, which were published in the following issues.

liberation.[25] He pointed toward economic reasons driving women to the labor market. According to Kechedzhi-Shapovalov, the development of industrial means of production had rendered women's role in domestic production "economically absurd". In other words, he wrote, women ceased being producers and became consumers.[26] Kechedzhi-Shapovalov's assessment contradicted popular advice by the likes of Piotrowska and Zolotarev, who saw business potential in female domestic labor and presented it as a guarantee for women's financial security. Instead, he encouraged professional education leading to employment, including schools of commerce. Like Strannoli͡ubskiĭ, when discussing the benefits of commercial education for women, he mentioned the praise female administrative employees receive: "Moscow merchants [*kommersanty*] have spoken strongly about preferring female clerks to their male counterparts, as the former are more thorough and careful in their work" (Kechedzhi-Shapovalov 1902, 149).

Another teacher, Joseph Goldstein, also mentioned employment opportunities as a major benefit of studying economics for women.[27] Even so, he described teaching girls as a frustrating task. In a public lecture he lamented passivity of his students, the cause of which he saw in upbringing (*vospitanie*): "*Do not do this or that, you are not a boy!* This is the phrase which defines the upbringing of contemporary women. [Such upbringing] destroys all originality, self-reliance and initiative [*init͡siativa*]".[28] He then complained that female students, albeit hardworking and meticulous, are prone to memorizing textbooks instead of actually understanding of the topic.[29] Such complaints about women's shallow learning style were a common trope among conservative writers, and were meant to undermine the women's struggle for equal rights to education.[30] Here, however, Goldstein implicitly suggests that possessing the qualities that make women ideal candidates for clerical jobs means lacking the qualities associated with entrepreneurship, like initiative and originality, and asserts the masculine nature of the latter.[31]

One more reason why educated women had a hard time claiming managerial authority is related to the respectability of female clerical work. To be fair, the image of male clerks in popular media was far from perfect. Like *kupet͡s* merchants, old-fashioned clerks were described as ignorant, untrustworthy, and despotic.[32] Still, the reputation of female clerks was

[25] Kichedzhi-Shapovalov received the degree of candidate of commerce from Riga Polytechnical Institute. He taught at higher commercial, trade and industry, and accounting courses in Saint Petersburg (Kechedzhi-Shapovalov 1911).

[26] M. Kechedzhi-Shapovalov 1901. "Istoricheskie sud'by zhenshchiny". ["Woman's Historical Fate."] *Sankt-Peterburgskie Vedomosti*, November 11.

[27] Goldstein taught political economy and led seminars at Moscow University, Moscow Commercial Institute and Higher Courses for Women.

[28] *Golos Moskvy*. 1909. "O zhenshchine". ["About a Woman."] March 6.

[29] Perhaps not surprisingly, according to the *Golos Moskvy* reporter, women in the audience were not impressed by Goldstein's speech: "A student, Ms Gurevich, suggested that the opinion leaders should re-educate themselves first, abandon this condescending attitude towards women pursuing education … and only then demand initiative and some 'civic courage' (*grazhdanskoe muzhestvo*)" (ibid.).

[30] See M. Pogodin 1868. "Emansipat͡siia zhenshchiny." ["Women's Emancipation."] *Russkiĭ*, November 12; *Russkie Vedomosti*. 1898. "Zhenskiĭ vopros na s''ezde germanskikh vracheĭ". ["Woman's Question at the Meeting of German Physicians."] June 26.

[31] Qualities like creativity, risk-taking and profit-seeking came to be associated with entrepreneurship and private initiative in Russian economic discourse as early as the mid-nineteenth century (Alberto Masoero 1994).

[32] On the representation of clerks in Russian classical literature see Kaplunovskiy 2006, 390-396.

arguably worse: their work was associated with immoral behavior and prostitution.[33] The association was so strong that some observers believed clerks to be the dominant category among sex workers (Gudvan 1925, 141), although contemporary statistics did not support this notion.[34] After the revolution of 1905, when white-collar commercial workers began organizing and voicing their political demands (see Victoria Bonnell 1983), vulnerability to sexual predators became one of the main issues raised in relation to female clerks.[35] The most frequently cited reason behind supposedly high rates of female clerks among sex workers was low pay and the necessity to seek extra income. Women working in retail reported that their monthly wages were half of those received by their male counterparts, despite the same hours (13-15 hours per day) and often performing the same tasks as men (if not more). According to one female clerk, in the capital in the early 1910s male clerks' monthly salary on average was 35-40 rubles, whereas female clerks earned 20-25 rubles, and in smaller shops as little as 6-18 rubles.[36] On top of that, according to multiple testimonies, shopkeepers required women to dress well and maintain attractive looks, which put an extra strain on their budget.[37] Moreover, female retail clerks frequently complained about sexual abuse and harassment from their clients and superiors.[38]

Female office clerks, who were more likely to get specialized training, were in a better position than retail clerks, receiving on average a higher salary and working shorter hours.[39] Still, they too reported the threat of sexual abuse and prostitution. One office clerk under the pen name R.O. B-ver wrote: "you could rarely find a decent, well-paid job at a bank, without bribing the director or other superior with *in kind* contribution. I could name a dozen young women who made brilliant careers, only thanks to being agreeable".[40] B-ver did not elaborate

[33] See, for example, satirical texts where it is implied that female clerks grant sexual favors. Markiz de Trubakur. 1880. "Vygodnai͡a torgovli͡a." ["Profitable Trade."] *Shut*, August 27; Bazil'. 1891. "Negodovanie." ["Indignation."] *Shut*, July 13.

[34] According to the Imperial Statistical Office and research conducted in Saint Petersburg by Obozenko the largest occupational group among sex workers were domestic servants (45 and 37.5 percent respectively), while clerks comprised only around 1 percent (Andreĭ Dubrovskiĭ 1887, XXXIII; Petr Obozenko 1896, 22-23).

[35] See section *Prikazschichiĭ vopros* [*Clerks' Question*] in *Novai͡a Rus'*: Prodavshchi͡tsa. [Saleswoman] 1908. "Zhenskiy trud." ["Women's Labor."] *Novai͡a Rus'*, November 7; Prodavshchi͡tsa A. [Saleswoman A.] 1908. "V Novo-Aleksandrovskom rynke." ["At the Novo-Aleksandrovskii Market."] *Novai͡a Rus'*, November 18; Prodavshchi͡tsa Gostinago dvora F. [Saleswoman F. from Gostiny Dvor] 1906. "Obshchiĭ li soi͡uz dli͡a zhenshchin ili spetsial'no zhenskiĭ?" ["A Joint or a Women-only Union?"] *Novai͡a Rus'*, November 23; R.O. B-ver 1908. "Zhenkiĭ trud v liberal'nykh professii͡akh." ["Women's Labor in the Liberal Professions."] *Novai͡a Rus'*, November 28; *Novai͡a Rus'*. 1908. "Trud zhenshchin v torgovle." ["Women's Labor in Trade."] December 16; *Novai͡a Rus'*. 1908. "Zhenskiĭ trud v torgovle." ["Women's Labor in Trade."] December 31; some of these testimonies also cited by Gudvan (1925, 136-141). See also report by L. Ozinskaya on female clerks in Odesa delivered on the first Women's Congress (1909, 340-343).

[36] *Vestnik Prikazchika*. 1912. "Zhenshchiny-prodavshchi͡tsy." ["Saleswomen."] September 25.

[37] Prodavshchitsa. 1908. "Zhenskiĭ trud." ["Women's Labor."] *Novai͡a Rus'*, November 7; Gostinodvorka. 1913. "K prodavshchi͡tsam." ["To Saleswomen."] *Vestnik Prikazchika*, № 7. See also Gudvan 1905, 92; Ozinskaya 1909, 342.

[38] A. Prodavshchi͡tsa 1908. "V Novo-Aleksandrovskom rynke." ["At the Novo-Aleksandrovskii Market."] *Novai͡a Rus'*, November 18; *Vestnik Prikazchika*. 1912. "Zhenshchiny-prodavshchi͡tsy." ["Saleswomen."] September 25. See also Ozinskaya 1909, 342.

[39] R.O. B-ver 1908. "Zhenkiĭ trud v liberal'nykh professii͡akh." ["Women's Labor in the Liberal Professions."] *Novaia Rus'*, November 28. See also report by P.P. Radushina delivered to the first Women's Congress (Radushina 1909, 396-397).

[40] R.O. B-ver 1908. "Zhenkiĭ trud v liberal'nykh professii͡akh." ["Women's Labor in the Liberal Professions."] *Novai͡a Rus'*, November 28.

what a “brilliant career” meant for clerks like her, but she made it clear that professional merit played a far less important role in promotions for women than for men.

The realities of female clerks were also different from the image suggested by advocates of female commercial education. Notably, trade unions of clerical workers resisted the categorization of white-collar work as a temporary occupation for young women and consistently included maternity leave in their demands (A. Belin 1906, 11, 31). Female clerks also lamented the age discrimination that made it harder for women in their thirties to get a job, as employers believed them to be “too old”.[41] While the likes of Strannoli͡ubskiĭ and Kechedzhi-Shapovalov cited anonymous businessmen praising female clerks for diligence and discipline, from the point of view of female workers they were driven by other motives. As one saleswoman put it on the pages of the clerical union paper, “capitalists” hire women because they cost less and are easier to control.[42] All in all, considering devaluation and commodification of their labor, lack of respect and an extremely subjugated position evident in testimonies from women in white-collar commercial jobs, it becomes clear that the idea of them climbing the social ladder by means of their qualifications and experience as male clerks aspired to was hardly plausible in the minds of contemporary men.

Discussion and Concluding Comments

In this article, I investigated how the introduction of formal commercial schools impacted women’s opportunities to receive specialized training as well as how their qualities were perceived and valued. I show that exclusion from trade apprenticeships did not prevent women from becoming proficient in business matters, but their access was mostly limited to women from merchant backgrounds. These women could claim their authority in similar ways to their male counterparts through legitimacy of their ownership underpinned by paternalistic ideology as well as expertise, but the former had a much higher significance for women. Meanwhile, exclusion of women from apprenticeships did restrict social mobility of women from the peasantry and urban poor and defined gradual meritocratic rise to business ownership as a male prerogative.

Girls rarely became trade apprentices, so the establishment of commercial schools at different levels broadened their access to specialized knowledge. This change corresponds to the growing proportions of women in white-collar commercial jobs and their higher shares in more skilled positions. With new commercial schools, men and women had access to largely similar training, but imagined outcomes for each were different. The process of formulating these outcomes also underwent change. An early plan for a commercial school for women made by Piotrowska in the early 1880s, albeit emphasizing work as a second choice after motherhood, presented an empowering idea that domestic skills could be transformed into a lucrative enterprise. Yet, by the end of the century, when commercial schools for women became the reality, white-collar work replaced entrepreneurship as an end goal. Legitimacy of commercial education was firmly linked to the notion of expert masculinity and a meritocratic career. Whereas commercial education promised men a career, for women entry into commercial work was considered temporary and thus did not allow their growth into higher positions. Moreover, in the workplace female expertise was devalued through lower pay as well as commodification and sexualization of their work.

In many ways the gendered division of education and labor within business organizations in Russia follows the trajectory observed in Western developed countries. Female clerical work in Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary and the US was associated

[41] *Vestnik Prikazchika*. 1912. “Zhenshchiny-prodavshchi͡tsy.” [“Saleswomen.”] September 25. See also Prodavshchi͡tsa. 1908. “Zhenskiy trud.” [“Women’s Labor.”] *Nova͡ia Rus’*, November 7.

[42] *Vestnik Prikazchika*. 1912. “Zhenshchiny-prodavshchi͡tsy.” [“Saleswomen.”] September 25.

with “dead-end” positions for young women, who were paid less than men (Carole Adams 1988; Renate Bridenthal 1973; Susanne Dohrn 1989; Mátyás Erdélyi 2019; Kwolek-Folland 1994, ch. 2; Simonton 1998, ch. 11). Great similarities can also be seen between conceptualizations of female clerical work in late Imperial Russia and Mexico in the 1920s, where the entry of women into white-collar public sector jobs was also associated with both objectification and concerns over sexual vulnerability (Susie Porter 2023). At the same time, professionals seeking to create or preserve the prestige of their qualifications (re)defined them in masculine terms, contrasting themselves with less qualified women (Linda Kirkham and Anne Loft 1993; Kwolek-Folland 1994, ch. 3; Larsen 2011). Categorizations of disciplines and schools as more or less appropriate for a given social class in the Russian Empire resembled the French system. In both countries, too, commercial education had less prestige (Larsen 2011, 27-28; Godelier 2020, 221-222). Attitudes to women’s education were also strikingly similar: “over”-educated women were perceived as a threat to the social order, so women’s access to elite institutions was either restricted or prohibited and women’s education overall tended to have inferior quality (Larsen 2011, 31; see also Françoise Mayeur 1977; Juliette Rennes 2011). Despite these similarities, commercial education for women developed differently. In France, inclusion of women into the framework of higher commercial schools was fraught, as these institutions emulated and competed with engineering and polytechnical schools to attract male students from bourgeois elites (Larsen 2011). In Germany and Austria-Hungary, campaigns of female clerks for equality in male and female commercial programs were met with opposition from professional associations and reluctance from officials to reform the system (Adams 1988, ch. 9; Erdélyi 2019, 42-52).

In contrast, in Russia women’s access to commercial education was not an issue for the state, conservative elites or business. Witte’s Ministry of Finance made development of professional education its explicit policy and prioritized the need to increase the domestic supply of industry and commerce specialists. Conservatives pushed commercial education as a safe alternative for women, which could give them desired intellectual growth and dignified living, without the threat of radicalization. While the business community was not unanimous about the need for formal education, it understood the benefits of the female workforce, so it did not contest the inclusion of women. In these circumstances commercial education in Russia assumed a more utilitarian aim.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisors Jari Eloranta and Laura Ekholm for their invaluable support of this work. In addition, I would like to express my gratitude to the participants at the 2023 YSI Doctoral Workshop, 2023 Economic and Business History Society annual meeting, and the anonymous reviewers, whose insightful questions and comments enhanced the quality and rigor of this piece.

Works Cited

Abdrakhmanov, Konstantin Alekseevich. 2017. “Otrazhenie trudovoĭ povsednevnosti zhenshchin kupecheskogo sosloviia v rossiĭskoĭ istoriografii XIX-XXI vv.” [“Depiction of Daily Business Life of Women from the Merchant Class in Russian Historiography from 19th Century to 21st Century.”] *Vestnik Orenburgskogo Gosudarstvennogo Pedagogicheskogo Universiteta. Ėlektronnyĭ Nauchnyĭ Zhurnal* [*Vestnik of the Orenburg State University. Online Edition*] (3 (23)).

Acker, Joan. 1990. “Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations.” *Gender & Society* 4 (2): 139-158.

Adams, Carole E. 1988. *Women Clerks in Wilhelmine Germany: Issues of Class and Gender.* Cambridge [Eng.]; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, Gregory (ed.). 1989. *The White-Blouse Revolution: Female Office Workers Since 1870*. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press.

Belin, A. 1906. *Professional'noe dvizhenie torgovykh sluzhashchikh v Rossii*. [*Professional Movement of Trade Employees in Russia*.] Moscow.

Bertgoldt, Grigoriĭ Vasil'evich. 1900. *Ustav torgovyĭ (st. 1-104, t. XI, ch. 2 izd. 1893 g.) o prikazchikakh, poverennykh i kommissionerakh, tovarishchestvakh: polnom, na vere i artel'nom: Sb. reshenīĭ Grazhd. kassats. dep. Pravitel'stvuiushchego senata*. [*Commercial Statute (Articles 1-104, Vol. XI, Part 2 of the edition of 1893) on Clerks, Attorneys and Brokers, Partnerships: General, Limited and Cooperatives: Collection of Decisions of the Civil Cassation Dept. of the Government Senate. of the Governing Senate*.] Moscow: F.V. Busygin.

Bessolitsyn, Aleksandr Alekseevich. 2012. “Ministerstvo finansov i formirovanie sistemy kommercheskogo obrazovaniia v Rossii na rubezhe XIX-XX vekov.” [“The Ministry of Finance and the Establishment of the Commercial Education System in Russia at the Turn of the 19th-20th Centuries.”] *Ekonomicheskaia istoria* [*Economic History*] 3 (12): 16-23.

Bessolitsyn, A.A. 2014. “Kommercheskoe obrazovanie v Evrope: germanskiĭ opyt i ego ispol'zovanie v Rossii v nachale XX veka.” [“Commercial Education in Europe: German Experience and its Implementation in Russia at the Beginning of the 20th Century.”] *Istoriko-ėkonomicheskie issledovaniia* [*Research in Economic History*] 15 (1): 173-192.

Bilenko, Nikita Alekseevich. 2018. “Torgovaia pravosub”ektnost' poddannykh Rossiĭskoĭ imperii vo vtoroĭ polovine XIX v.” [“Economic Rights of Citizens in the Russian Empire in the Second Half of the 19th Century.”] In *Torgovlia, kupechestvo i tamozhennoe delo v Rossii v XVI-XIX vv.* [*Trade, Merchants and Customs in Russia in the 16th-19th Centuries*], edited by A.I. Razdorskiy, 416-422. Nizhniy Novgorod: IP Yakushov Yu. I.

Boborykin, Pyotr Dmitryevich. 1883a. 1 *Kitay-gorod*. Saint Peterburg, Moscow: T-vo M.O. Vol’f.

Boborykin, Pyotr Dmitryevich. 1883b. 2 *Kitay-gorod*. Saint Peterburg, Moscow: T-vo M. O. Vol’f.

Bödeker, Hans Erich. 2012. “Economic Societies in Germany, 1760-1820: Organisation, Social Structures and Fields of Activities.” In *The Rise of Economic Societies in the Eighteenth Century: Patriotic Reform in Europe and North America*, edited by Koen Stapelbroek and Jani Marjanen, 182-211. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Bonnell, Victoria E. 1983. *Roots of Rebellion: Workers’ Politics and Organizations in St. Petersburg and Moscow, 1900-1914*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bowman, Linda. 2003. “Seeking Salvation: Moral Economies and Management at the Morozov Mills, 1885-1905.” *Social History* 28 (3): 322-345.

Bradley, Joseph. 2009. *Voluntary Associations in Tsarist Russia: Science, Patriotism, and Civil Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Briantsev, Mikhail V. 1999. *Kul'tura russkogo kupechestva. Vospitanie i obrazovanie.* [*Culture of the Russian Merchant. Upbringing and Education.*] Briansk: Kursiv.

Briantsev, Mikhail V. 2000. "Russkoe kupechestvo: Sotsiokul'turnyĭ aspekt formirovaniia predprinimatel'stva v Rossii v kontse XVIII - nachale XX vv." ["Russian Merchantry: Sociocultural Aspect of Entrepreneurship Formation in Russia at the End of 18th until the Beginning of the 20th Century."] Doctoral dissertation. Moscow Pedagogical State University.

Bridenthal, Renate. 1973. "Beyond Kinder, Küche, Kirche: Weimar Women at Work." *Central European History* 6 (2): 148-166.

Buryshkin, Pavel Afanas'evich. 1990. *Moskva kupecheskaia*. [*Merchant Moscow.*] Moscow: Stolitsa.

Byker, Tanya, and Amanda Gregg. 2019. "Female Partners and Corporate Founders in Imperial Russia, 1894". Working paper.

Carnaffan, Gladys. 1989. "Commercial Education and the Female Office." In *The White-Blouse Revolution: Female Office Workers Since 1870*, edited by Gregory Anderson, 67-87. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press.

Chandler, Alfred D. 1971. *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Crowston, Clare. 2008. "Women, Gender, and Guilds in Early Modern Europe: An Overview of Recent Research." *International Review of Social History* 53 (S16): 19-44.

Davidoff, Leonore, and Catherine Hall. 1987. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850.* London: Hutchinson.

Davies, Margery. 1993. "Woman's Place is at the Typewriter: The Feminization of the Clerical Labor Force." In *Volume 8/1 Professional and White-Collar Employments*, edited by Nancy F. Cott, 228-255. Berlin, Boston: K.G. Saur.

Dohrn, Susanne. 1989. "Pioneers in the Dead-End Profession: The First Women Clerks in Banks and Insurance Companies." In *The White-Blouse Revolution: Female Office Workers Since 1870*, edited by Gregory Anderson, 48-66. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press.

Dubrovskiĭ, Andreĭ Vasil'evich (ed.). 1887. *Prostitutsiia: po obsledovaniiu 1-go avgusta 1889 goda*. [*Prostitution: Results of the Survey Conducted on August 1st 1889.*] Saint Peterburg: TSentral'nyĭ statisticheskiĭ komitet Ministerstva vnutrennikh del.

Elias, Allison. 2020. "'Measured by Two Yardsticks': Women in Bank Management Training, 1960s to 1990s." *Management & Organizational History* 15 (2): 132-153.

Engwall, Lars, Matthias Kipping, and Behlül Üsdiken. 2016. *Defining Management: Business Schools, Consultants, Media.* New York: Routledge.

Engwall, Lars, and Vera Zamagni. 1998. *Management Education in Historical Perspective*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Erdélyi, Mátyás. 2019. "Experts in the Bureau: Private Clerks and Capitalism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy." Doctoral dissertation. Central European University.

Fellman, Susanna. 2001. "The Professionalisation of Management in Finland:" *Scandinavian Economic History Review* 49 (3): 5-27.

Filatkina, Nataliia Aleksandrovna, and Alekseĭ Vikulovich Morozov. 2004. "Vospominaniia A. V. Morozova (publikatsiya)." ["Memoirs of A.V. Morozov (publication)."] In *Staroobriadchestvo v Rossii (XVII-XX vv.): Sb. nauch. trudov* [*Old Belief in Russia (18th-20th Centuries)*], edited by E.M. IUkhimenko, 542-553. Moscow: IAzyki slavianskoĭ kul'tury.

Filatova, Svetlana Vladimirovna. 2016. "'Prikazchik, grosh v iashchik, a piatak za sapog': naëmnye sluzhashchie torgovykh kupecheskikh zavedeniĭ vo vtoroĭ polovine XIX -

nachale XX vv. (po materialam Srednego Povolzh'i͡a).” [“…: Employees of Merchant Enterprises in the Second Half of the 19th Century–Beginning of the 20th Century.”] In *Material'nyĭ faktor i predprinimatel'stvo v povsednevnoĭ zhizni naseleni͡ia Rossii: istori͡ia i sovremennost' (regional'nyĭ aspekt)* [*Material Aspect and Entrepreneurship in the Daily Lives of the Russian People: History and Present (Regional Perspective)*], edited by V.A. Veremenko and S.V. Stepanov, 194-200. Leningradskiĭ gosudarstvennyĭ universitet imeni A.S. Pushkina.

Freeze, Gregory L., and ChaeRan Y. Freeze. 2019. *A Jewish Woman of Distinction: The Life and Diaries of Zinaida Poliakova*. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press.

Godelier, Eric. 2020. “From the ‘Science’ of Practices to Management Science: Milestones for a History of Management Education in France (1900s-2000s).” *Management & Organizational History* 15 (3): 219-251.

Goncharov, I͡Uriĭ Mikhaĭlovich. 2004. “Roditeli i deti v sem'i͡akh provint͡sial'nykh gorozhan serediny XIX — nachala XX v.” [“Parents and Children in Urban Families in the Mid-19th–Early 20th Centuries.”] In *Pi͡atye Tatishchevskie chteni͡ia. Dukhovnost' i nravstvennost' na Urale v proshlom i nastoi͡ashchem* [*The 5th Tatishchev Conference. Spirituality and Moral in the Urals in the Past and Present*], 44-48. Ekaterinburg: IIiA UrO RAN.

Gorshkov, Boris B. 2009. *Russia's Factory Children: State, Society, and Law, 1800-1917*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Gudvan, Abram Moiseevich. 1905. *Prikazchichiĭ vopros: Zhizn' i trud prikazchikov*. [The Clerk’s Question: Life and Labor of Clerks.] Odesa: skl. izd. u M. G. Barmas.

Gudvan, Abram Moiseevich. 1925. *Ocherki po istorii dvizheni͡ia sluzhashchikh v Rossii*. Moscow: Ts. K. SST·s.

Gul͡iaev, Alekseĭ Ivanovich. 1912. *Spravochna͡ia kniga po torgovo-promyshlennomu zakonodatel'stvu i torgovoĭ praktike*. [*Reference Book on Trade Law and Practice.*] Saint Peterburg: T-vo Kn. delo.

Halford, Susan, Mike Savage, and Anne Witz. 1997. “Gender and Organisations: Theoretical Issues.” In *Gender, Careers and Organisations: Current Developments in Banking, Nursing and Local Government*, edited by Susan Halford, Mike Savage, and Anne Witz, 1-28. London: Macmillan Education UK.

Hamilton, Eleanor. 2013. “The Discourse of Entrepreneurial Masculinities (And Femininities).” *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 25 (1-2): 90-99.

Hartmann, Heinz. 1959a. *Authority and Organization in German Management*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hartmann, Heinz. 1959b. “Managers and Entrepreneurs: A Useful Distinction?” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 3 (4): 429-451.

Hilton, Marjorie L. 2012. *Selling to the Masses: Retailing in Russia, 1880-1930*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Jernberg, Frida, Anna Lindbäck, and Annie Roos. 2020. “A New Male Entrepreneur? Media Representation of Male Entrepreneurs before and after #metoo.” *Gender in Management: An International Journal* 35 (2): 211-224.

Joffe, Muriel, and Adele Lindemeyr. 1998. “Daughters, Wives, and Partners: Women of the Moscow Merchant Elite.” In *Merchant Moscow: Images of Russia’s Vanished Bourgeoisie*, edited by James L. West and Iurii A. Petrov, 95-108. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Johnsen, Christian Garmann, and Bent Meier Sørensen. 2017. “Traversing the Fantasy of the Heroic Entrepreneur.” *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research* 23 (2): 228-244.

Kaplan, Andreas. 2018. “European Management and European Business Schools: Insights from the History of Business Schools.” In *Management Research: European Perspectives*, edited by Sabina Siebert, 211-226. New York: Routledge.

Kaplunovskiy, Alexander. 2006. “„Kupečeskie prikazčiki“ und „torgovo-promyšlennye služaščie“: Die Dynamik sozialer Identitäten im ausgehenden Russländischen Reich im Fokus der Begriffsgeschichte.” [“…: The Dynamic of Social Identities in the Late Russian Empire in a Conceptual History Focus”] *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* [*East European History Yearbooks*] 54 (3): 375-409.

Kechedzhi-Shapovalov, Mikhail Vasil'evich. 1902. *Zhenskoe dvizhenie v Rossii i za granit͡seĭ*. [*Women’s Liberation Movement in Russia and Abroad.*] Saint Peterburg: Tip. Spb. obshch. pech. dela v Rossii E. Evdokimov.

Kechedzhi-Shapovalov, Mikhail Vasil'evich. 1905. *Sovremennoe znachenie kommercheskogo obrazovani͡ia*. [*Contemporary Significance of Commercial Education*.] Saint Peterburg: Tip. A.V. Orlova.

Kechedzhi-Shapovalov, Mikhail Vasil'evich. 1911. *Kommercheskoe obrazovanie, ego znachenie, zadachi, metody i organizat͡si͡a (v Rossii i za granit͡seĭ): Stat'i. Doklady. Rechi: 1902-1911 gg*. [*Commercial Education, its Significance, Aims, Methods and Organization (in Russia and Abroad): Articles. Reports. Speeches: 1902-1911.*] Saint Peterburg: Uleĭ.

Kelly, Catriona. 2001. *Refining Russia: Advice Literature, Polite Culture, and Gender from Catherine to Yeltsin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kirkham, Linda M., and Anne Loft. 1993. “Gender and the Construction of the Professional Accountant.” *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 18 (6): 507-558.

Kishtymov, A.L. 2017. “U istokov vysshego kommercheskogo obrazovaniya: M.V. Dovnar-Zapol’skiy — organizator i rukovoditel’ Kiyevskogo kommercheskogo instituta.” [Origins of Higher Commercial Education: M.V. Donvar-Zapol’sky—The Founder and Director of the Kyiv Commercial Institute] *Istoriko-politichni studiï. Seriya: Istorichni nauki : zb. nauk. pr.* [*Studies in History and Politics: Historical Disciplines Series*] (1): 74-93.

Klepikov, Aleksandr Konstantinovich. 1911. *Zapiski fabrichnogo inspektora (iz nabli͡udeniĭ i praktiki v period 1894-1908 gg.)*. [*Factory Inspector’s Notes (Observations and Practice in 1894-1908).*] Moscow: S. Dorovatovskiĭ i A. Charushnikov.

Kolychev, A. 1905. “O polozhenii torgovykh sluzhashchikh.” [“On the Conditions of Trade Employees.”] *Russkai͡a mysl'* [*Russian Thought*] (February): 162-182.

Koreeva, Natal'i͡a Anatol'evna. 2018. “‘Obi͡azui͡us' nakhodit'si͡a u nego v usluzhenii v dolzhnosti prikazchika’: oformlenie trudovykh otnosheniĭ mezhdu kupt͡sami i prikazchikami v pervoĭ polovine XIX v. (po materialam Kazanskoĭ gubernii).” [“…: Employment Contracts Between Merchants and Clerks in the First Half of the 19th Century (Based on Sources from Kazan’ Governorate).”] *Iz istorii i kul'tury narodov Srednego Povolzh'i͡a* [*History and Culture of Mid-Volga Peoples*] 1 (8): 115-133.

Kosetchenkova, Elena Anatol'evna. 2007. *Stanovlenie i razvitie zhenskogo professional'nogo obrazovani͡ia v Rossii v kont͡se XIX - nachale XX veka*. [Establishment and Development of Women’s Professional Education in Russia in the End of 19th Century–Beginning of 20th Century.] Kursk: Kursk State University.

“Kratkie svedeni͡ia o kommercheskikh uchebnykh zavedeni͡akh Ministerstva finansov v 1902-1903 uchebnom godu. Vyrezka iz zhurnala ‘Tekhnicheskoe obrazovanie’, 1903.” [“Brief Statistics on Commercial Schools under the Ministry of Finances in 1902-1903 School Year. Supplement to *Technical Education*, 1903.”]

Krishna, Aradhna, and A. Yeşim Orhun. 2022. “Gender (Still) Matters in Business School.” *Journal of Marketing Research* 59 (1): 191-210.

Kuzmina, Ol'ga Viktorovna. 2010. “K voprosu o podgotovke kvalifit͡sirovannykh kadrov dl͡ia russkoĭ promyshlennosti na rubezhe XIX-XX vv. (s”ezdy russkikh de͡iateleĭ po professional'nomu i tekhnicheskomu obrazovani͡iu).” [“Training of High-Skilled Workers for Russian Industry at the Turn of 19th-20th Centuries.”] *Nauchno-tekhnicheskiĭ vestnik informat͡sionnykh tekhnologiĭ, mekhaniki i optiki* [*Science and Technology Bulletin: Information Technology, Mechanics, Optics*] (4 (68)): 113-116.

Kwolek-Folland, Angel. 1994. *Engendering Business: Men and Women in the Corporate Office, 1870-1930*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Larsen, Eirinn. 2011. “The Masculine Foundation of Business Education: France and Norway in Comparison (1870s-1940s).” *Entreprises et histoire* [*Enterprise and History*] 65 (4): 24-42.

Locke, Robert R. 1984. *The End of the Practical Man: Entrepreneurship and Higher Education in Germany, France, and Great Britain, 1880-1940*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Marrese, Michelle Lamarche. 2002. *A Woman’s Kingdom: Noblewomen and the Control of Property in Russia, 1700-1861*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Maslov, I͡Uriĭ Nikolaevich. 2001. “Kommercheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii v kont͡se XIX - nachale XX vekov.” [“Commercial Education in Russia at the End of the 19th–Beginning of 20th Century.”] Kursk Pedagogical University.

Masoero, Alberto. 1994. “Entrepreneurship and Service Ethos in Russian Economics in the Second Half of 19th Century.” In *Political Economy and National Realities: Papers Presented at the Conference held at the Luigi Einaudi Foundation, Palazzo d’Azeglio, Turin, September 10-12, 1992*, “Studi”; 31, edited by Manuela Albertone and Alberto Masoero, 307-327. Torino: Fondazione Luigi Einaudi.

Materialy po kommercheskomu obrazovani͡iu: Vyp. 1. Vyp. 1: Kommercheskie uchilishcha. [*Sources on Commercial Education: Vol. 1. Vol. 1: Commercial Secondary Schools.*] 1901. Tip. Yu. A. Mansfel’d.

Materialy po kommercheskomu obrazovani͡iu: Vyp. 1. Vyp. 2: Kommercheskie uchilishcha. [*Sources on Commercial Education: Vol. 1. Vol. 2: Commercial Secondary Schools.*] 1902. Tip. Yu. A. Mansfel’d.

Mayeur, Françoise. 1977. *L’enseignement secondaire des jeunes filles sous la Troisième République.* [*Girls’ Secondary Teaching During the Third Republic.*] Paris: Presses de la Fondation nationale des sciences politiques.

Mikhailovskiĭ, Ia. T. 1890. “Vstupitel'na͡ia rech' predsedatel͡ia IV otdelen͡iia s”ezda I͡A. T. Mikhaĭlovskogo.” [“Introductory Speech by I. A. Mikhaĭlovskiĭ, the Chair of Session IV of the Meeting.”] In *S”ezd russkikh de͡iateleĭ po tekhnicheskomu i professional'nomu obrazovani͡iu v Rossii. 1889-1890. Trudy IV-go otdelen͡iia. Zhenskoe professional'noe obrazovanie* [*Meeting of Russian Specialists in Technical and Professional Education in Russia. Reports from Session IV. Women’s Professional Education*], edited by V.I. Sreznevskiĭ, 1-3. Saint Petersburg: Tip. I͡U. N. Erlikh.

Morozova, T.P., and I.V. Potkina. 1998. *Savva Morozov*. Moscow: Russka͡ia kniga.

Obozenko, Petr Evgrafovich. 1896. “Podnadzorna͡ia prostitut͡si͡ia S.-Peterburga po dannym Vrachebno-polit͡seĭskogo komiteta i Kalinkinskoĭ bol'nit͡sy.” [“Legal Prostitution in Saint Petersburg According to the Medicine and Police Committee of Kalininka Hospital.”] Voenno-medit͡sinska͡ia akademi͡ia.

Ocherk pi͡atidesi͡atiletneĭ de͡iatel'nosti Vspomogatel'nogo Obshchestva Kupecheskikh Prikazchikov v Moskve. 1863-1913. [*Outline of the 50-year Activities of the Society for the Support of the Merchant Clerks in Moscow. 1863-1913.*] 1913. Moscow: Tip. A.Z. Kiselëva.

Ogilvie, Sheilagh C. 2003. *A Bitter Living: Women, Markets, and Social Capital in Early Modern Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ogilvie, Sheilagh C. 2019. *The European Guilds: An Economic Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Otkhozhie promysly krest'ianskogo naseleniia IAroslavskoĭ gubernii: (Po dannym o pasportakh za 1896-1902 gg.). [*Migratory Jobs of Yaroslavl Governorate Peasants (Based on Passport Data 1896-1902).*] 1907. 19 Yaroslavl': tipo-lit. Gub. zemsk. upravy.

Ozinskaya, L. 1909. "O polozhenii torgovo-promyshlennykh sluzhashchikh." ["On Conditions of Employees in Trade and Industry."] In *Trudy 1-go Vserossiĭskogo zhenskogo s"ezda pri Russkom zhenskom obshchestve v S.-Peterburge 10-16 dekabria 1908 goda* [*Reports from the 1st All-Russian Meeting Organized by the Russian Women's Society in Saint Petersburg, December 10-16, 1908*], 340-343. Saint Peterburg.

Pamiatnaia knizhka vospitannikov Imperatorskogo S.-Peterburgskogo kommercheskogo uchilishcha, okonchivshikh kurs v 1850-1913 gg. [*Year Book of the Alumni of the Saint Petersburg Imperial Commercial School, who Graduated in 1850-1913.*] 1913. Saint Peterburg: O-vo dlia posobiia b. vospitannikam S.-Peterb. kommerch. uch-shcha i ikh semeĭstvam.

Perepis' Moskvy 1882 goda. Naselenie i zaniatiia. [*Moscow Population Census of 1882. Population and Occupations.*] 1885. Moscow: Gor. tip.

Perepis' Moskvy 1902 goda. Ch. 1: Naselenie. Vyp. 2 Naselenie g. Moskvy (bez prigorodov) po zaniatiiam, veroispovedaniiu i rodnomu iazyku. Bezrabotnye i uvechnye. [*Moscow Population Census of 1902. P. 1. Vol. 2. Population of the City of Moscow (Without Suburbs) by Occupation, Religion and Native Language. Unemployed and Disabled.*] 1906. Gor. tip.

Petrograd po perepisi naseleniia 15 dekabria 1910 goda. Ch. 1. Chislennost' i sostav naseleniia po polu, vozrastu, gramotnosti, stepeni obrazovaniia, mestu rozhdeniia, vremeni poseleniia v Petrograde, semeĭnomu sostoianiiu, veroispovedaniiu, sosloviiu i rodnomu iazyku. [*Petrograd Population Census. P. 1. Population by Sex, Age, Literacy, Education, Place of Birth, Time of Settlement in Petrograd, Marital Status, Religion, Estate and Native Language.*] Petrograd: Izd. Gor. upravy po Stat. otd-niiu.

Petrograd po perepisi naseleniia 15 dekabria 1910 goda. Ch. 2. Raspredelenie naseleniia po gruppam zaniatiĭ. [*Petrograd Population Census. P. 2. Population by Occupation.*] Petrograd: Izd. Gor. upravy po Stat. otd-niiu.

Piotrowska, Paulina. 1880. *Tekhnicheskoe zhenskoe obrazovanie*. [*Technical Education for Women.*] Vilna: pech. A.G. Syrkina.

Polevoĭ, Ksenofont Alekseevich. 1847. *Rukovodstvo dlia molodykh liudeĭ, naznachaiushchikh sebia k torgovym delam*. [*Guide for Young Men Aspiring for Trade.*] Saint Peterburg: tip. K. I. Zhernakova.

Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoĭ Imperii. Sobranie I. Vol. XIX. [*Complete Collection of Russian Laws. Series I. Vol. XIX.*] 1830. Saint Peterburg: Tip. II Otdeleniia Sobstvennoĭ Ego Imperatorskogo Velichestva Kantseliarii.

Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoĭ Imperii. Sobranie II. Vol. VII. [*Complete Collection of Russian Laws. Series II. Vol. VII.*] 1832. VII Saint Peterburg: Tip. II Otdeleniia Sobstvennoĭ Ego Imperatorskogo Velichestva Kantseliarii.

Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoĭ Imperii. Sobranie III. Vol. XVI. [*Complete Collection of Russian Laws. Series III. Vol. XVI.*] 1899. Saint Peterburg: Gosudarstvennaia tipografiia.

Porter, Susie S. 2023. "Sexual Harassment in the Workplace, 1920s Mexico City." *Essays in Economic & Business History* 41 (1): 148-162.

Potkina, Irina Viktorovna. 2004. *Na Olimpe delovogo uspekha: Nikol'skaia manufaktura Morozovykh, 1797-1917*. [*At the Top of Business Success: Morozov's Nikol'skaia Manufacturing, 1797-1917.*] Moscow: Izd-vo Glavarkhiva Moskvy.

Radushina, P.P. 1909. “O 1-oĭ zhenskoĭ arteli kassirsh, prodavshchi͡ts, bukhgalterov i kontorshchi͡ts.” [“On First Women’s Artel’ of Cashiers, Saleswomen, Bookkeepers and Office Clerks.”] In *Trudy 1-go Vserossiĭskogo zhenskogo s”ezda pri Russkom zhenskom obshchestve v S.-Peterburge 10-16 dekabri͡a 1908 goda* [*Reports from the 1st All-Russian Meeting Organized by the Russian Women’s Society in Saint Petersburg, December 10-16, 1908*], 396-400. Saint Peterburg.

Raschka, Johannes. 2006. “Selbstbestimmung durch Selbständigkeit? Unternehmerinnen im Zarenreich 1861-1914.” [“Self-determination through Self-employment? Women Entrepreneurs in the Tsarist Empire 1861-1914.”] *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* [*East European History Yearbooks*] 54 (4): 519-534.

Rennes, Juliette. 2011. “The French Republic and Women’s Access to Professional Work: Issues and Controversies in France from the 1870s to the 1930s.” *Gender & History* 23 (2): 341-366.

Rieber, Alfred J. 1991. *Merchants and Entrepreneurs in Imperial Russia*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Rodrigues, Lúcia Lima, Russell Craig, and Delfina Gomes. 2007. “State Intervention in Commercial Education: The Case of the Portuguese School of Commerce, 1759.” *Accounting History* 12 (1): 55-85.

Ruckman, Jo Ann. 1984. *The Moscow Business Elite: A Social and Cultural Portrait of Two Generations, 1840-1905*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.

Sakulin, P.N. (ed.). 1907. *Moskovskoe obshchestvo rasprostraneni͡ia kommercheskogo obrazovani͡ia: 1897-1907: Obzor dei͡atel'nosti*. [*Moscow Society for the Dissemination of Commercial Knowledge, 1897-1907: Overview of Activities.*] Moscow: tip. t-va I.D. Sytina.

Schofield, R.S. 1973. “Dimensions of Illiteracy, 1750-1850.” *Explorations in Economic History* 10 (4): 437-454.

Scott, Joan Wallach. 1988. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Shinova, Anastasiya. 2020. “"Iz kukhni zhenshchina vygnana v vodovorot promyshlennoĭ dei͡atel'nosti": zhenskiĭ trud v Moskve i Sankt-Peterburge na rubezhe XIX-XX vv. (sravnitel'nyĭ analiz statisticheskikh istochnikov).” [“Female Labor in Moscow and Saint-Petersburg at the Turn of the 19th and 20th Centuries (Comparative Analysis of Statistical Sources).”] *ISTORIYA* [*HISTORY*] 11(3 (89)).

Simonton, Deborah. 1998. *A History of European Women’s Work: 1700 to the Present*. London: Routledge.

Smith, Alison Karen. 2014. *For the Common Good and Their Own Well-Being: Social Estates in Imperial Russia*. New York: Oxford University Press.

S.-Peterburg po perepisi 15 dekabri͡a 1890 goda. Ch. 1. Naselenie. Vyp. 2 Raspredelenie naseleni͡ia po zani͡atii͡am. [St. Petersburg According to the Population Census of December 15, 1890. P. 1. Population. Vol. 2: Distribution of Population by Occupation] 1892. Saint Peterburg: tip. Shredera.

S.-Peterburg po perepisi 15 dekabri͡a 1900 goda. Naselenie. Vyp. 2. Raspredelenie naseleni͡ia po zani͡atii͡am. [St. Petersburg According to the Population Census of December 15, 1900. Population. Vol. 2: Distribution of Population by Occupation.] 1903. Saint Peterburg: tip. Shredera.

S.-Peterburg po perepisi 15-go dekabri͡a 1881 goda. T. 1: Naselenie. [St. Petersburg According to the Population Census of December 15, 1881. P. 1. Population.] 1884. Saint Peterburg: Tipo-lit. A. Perott.

Sreznevskiĭ, V.I. (ed.). 1890. *S”ezd russkikh dei͡ateleĭ po tekhnicheskomu i professional'nomu obrazovani͡iu v Rossii. 1889-1890. Trudy IV-go otdeleni͡ia. Zhenskoe professional'noe obrazovanie.* [*Meeting of Russian Specialists in Technical and Professional Education*

in Russia. Reports from Session IV. Women's Professional Education.] Saint Petersburg: Tip. I͡U. N. Erlikh.

Statisticheskie svedeniĭa o sostoi͡anii uchebnykh zavedeniĭ, podvedomstvennykh Uchebnomu otdelu Ministerstva torgovli i promyshlennosti 1912-1913 uch. god. [Statistics on the State of Educational Institutions Subordinate to the Educational Department of the Ministry of Trade and Industry 1912-1913 Academic Year.] 1914. Petrograd: Ucheb. otd. Min-va torgovli i promyshlennosti.

Statisticheskiĭ ezhegodnik goroda Moskvy. God tretiĭ. 1909/1910. [*Statistical Yearbook of the City of Moscow. Third Year. 1909/1910.]* 1913. Moscow: Gor. tip.

Statisticheskiĭ ezhegodnik goroda Moskvy i Moskovskoĭ gubernii. Statisticheskie dannye po gorodu Moskve za 1914-1925 g.g. [*Statistical Yearbook of Moscow and the Moscow Province: Statistical Data for 1914-1925.*] 1927. Moscow: Stat. otd. Mosk. soveta.

Steinberg, Mark D. 1992. *Moral Communities: The Culture of Class Relations in the Russian Printing Industry, 1867-1907*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Strannoli͡ubskiĭ, A.N. 1890. "O zhenskikh professional'nykh shkolakh dli͡a lit͡s, priobrevshikh zakonchennoe obshchee obrazovanie gimnazicheskogo tipa." ["On Women's Vocational Schools for Gymnasia Graduates."] In *S"ezd russkikh dei͡ateleĭ po tekhnicheskomu i professional'nomu obrazovani͡iu v Rossii. 1889-1890. Trudy IV-go otdeleni͡ia. Zhenskoe professional'noe obrazovanie* [*Meeting of Russian Specialists in Technical and Professional Education in Russia. Reports from Session IV. Women's Professional Education.*], edited by V.I. Sreznevskiĭ, 202-229. Saint Petersburg: Tip. I͡U. N. Erlikh.

Ulianova, Galina. 2000. "Predprinimatel': tip lichnosti, dukhovnyĭ oblik, obraz zhizni." ["Entrepreneur: Personality, Spirituality, Lifestyle."] In *Istori͡ia predprinimatol'stva Rossii. Kniga vtora͡ia. Vtora͡ia polovina XIX-nachalo XX veka*, [Russian Business History. Book 2. Second Half of 19th–Early 20th Century.] 441-466. Moscow: Rosspen.

Ulianova, Galina. 2009. *Female Entrepreneurs in Nineteenth-Century Russia*. London; Brookfield, VT: Pickering & Chatto.

Ulianova, Galina. 2022a. "Female Entrepreneurs as Board Directors of the Largest Russian Joint-Stock Companies, 1870-1900." *The Russian Review* 81 (3): 462-490.

Ulianova, Galina. 2022b. *Kupchikhi, dvori͡anki, magnatki: zhenshchiny-predprinimatel'ni͡tsy v Rossii XIX veka*. [Merchants, Gentry, Magnates: Female Entrepreneurs in 19th Century Russia.] Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.

Vakhromeeva, Oksana Borisovna. 2008. *Zhenshchina i sem'i͡a v Evropeĭskoĭ Rossii na rubezhe XIX-XX vekov*. [Woman and Family in European Russia in the End of 19th – Early 20th Century.] Saint Peterburg: Znamenitye universanty.

Vakhromeeva, Oksana Borisovna. 2009. "Zhenskoe kommercheskoe obrazovanie v Sankt-Peterburge v kont͡se XIX - nachale XX vv." [Women's Commercial Education in the end of 19th–early 20th Century.] *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Istori͡ia* [*Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*] 2 (2): 148-154.

Vakhromeeva, Oksana Borisovna. 2014. "Peterburgska͡ia remeslenni͡tsa v kont͡se XIX - nachale XX veka." ["Female Artisans of Saint Petersburg in the End of 19th–Early 20th Century."] *Peterburgskie Issledovani͡ia* [Saint Petersburg Research] 5: 40-50.

Varent͡sov, Nikolaĭ Aleksandrovich. 1999. *Slyshannoe. Vidennoe. Peredumannoe. Perezhitoe*. [*Heard. Seen. Thought Through. Lived Through.*] Moscow: Novoe lit. obozrenie.

Vernadska͡ia, Mari͡ia Nikolaevna. 1862. "Zhenskiy trud." ["Women's Labor."] In *Sobranie sochineniĭ pokoĭnoĭ Marii Nikolaevny Vernadskoĭ, urozh. Shigaevoĭ* [*Collection of the Works of the Late Mariia Nikolaevna Vernadskaia, neé Shigaeva*], 94-115. Saint Peterburg: Tip. Dep. udelov.

Volkova, Anna Ivanovna. 1913. *Vospominaniia, dnevnik i stat'i*. [*Memoirs, Diaries and Articles.*] Nizhniy Novgorod: A. S. Vishniakov.
Wagner, William G. 1994. *Marriage, Property, and Law in Late Imperial Russia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Warner, Malcolm. 1987. "Industrialization, Management Education and Training Systems: A Comparative Analysis [1]." *Journal of Management Studies* 24 (1): 91-112.
Weber, Max. 2019. *Economy and Society: A New Translation*. Edited by Keith Tribe. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Williams, Kristin S., and Albert J. Mills. 2019. "The Problem with Women: A Feminist Interrogation of Management Textbooks." *Management & Organizational History* 14 (2): 148-166.
Zolotarev, L.A. 1897. *Sem'ia i zhenskiĭ trud*. [*Family and Women's Labor*] Moscow: Self-published.

Newspapers

Golos Moskvy [*Voice of Moscow*]
IUzhnyĭ kraĭ [*Southern Lands*]
Moskovskie vedomosti [*Moscow News*]
Moskvich [*Muscovite*]
Novaia Rus' [*New Ruthenia*]
Novosti [*News*]
Obrazovanie [*Education*]
Penzenskie gubernskie vedomosti [*Penza Province News*]
Permskie gubernskie vedomosti [*Perm' Province News*]
Promyshlennost' i Torgovlia [*Industry and Trade*]
Rus' [*Ruthenia*]
Russkiĭ [*Russian*]
Russkie vedomosti [*Russian News*]
Sankt-Peterburgskie Vedomosti [*Saint Petersburg News*]
Shut [*Joker*]
Vestnik Prikazchika [*Clerk's Bulletin*]