

Chapter 2

Leading the Entrepreneurial University: Meeting the Entrepreneurial Development Needs of Higher Education Institutions

Allan Gibb, Gay Haskins and Ian Robertson

This paper focuses on the leadership challenge facing staff of universities across the world in moving their institutions to a more entrepreneurial mode (Bernasconi 2005; Keast 1995). It is based upon an extensive literature review, the results of which demonstrate clearly that the issues raised in this paper are widely shared internationally.¹ The paper has an action and innovation focus in that it constitutes part of the preparation for the development of the Entrepreneurial University Leadership Programme which was launched in 2010 at Oxford University's Saïd Business School for senior university leaders. This program now runs annually with the National Council for Entrepreneurship in Education (NCEE, formerly called the National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship) and Universities UK as lead partners. This paper demonstrates the thinking and concepts behind the program and is used as key background material.

¹ The extensive referencing is designed to demonstrate that wide global context of the issues discussed. The authors thank Klara Capova of Durham University for her invaluable assistance in conducting an extensive bibliographical search.

A. Gibb (✉)

University of Durham, 10 Kimblesworth Grange, Durham, DH1 5SL, UK
e-mail: allan_gibb@hotmail.com

G. Haskins

Saïd Business School, University of Oxford, Egrove Park, Oxford, OX1 5NY, UK
e-mail: gay.haskins@sbs.ox.ac.uk

I. Robertson

National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education (NCEE), The Innovation Centre,
Coventry University Technology Park, Puma Way, Coventry CV1 2TT, UK
e-mail: ian@entrepreneurialinstitution.com

2.1 Introduction

There is now a considerable international literature addressing the notion of what has been termed ‘the entrepreneurial university’ (Wasser 1990; Clark 1998; Currie 2002; Barsony 2003; Jacob et al. 2003; Etzkowitz 2004; Gibb and Hannon 2006; Kirby 2006; Lazzeroni and Piccaluga 2003; Poh-Kam Wong et al. 2007; Guerrero-Cano 2008; Mohrman et al. 2008; Lehrera et al. 2009). The entrepreneurial university concept embraces universities of all types including those with a strong research tradition as well as newer organizations (Geiger 2006; Mohrman et al. 2008; Kauffman 2009). The literature, both academic and pragmatic policy oriented, ranges over a wide range of issues including:

- the basic philosophical ‘idea’ of a university and how this is changing over time (Coaldrake and Stedman 1999; Smith and Langslow 1999; Maskell and Robinson 2001; De Ziva 2005) and the culture of the university (Daumard 2001; Davies 2001; Mendoza and Berger 2005);
- the commercialization of university know-how (Cook et al. 2008);
- the process of technology transfer and exchange (CVCP 1999; Leydesdorff and Meyer 2003; Sainsbury 2007; Mittelstädt and Cerri 2008; Zhou 2008);
- the associated closer engagement of the university with industry and indeed stakeholders of all kinds (Garlic 1998; Owen-Smith et al. 2002; Charles 2006; CIHE 2008);
- the movement towards a ‘Triple Helix’ model of partnership among government, industry, and higher education (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff 2000; Leydesdorff and Etzkowitz 2003; Thorn and Soo 2006);
- the employability and skills development agenda of graduates and their preparation for a global labor market (HEFCE 2003; European Commission 2005; ESECT 2005; Leitch 2006);
- the strategic response to the ‘massification’ of demand for higher education (Smith 1999; Shattock 2000);
- the internationalization of universities (Noir sur Blanc 1999; Kwiek 2000, 2001; Knight 2003; Altbach 2005; Altbach and Knight 2006; OECD 2004) and their strategies for dealing with global competition (both opportunities and threats);
- the changing nature of the knowledge society and the challenge this poses to the organization of knowledge within higher education (Barnett 2000; Viale and Etzkowitz 2005; Becher and Trowler 2007; Senge 2007);
- the pressures on universities to respond to social as well as economic local and regional development problems albeit in a global context (Charles 2003; AUQA 2005; Smith 2007; Arbo and Benneworth 2008);
- the central pressure upon higher education, from central government, to foster innovation and demonstrate relevance to national and international competitiveness agendas (Lambert 2003; Williams and Kitaev 2005; Mittelstädt and Cerri 2008);
- the autonomy and future funding of universities (Darling et al. 1989; Greenaway and Haynes 2003; Li-Chuan 2004; Moses 2005; Bridgman 2007; Armbruster 2008);

- and overall, in response to the above, reflections on the ‘public value’ of higher education institutions (Moore 1995; Weerts 2007).

The literature reveals the growing diversity of the university concept internationally (Thorn and Soo 2006), and within countries (Poh-Kam et al. 2007; Pan 2007). There are many different ‘typologies’ of universities, with different views of ‘excellence’ (van Vught 2008) and each with different strategic agendas, some with a strong industry, technology, and occupational focus (Pratt 2001; Jacob et al. 2003). This, in turn, leads to debates about the growing influence of vocationalism in higher education (Bridges and Jonathan 2003) and the linking of the higher education sector with other institutions in a country’s education system particularly further education and community colleges (Hager and Hyland 2003). At a national level, however, traditions and power-influencing hierarchies and pressure groups (Bourdieu 1999) play a major role in both constraining and shaping the nature of higher education institutions and their capacity to adapt to change. Such influence is also reflected in the education policy frameworks of governments (EU 2006) which are increasingly directive (Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Hayrinen–Alestalo 1999; Henkel 2004). In general, (but not universally²) governments throughout the world still hold considerable sway over the sector because of its substantial dependency upon the public purse (Williams 2009).

All of the above pressures have served to shape change in organization and governance structures of universities (Higher Education in Europe 2004; Kohler and Huber 2006). They are also leading to changes in mission statements and strategies (Shattock 2000; Chervitz 2002, 2005). These changes have been the focus of much of the debate concerning the entrepreneurial paradigm (Martin and Etzkowitz 2000; Leydesdorff and Etzkowitz 2001; Bok 2003; Becher and Trowler 2007). Leading writers on this theme have effectively made recommendations as to how to redesign institutions entrepreneurially (Clark 1998, 2004; Wissema 2008; Etzkowitz 2008), but without full exploration of the entrepreneurial organization concept. Considerable attention has also been focused upon the leadership challenges involved in the changing modes of governance, particularly in the UK, through the work of the Higher Education Leadership Foundation (CEL 2006, 2007), but with only limited focus upon the arguably highly relevant notion of the entrepreneurial leader. What appears to have been largely missing in the debate, therefore, has been deeper basic exploration of the two key relevant concepts of entrepreneurial organization and entrepreneurial leadership and their effective interface within the dynamic change environment facing the Higher Education sector. In this paper we will explore these concepts with reference to the ‘debates’ noted briefly above.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Firstly, there is an exploration of the nature of the environment impacting on higher education, the varied institutional responses and how the entrepreneurial concept relates to this. Secondly, there is an analysis of the challenge to organization design as well as individual academic

² See, for example, the cross country analysis in IHEP (2009).

response, and how this relates to notions of the entrepreneurial organization. Thirdly, there is exploration of the leadership challenge and its particularly entrepreneurial flavor. Fourthly, there is a summary of what this means for the development of leaders and key managers in higher education institutions and how the Entrepreneurial University Leadership Programme was conceived and designed to meet their development needs.

2.2 The Entrepreneurial Environmental Challenges and University Responses

The entrepreneurial concept is centrally concerned with the means of coping with and creating uncertainty and complexity (Casson 1982, Chap. 5). Its traditional essence, (Schumpeter 1934), is that of creating and dealing with new and innovative combinations of ‘factors of production’ and ‘ways of doing things’. The Schumpeterian notion of ‘creative destruction’, leading to innovation and renewal, manifests itself in uncertain and complex task environments for those within the system. Dynamic task environments with high levels of change therefore demand, and emerge through, entrepreneurial initiative. Conversely, static environments lend themselves to more predictable and routinized bureaucratic patterns of response.

The changing dynamic environment of higher institutions and their respondent evolution (Doutriaux and Barker 1996; Kohler and Huber 2006; Wissema 2008) is portrayed in Fig. 2.1. The figure attempts to characterize the evolving nature of the task environment facing universities on a simple/complex and certain/uncertain axis.³ It highlights the way that the notion of ‘Excellence’ might be changing (Corbett 2006; Deem and Lucasa 2008; Huisman 2008; Wissema 2008). Within this frame, it seeks to summarize their response as evidenced by a growing body of the literature.

Certainty in the environment has been reduced by changes in funding. There has been a movement away from a system that was at one time nearly universal (with some private university exceptions, to be observed mainly in the US) of almost total central or regional public funding, to a situation where a growing proportion of finance has to be sought from nondirect public sources including fees, research grants, local development monies, alumni, industry and social enterprise, contract research, and philanthropy (Williams 2009). While government remains a key player in most countries, it has moved its disbursement stance into a more directive mode. Thus, the uncertainty resulting from having to seek a greater proportion of funding from other sources is matched by pressure to move

³ Derived from Lawrence and Lorsch (1986), Covin and Slevin (1991) and Gibb (1985). Acknowledgement also to Professor Antti Paasio of the University of Turku Finland who provided the germ of the idea. While the arrows on the Simple/Complex and Certain/Uncertain matrix point in one direction it is possible for a university to move from any one segment to another.




Fig. 2.1 The changing university paradigm

away from the simpler, more certain, ‘autonomous’ environment (guaranteed by the public purse) within which to pursue individualistic research and teaching. There is now an imperative to demonstrate more direct public value (see below). Some governments (for example Finland) are providing direct financial incentives to higher education institutions to leverage public funding.

The public pressures for change are underpinned by a number of factors which are also contributing substantially to uncertainties and complexities, as explored in the sections below.

2.2.1 The Massification of Higher Education

Of major importance is the move to what has been labeled the ‘massification’ of the education offer from the university sector (Rinne and Koivula 2009). The UK Government, for example, has committed itself to higher education being open to half the UK school leaving population. This is a trend evident in many other ‘developed’ countries (Rinne op cit.). It is difficult, if not impossible for this growth in ‘demand’ to be wholly funded by the state. The emphasis is, therefore, placed on other sources of funding, particularly fees—a controversial issue in many countries (Douglas 2008). This leads, in turn, to the creation of a more openly competitive market for students, requiring a more entrepreneurial response from institutions. It is also leading to a more critical and demanding student consumer group and many of them are now funding more of their own education through personal debt. There is already evidence of this in the UK⁴: this situation has been considerably exacerbated by the 2009 global crisis.

⁴ Student protests across the UK. BBC News Wednesday November 5 (2008).

2.2.2 The Employability Agenda

The global downturn has also impacted substantially on the issue of the employability of graduates (ESECT 2005; Cranmer 2006). Universities are finding themselves in a competition focused upon the job take-up of their students. Students themselves face increasing regional and global competition in the labor market (Rajan et al. 1997; Westwood 2000). The employability issue, however, goes beyond that of simple graduate unemployment and employment prospects. There are calls by industry and indeed governments for graduate education to incorporate a greater skills focus across the whole curricula (OECD 2001; Papayannakis et al. 2008). More precisely, there is an articulation by employers of the need for graduates to be equipped with a range of ‘enterprising skills’ with foci upon creativity, capacity for innovation, networking, relationship management and risk taking (Moreland 2007). This ‘need’ has been extensively articulated by the European Commission in a number of studies calling for the development of the ‘Entrepreneurial Mindset’ in the student population (EU 2006). There is also some evidence that this view of the importance of entrepreneurial skills to future employment is shared by the student population (Coaldrake 2001) and that universities are not seen to be fully equipped to meet this need (Coaldrake 2001; Durham University CEL 2009). While, therefore, there is certainly a demand it is clear that it cannot easily be met within the existing institutional system (Cranmer 2006).

2.2.3 The Student Voice

Against the above backdrop, there has been a substantial growth of student societies in universities across the world many of them linked internationally in partnership.⁵ They are becoming the vehicle for articulating the student need for entrepreneurship curriculum in the university. Many UK Universities, for example, now have student entrepreneurship societies some with very substantial membership and engaged in a wide range of activity. The Oxford University society, ‘Oxford Entrepreneurs’ (www.oxfordentrepreneurs.co.uk), has a membership of several thousand students. It has a full time (1 year sabbatical) president and runs a variety of activities, including competitions, networking and counseling events, start-up workshops, guest speaker presentations, placement programs, and links to venture capital. These societies become a mechanism for articulating student need to the university and demand for entrepreneurship programs across the whole curriculum (Edwards 2001). While they generally operate with a considerable degree of autonomy they can benefit substantially from dedicated staff and faculty support (Williamson et al. 2009).

⁵ See, for example, the work of Students in Free Enterprise (www.sife.org), European Confederation of Junior Enterprises (JADE) (www.jadenet.org), and National Consortium of University Entrepreneurs (NACUE) (www.nacue.org).

2.2.4 Developing Entrepreneurial Skills

The articulation of employer need, coming from a range of private and public sources, has moved the focus of graduate entrepreneurship education beyond its hitherto major concentration upon equipping a limited number of graduates for self employment (Green and Saridakis 2008) into the area of the development of entrepreneurial skills for all (Jack and Anderson 1999; Klofsten 2000; Rae and Carswell 2000; Blenker et al. 2006; Miclea 2004; Kneale 2005). This matches a public policy rhetoric which goes beyond industry demand towards articulating the need to equip students at all levels in the education system with personal entrepreneurial capacities to deal with greater levels of uncertainty and complexity in both their work and personal life (Poon and Hee Ang 1995; Ravasi and Turati 2005; Gibb 2007). This includes the capacity to design organizations of all kinds, public, private, and NGO, to support effective entrepreneurial behavior (Barrie 2007). This focus has implications for the wider debate on the nature of university learning (Haggis 2006; Leisner 2006; Barrie 2007; Kinchin et al. 2008). This broad view of entrepreneurship places emphasis in a ‘teaching’ context upon the pedagogical and organizational processes necessary to the support of entrepreneurial competency and attributes across a range of different disciplinary and multi-disciplinary contexts (Volkman 2004; Politis 2005). Entrepreneurship, therefore, becomes almost an intra-disciplinary concept intrinsic to the development of all students and university teaching staff (Coaldrake and Stedman 1999; Roman et al. 2008). This is far from the conventional business school model. The approach also, however, has implications for the organizational structures that will support the embedding of such an entrepreneurial concept within the institution (see below). Much of the recent thinking in this respect is influenced by the work of the US Kauffman Foundation and its Cross-Campus Entrepreneurial Education Initiative (www.kauffman.org and Mendes et al. 2006). The broader employability and entrepreneurial skills agenda has also presented a major challenge for the work of university careers departments, many of them are now engaging with external agencies on the development of programs for enhancing a range of graduate entrepreneurial skills as well as capacity for self employment (www.ncee.org.uk). This shift in emphasis has major implications for the development of their own staff.

2.2.5 The Challenge of Globalization

Graduate employment futures, in the context of a global labor market, are characterized by frequent changes in job, occupation, and location, also potentially involving periods of involuntary self or contract employment (Rajan et al. 1997). This demands a capacity in graduates to think and act both locally and globally in an entrepreneurial way. Their ability to develop this capacity becomes a function of the nature of the university itself and its strategies to bridge the local–global

interface. In this context, the policy thrust in Europe has been to firmly link entrepreneurship with competitiveness and education (EU 1998, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008). There is much debate on this issue in the education literature (Carnoy 1999; Brush et al. 2003; Altbach 2005) with a distinction made between exploring the impact of globalization and the changes demanded or resulting from wide ranging global pressures (Kwiek 2000, 2001; Toakley 2004; Scase 2007) on the one hand, and internationalization or the processes by which a university seeks to respond to threats and opportunities on the other. In short, globalization is an external force and internationalization is a response to that force. Distinctions can, thereafter, be made among the motivations of universities to internationalize, the targets they set for themselves, the processes they pursue, and the desired outcomes.

Already, at the beginning of this century, across Europe, the vast majority of higher education establishments saw internationalization as of major importance (Noir sur Blanc 1999). The imperative in this respect has since become acute (UNESCO 2003; OECD 2004; International Association of Universities 2005). This reflects the fact that institutions increasingly perceive themselves as being in an internationally competitive market place, for staff, for students, for income generation, and for research (UNESCO 2003; Altbach and Knight 2006). Prestige, not finance, appears to be a major motivation: internationalization is seen to raise the national as well as the global profile (Altbach and Knight 2006). It can also be seen as part of a competitive strategy to improve quality of staff and students via overseas recruitment as well as a means of enhancing student experience and existing staff development (Green and Baer 2000). It can lead on to curriculum development and innovation as well as greater cultural sensitivity. Developing partnerships, both academic and industrial, also seems to be a powerful tool in this respect.

2.2.6 The Internationalization Strategies of Universities

Commitment to internationalization involves elements of entrepreneurial risk taking and strategic choice (Knight 2003). Figure 2.2 encapsulates the various target processes and activities involved in internationalization. Some of these activities and processes carry more risk than others. Establishing overseas campuses, for example, entails high risk. The major issue here is to what extent international activity adds to the global understanding of the institution, enhances student and staff learning, and enables it to truly understand, be sensitive to, and work with, different cultures (Green and Baer 2000). The centre-point of Fig. 2.2 is arguably the most important strategic outcome, that is the degree to which the institution adds value to its own learning as a result of the activities listed and the degree to which it rewards such learning. Overall, in outcome evaluation terms, there will be a need to measure the degree to which the activity brings both status and material rewards (income and other resources) that are sustainable. The former appears to be as important, if not more so, than the latter—although in the long run the two are intimately related.




Fig. 2.2 Activities and processes involved in university internationalization

2.2.7 The Global Knowledge Configuration

A major influence upon the drive to internationalization is the rise of the global knowledge economy (Peters 2003) accessed substantially through the Internet (Senges 2007). The Web has effectively eaten into the local and national monopoly of knowledge that universities have traditionally enjoyed. It has also created new combinations and foci for knowledge (Delanty 2001) in that it has no respecter of traditional disciplines and more open to the organization of knowledge on a 'need to know' and issue basis. It challenges the monopoly that universities have hitherto had on the organization and delivery of 'explicit' knowledge (Habermas and Blazek 1987; Delanty 2003); and it challenges the power of elite groups who maintain and channel knowledge through major journals and publications. It considerably reduces the time it traditionally takes, through academic journals, to bring new knowledge into the public domain. Journals and their academic editors and boards are having to adapt to this competitive pressure exemplified by, increasingly, individual academics opening up their ideas and findings through their own websites and Facebook entries. The sharing of experiential and tacit knowledge via the Internet also exposes the 'know how' position of universities. Faced with this scenario, academe is confronted with the challenge of becoming more of a 'learning organisation' (Kristensen 1999) rather than solely a 'learned organisation.' Also, it is opening itself up to learning from a wider range of stakeholder sources, involving engagement in the 'community of practice' (Wenger 1998) as well as in more formal/informal processes of knowledge exchange.

2.2.8 Knowledge Transfer and Engagement Processes

In the developed economies, active university engagement in knowledge exchange has also been substantially driven by a public policy agenda which has placed higher education firmly in the forefront of enhancement of national innovation and competitiveness (Lee 1996; Agraval 2001; Shane 2004; Kweik 2005). Over the past decade, in particular this has been the lever for change in the way that universities disseminate knowledge (Lee 1996; Mendoza and Berger 2005). The traditional mode in respect of science (the main focus of public pressure) was independent creation of knowledge beyond direct control of government (although substantially funded by it). Research was driven by curiosity not economic interest, and disseminated by publication of the papers. This last mentioned was the main channel for placing new knowledge into the public domain. It was assumed that 'industry' would read, digest, and act when appropriate. Over the last half-century the limitations of this approach have been very exposed, in particular with reference to the time lags involved in publication, and the dependency upon the disposition of individuals who may move both location and field of interest and their associated interaction with industry.

An almost universal approach to dealing with this problem has been through knowledge transfer institutions and mechanisms, such as:

- the creation of science and technology parks, adjacent to, and sometimes owned by, universities;
- the development of the role of intermediaries such as industrial liaison offices;
- the opening of technology transfer and information offices (Chapple et al. 2004);
- the development of student and staff incubators (Ylinenpää 2001);
- the launching of new venture programs for staff and students;
- the development of clearer IP policies and arrangements for the licensing and patenting of university know-how (Baldini et al. 2006);
- the organization of spin off activity; and
- the creation of venture and loan funds.

There is evidence, however that this is not enough. A growing body of the literature (Hughes 2003; Link 2006; Dooley and Kirk 2007; Abreu et al. 2008) argues that the key to successful knowledge transfer is a process of continuous dialog building up social networks (Nicolaou and Birley 2003), success in which is a function of development of strong personal (as opposed to institutional) relationships over time leading to the creation of trust (a key element in entrepreneurial activity). It has even been argued that an over focus upon transactional mechanics such as licenses and patents may distract from the development of personal intimacy and trust (Dooley and Kirk 2007; Brown and Jenkins 2008).

The role of the individual academic in building the relationship is that of bringing a wider perspective to a client problem, being prepared to engage in the development out of research, and by this means help to bridge the gap between explicit and tacit knowledge which is often highly contextual. This relationship

involves complete engagement with a process and is not just a simple case of commercial exploitation of a particular piece of university research (Agraval 2001). In this way, the concept of transfer partnerships takes on a deeper meaning than that embodied in some official policy recommendations (Sainsbury 2007). The building of relationships provides a number of benefits to the university including: potential additional funding for research; access to proprietary technology held by industry; and enhanced status and faster feedback loops on its own concepts and ideas (Geiger 2004, 2006; Dooley and Kirk 2007). It may also put pressure on the university to generate problem-focused multi disciplinary teams and centers (Campbell et al. 2002; National Academy of Science USA 2005).

2.2.9 Regional and Local Engagement

It is in the field of knowledge transfer and engagement that the regional role of universities has been most highlighted (Boucher et al. 2003; Charles 2003, 2006; IHEP 2007; Arbo and Bennenworth 2008). There is an obvious potential link between a university's contribution to innovation and its contribution to a region's development (Smith 2007). This link is reflected in the growing focus of European government regional policies since the 1980s upon innovation and technology development and the exploitation of university knowledge (particularly with the support of the European Commission). Worldwide, the models of MIT (O'Shea et al. 2007), Silicon Valley and North Carolina in the US have become iconic along with the Cambridge Phenomena (Segal 1985) in the UK. There are, however, many other European examples on offer, for example, Linköping in Sweden, Turku in Finland, and Twente in the Netherlands (Braun and Diensberg 2007). The label of the 'Entrepreneurial University' is, therefore, frequently associated with the notion of the university as a regional innovation hub (Sole-Parellada et al. 2001). It appears to be widely accepted in this context that successful innovation necessarily involves a highly interactive process of engagement among universities, industry, and government. This engagement process has been labeled the Triple Helix Model (Benner and Sandstrom 2000; Shinn 2002; Leyesdorff and Meyer 2003; Zhou 2008; Etzkowitz 2008).

The model portrays an interactive process of research funding through private and public partnerships focused upon the development out of research and learning, by all partners, from this process. This model is not solely a regional one, but has a strong regional orientation particularly when it engages with small and medium-sized firms. It assumes that entrepreneurs will work in the university and academic staff in the company, that the partnership may also link with other sources of funding and that there will be clear patterns of co-ordination (Etzkowitz 2008). Its full manifestation can be characterized as in Fig. 2.3. The model is also associated with the Mode 2 concept of a university discussed later below (Gibbons et al. 1994; Novotny 2003). While universities now frequently have 'professionally managed' offices for regional development and knowledge transfer issues, it




Fig. 2.3 The basis of the triple Helix Model—Higher education, government, and private sector partnership

has been argued above (Dooley and Kirk 2007) that even though they are a window to the outside world they may constitute a barrier to total academic staff commitment and ownership which is at the heart of Fig. 2.3.

While much of the discussion of the Triple Helix model is narrowly focused upon knowledge transfer, universities have increasingly been drawn into a playing a stronger regional social and economic development role in many other ways (Arbo and Benneworth 2008). While they are often important employees and indirect job generators in a region in their own right they can take on the mantle of being a leading network hub for focus upon regional development issues. They can act as animateurs for the development of sustainable networks of exchange on important issues. They can focus on supplying skilled young people to a region and are a mechanism for enhancing social mobility. Through their outreach education and training programs, they can seek to bring forward the future and act as a major learning source for regional stakeholders. They can, through their reputation and specialist expertise, play an important role in attracting investment to a region. Via research they throw independent light on key development issues and act as a means for independent evaluation. They are often an exporter, bringing in income to a region: but also, through their internationalization work, they can bring major contacts into the locality, and thus raise its visibility and capacity to build networks abroad. They also often act as an intermediary in articulating regional development issues to central government in areas of technology policy, education and skills development and competition policy. Overall, they may take a central place in the development of many aspects of a region's culture. There is clear evidence that across Europe universities are taking on more of the role of bridging local with global (Arbo and Benneworth 2008). Whether an individual university wishes to

play a transformational role as a regional change agent is, however, an issue for its individual mission and strategy.

2.2.10 University Funding, Enterprise, Autonomy, and Academic Freedom

It was noted above that throughout the world there has been a gradual evolution in the way that universities are funded, as public budgets fail to take the strain of rapidly growing student numbers (Zumeta 2007; Williams 2009). In the UK, for example, base public funding provides only 40 % of university resource, the remainder expected to come from a variety of sources including hypothecated (targeted) public programs, European or local government funding, student fees (Greenaway and Haynes 2003), research finding, contract work, foundations, alumni donations, and catering and other services-altogether some £7bn of £18bn of the UK university income comes from non-state sources (Universities UK 2007).

There is no space in this paper to explore the intricacies of higher education funding, widely debated elsewhere (Cunningham and Cochi-Ficano 2000; Rolfe 2001; De Ziva 2005; Douglas 2008; Williams 2009), but the issue is of relevance to the entrepreneurial concept in a number of ways. Most important is the degree to which funding impinges upon the autonomy of institutions (Darling et al. 1989; Li-Chuan 2004). Here, there has been, and continues to be, much debate. On the one hand, there are those who argue that public funding constrains academic freedom particularly as it becomes more directive and that diversified income sources ensure a higher degree of freedom (Li-Chuan 2004). Others argue that funding raised from elsewhere, particularly from the private sector, in many cases has strings attached to it (Leslie and Ramey 1998).

In reality the detail is more complex. Much depends upon the mix of funding; for example, monies from alumni, charitable donations, and research grants from independent bodies may be less likely to impinge upon autonomy than commercial contracts. More subtly, much also depends upon the impact of funding arrangements on choice of personnel (freedom to appoint staff and students), freedom to determine curriculum and the balance of research and teaching, the make-up of governing boards and the processes of accountability which impact upon freedom to develop (Li-Chuan 2004). A major issue in funding overall is the degree to which it impinges on the fulfillment of the university mission (Hearn 2003).

Funding strategies are therefore becoming more complex, with governments forcing the issue by giving matching incentives to fund-raising from private sources.⁶ The search to 'buy autonomy' has created considerable interest in the

⁶ For example, in Finland the government has introduced an incentive program to raising of finance by leveraging private with public funding.

cost benefit of ‘fund raising’ through development offices (Baade and Sundberg 1996) and has caused reflection upon the relatively poor performance of European universities in tracking, building relationships with and raising funds from, alumni compared with their American counterparts (Thomas 2004). In some countries, in response to the above scenario, the privatization of universities is very much on the public agenda (IHEP 2009).

Altogether, the financing issue is yet another central focus for entrepreneurial management, with considerable risk attached, not only of a simple resource nature.

2.2.11 Creating Public Value

The issues discussed above demonstrate the increasingly complex and uncertain task environment facing higher education. University responses to this have heightened the intellectual controversy concerning the central ‘idea’ of a university (Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Gilbert 2000; Graham 2002; Kirp 2003). At the heart of the debate is the notion that universities are being driven by a range of market forces into commercial organizations focused upon the ‘sale’ or ‘capitalisation’ of knowledge. The latter is defined as ‘knowledge created for use as well as for disciplinary advance and linked with economic and social advance’ (Etzkowitz 2004). Some writers go so far as to describe universities as ‘knowledge factories’ (Lazzeroni and Piccaluga 2003). Thus, the intellectual autonomy of the institution and curiosity-based research, in particular, is seen to be eroded in favor of ‘value in use’ (Albert 2003). This has been characterized as a move from a Mode 1 model where the university was an independent space for discovery, beyond control, with government, as key funder, the main guarantor, to a Mode 2 typology of an organization engaged in high levels of interaction with a range of stakeholders where sustainability is a function of a broader legitimization as seen through the eyes of the state, private partners, and indeed society as a whole (Gibbons et al. 1994; Dooley and Kirk 2007; Rinne and Koivula 2009). The University moves from being a niche organization towards a more open and comprehensive organization (Nowotny and Scott and Gibbons 2001). Funding in this Mode comes from an ever-widening range of sources. The university sees its offer as a public good embracing the concept of ‘knowledge travel’ as set out in Fig. 2.4 (Barnett 2000) and moving away from its dependency upon ‘credentialism’ (Rinne and Koivula 2009).

The Mode 2 characterization firmly places the university within the concept of being an instrument for creating ‘public value’ (Nowotny et al. 2003; Alperovotz et al. 2005). This concept developed by Mark Moore of Harvard University (Moore 1995) has commanded a great deal of attention world wide, and particularly from government in the UK (Kelly et al. 2007). It is seen as an alternative to the measurement of outcomes from public investment via cost benefit analysis. The three key essences of the model are: a strong initial planning focus upon the value of the proposed ‘offer’ to the community; the creation of legitimacy for courses of action by full engagement of the relevant community stakeholders; and




Fig. 2.4 The Mode 2 university and the new foci of 'Knowledge Travel'

ensuring that the plans and proposals are clearly within the capacity, goals, and values of the institution. Of key importance to the changing university scenario described earlier is the concept's emphasis upon gaining legitimacy by wide engagement of interested parties in the process of doing things.

2.3 The Entrepreneurial Organizational Challenge

2.3.1 The Entrepreneurial Organization Concept

Much emphasis has been placed by many of the referenced authors to the need for a university to be highly flexible in its response to the environment described above (Vaira 2004). The above paragraphs have briefly characterized some of the responses. The combination of different demands being made by government, still a major source of funding, via processes of quality measures rather than direct control, combined with the competitive market, and stakeholder demands described above, have presented considerable challenges to the university organization design around the world (OECD 2005, 2007; Olssen and Peters 2005; Pan 2007; Pilbeam 2008). Contingency organizational theory demands that institutions are designed around the specific nature of their task environment and thereafter flexibly adjust in response to change in the environment (Lawrence and Lorsch 1986; Covin and Slevin 1991; Namen and Slaven 1993). Many writers have focused upon this issue in the higher education context (Coaldrake 2001; Salmi 2001).

Burton Clark, perhaps the most influential writer in this field, argues (2004a) on the basis of a number of case studies (including two UK universities) for five key components of entrepreneurial university organization:

- a strong central steering core to embrace management groups and academics;
- an expanded development periphery involving a growth of units that reach out beyond the traditional areas in the university;

- diversity in the funding base, not only by use of government third stream funding but from a wide variety of sources;
- a stimulated academic heartland with academics committed to the entrepreneurial concept; and
- an integrated entrepreneurial culture defined in terms of common commitment to change.

While his arguments can clearly be seen to be in response to some of the pressures noted above, the depth of his research has been criticized (Deem 2001; Finlay 2004). Moreover, no strong conceptual argument (as opposed to an empirical conclusion) is put forward to link this with his call for institutions to be more focused upon innovation, taking risks, and dealing with uncertainty.

Etzkowitz, another leading writer on this issue, puts forward (2004) five propositions concerning the entrepreneurial university concept, namely that such institutions are focused upon: the capitalization of knowledge; managing interdependence with industry and government; are nevertheless independent of any particular sphere; are 'hybrid' in managing the tension between independence and interdependence; and embody reflexivity, involving continuous renewal of internal structures.

The observations of these writers and others can be plotted against a broader conceptual frame setting out key components of an organization moving to cope entrepreneurially with high levels of uncertainty and complexity. Such an organization is designed to maximize the use of effective entrepreneurial behavior appropriate to the task environment (Lawrence and Lorsch 1986; Covin and Slevin 1991). Figure 2.5 presents such a framework for evaluation of the broad entrepreneurial challenge to university organization design.

It is important to distinguish the entrepreneurial model from other organizational approaches and concepts introduced into academe over the past decade in particular the 'new managerialism' (Deem 1998, 2001), the 'corporate business model', 'professionalism' (Blackmore and Blackwell 2006; Kolsaker 2008) and 'marketisation' (Bok 2003). Entrepreneurial organization is not synonymous with any of these. The entrepreneurial concept stretches well beyond the business and new venture context. It is distinct from, but possibly overlapping with, components of the managerialist concept as it is to be associated with a certain style of leadership; but managerialism has become associated with many of the 'rules' of corporate bureaucracy, namely: highly formal planning processes and information systems; tight accountability and standard setting; audits; order; and demarcation.

'Professionalism' is clearly associated to some degree with this by the bringing into universities a new culture of professional managers (Sporn 1996) leading, some argue, to the possible marginalization of academics (Deema 2007). This contrasts with an entrepreneurial emphasis upon enhancing the capacity of the existing body of academe to lead change. Finally, the entrepreneurship concept is not at all wholly synonymous with 'marketisation' either in the pure commercial sense of setting up the university to 'sell' know-how nor in the sense of adopting business and other approaches to reaching customers although it may embody appropriate elements of both at times. Certainly, the concepts of 'branding' the



Fig. 2.5 The university as an entrepreneurial organization

university, image creation and reaching out to the public through various channels especially through the media are important.

2.3.2 The Organization Development Challenges

The frame above (Fig. 2.5) can be used to explore some of the organization development challenges noted above. Entrepreneurial organizations have a strong bottom-up development and initiative focus, empowering individuals at all levels of the organization to enjoy freedom for action. The dominant controlling and motivating parameter is not systems but shared mission, values and culture, and trust (Davies 2001; Daumard 2001). Thus, a major challenge and opportunity to universities is to build entrepreneurship upon the considerable freedom enjoyed by departments and individuals, traditionally embodied in the notion of a ‘community of scholars’ moving this more towards a ‘community of practice’ (Todorovic et al. 2005; Wenger 1998). In this respect there is a diverse number of issues. Universities can be characterized as pluralistic organizations with different departments having very different external orientations and indeed academic values. While a strong central steering group, as Clark has argued, may therefore be desirable in reinforcing the mission, the major challenge is that of placing ownership of innovation and change with academic departments, finding champions therein who, perhaps incrementally, can move innovation up the departmental agenda. This is not an easy task. There is evidence to suggest that departments are often heavily focused upon ‘defending their patch’ within the present organization system rather than upon innovating (Bryman 2007).

It has already been argued above that establishing intermediary professional units to ‘manage’ a range of externally focused activities, in the absence of departmental initiative, may emasculate the capacity and motivation for academics to take up

challenges in their own distinct environment. In stimulating academic initiative, formal strategic planning and mission statements may be less important than encouragement of flexible strategic thinking, integrating action with strategy, when confronting opportunity, and threats (Courtney et al. 1999). Shattock argues that, in the present climate, strategic planning should be ‘a framework only for opportunistic decision making’ (Shattock 2000). Entrepreneurial innovation will also require flexibility in organization design to allow the growth of overlap and interdependency among different departments, projects, and even individuals in adjusting flexibly to the demands of society for new combinations of knowledge. This may lead to Schumpeterian ‘creative destruction’ (Schumpeter 1934), as those departments slow to adapt, fade or merge into new units. Overall, in this scenario, there will be a challenge to the reward system in the organization in moving it towards recognition of innovation, successful integration of knowledge, and relevance to the wider community.

While the above may challenge the university in the way that it measures excellence (Amaral and Magalhaes 2003; Schuetze 2007), incorporating the concept of ‘public value’ as described above, does not necessarily, as is sometimes argued (Mawditt 1998; Berglund 2008), threaten emphasis upon excellence in research, nor the essential ‘idea’ of a university. Etzkowitz, for example, argues that the current concern for the wider embedding of knowledge takes universities back to their original objectives. Others argue that the new ‘DNA’ of knowledge is ‘polyvalent’ and intellectual with the interdisciplinary, theoretical, and practical merging together (Viale et al. 2005). In a seminal paper for the US Kauffmann Foundation (2008), Michael Crow, the president of Arizona State University, a major US research university, argues the case for the ‘New American Research University’ with academic enterprise as the ‘organising principle’. His targets for such an organization are:

- academic excellence focused upon, and backed up with, maximising social impact;
- competitiveness;
- agility;
- adaptability;
- inclusivity;
- focussing globally yet also locally;
- responsiveness to changing needs;
- and speedy decision-making capability.

His view of the university is as a ‘force for societal transformation’ with a culture of academic enterprise focused upon user-inspired relevance and transcending disciplinary-based limitations. The concept of the ‘citizen scholar’, also increasingly debated in the US (Cherwitz 2005) aligns with this where the focus is upon empowerment of the individual. These concepts have major organizational and physical design, as well as intellectual, implications.

2.3.3 Governance and the Entrepreneurial University

It is the view of the UK committee of university chairs (CUC) that stakeholders external to the university have a major role in holding it to account (CUC 2000, 2004, 2009). The main mechanism for this in most universities across the world is the council or board of governors (Dearing 1997; CUC 2000; Chan and Lo 2007). There has been much debate internationally on governance in universities (OECD 2003; Ka Ho Mok 2005; Kohler and Huber 2006; Bleiklie and Kogan 2007; Schonfield 2009; Mora and Vieira 2009). This has focused upon a number of issues of which the power of the council & board in approving and shaping a university's strategy is major. (Navarro et al. Navarro and Gallardo 2003; Shattock 2009: Chap. 4). The debate explores: the relationship between the chair of the council & board and the universities vice chancellor or principal; the size and composition of the board⁷ and the balance of its representation; what should be its key performance indicators; and, perhaps most important, in the context of this paper, the board as an instrument for leading change (Lombardi et al. 2002).

In line with the ideas of Clark (2004a, b), there have been moves to streamline boards; and to strengthen their power and links with the VC or CEO and his or her management team. In the UK this was a main recommendation of the 1997 National Committee of Enquiry into Higher Education (Dearing 1997). This led to internal changes in many universities, with a strengthening of the power of an executive team at the expense of the traditional academic representative body, the senate. This has also been accompanied, in the UK and also more universally, by internal changes aimed at reducing bureaucracy and removing a heavy dependency upon committee structures which are said to impede innovation. There has also been a broad trend towards the appointment of professional administrators reporting to a small senior executive team. All of these changes are contested by some, on the grounds of weakening democracy in the institution and marginalizing the concept of a community of scholars (Graham 2002, 2003; Zhou 2008; Berglund 2008). They have, however, been counterbalanced in some cases by processes of greater devolution to academic departments.

In the context of this paper's focus upon entrepreneurship, the issue of governance can be assessed in several ways. First, by the degree to which streamlining the board enhances the university's engagement with external stakeholders across the whole institution, building the 'learning organisation' capacity as described above (Miller and Katz 2004). Second, whether, as a result, the university becomes more sensitive in its long-term strategies to wider societal needs. Third, whether there is an impact on decision-making structures throughout the organization, as discussed above, other than at the top. And, overall, whether it increases the capacity of the organization to innovate. There is currently little research that addresses these issues in the context of the effectiveness of governance arrangements.

⁷ In the UK the Dearing report (1997) (Higher Education in the Learning Society) led to the streamlining of boards.

2.3.4 The Individual Academic Entrepreneur

Within every university, and perhaps within every department, there will be some academics who will be continuously looking outward, harvesting knowledge, and experience from a wider range of stakeholders than can be found within the ‘halls of academe’ (Bird and Allen 1989). There will also be some who in general ‘buy into’ the concept of the entrepreneurial university as outlined above, although they may have a widely different balance of views as to what this means in both concept and practice (Duberley et al. 2007; Mcinnis 2001; Meyer and Evans 2007). Moreover, academics find themselves in very different types of organization within the sector with different cultures and views of what constitutes ‘excellence’ (Finlay 2004). Etzkowitz, for example, has radically posited the notion of research groups as ‘quasi firms’ (2003). While there may have been an erosion of the power of academics in some universities the individual department and staff member still has considerable independence. In what has been described as the traditional liberal university model (Delanty 2001) the degree of interaction with the external environment was wholly an individual choice. As universities, in general, (some more than others) move to what Delanty describes as a reflexive model (based upon exchange and reciprocity between knowledge producers and users) there is more scope for rewarding the academic entrepreneur. In the scientific knowledge transfer context, described earlier in this chapter, this becomes important as it is the personal academic interface that is elevated above the impact of physical and administrative structures, as characterized by science and technology parks and technology transfer offices (Klofsten and Jones-Evans 2000; Franklin et al. 2001).

The evidence suggests that conflicting interests for academics do arise in the arena of practical engagement, with industry in particular, and that there are career uncertainties for those academics who actively engage (Duberley et al. 2007). But the same study demonstrates that scientists often view the prospect of commercialization of their work as a means to its full realization, and demonstration of their own potential. While the increased blurring of the distinction between pure and applied science seems to be more widely accepted, the key issues for academics seem to be more about resources, career concerns, processes, and rewards (non-financial as well as financial). Overall, the dynamics of the changes described earlier have major implications for the design of career structures in academe.

2.4 The Leadership Challenge

2.4.1 Summarizing the Basic Challenges

The previous sections of this chapter have painted a broad scenario of factors that seem to be moving many universities towards a more entrepreneurial mode and have also reviewed organization and individual development issues impinging on the institution’s possible response. The US Department of Education sees this as a major

test of leadership (2006). For those in a position to lead this change there are many tensions. Sir David Watson 2008 in a contribution to a 'Consultation' workshop organized by the UK Council for Industry and Higher Education and the Society for Research into Higher Education summed these up in a UK context as: Conservative v Radical; Competitive v Collegiate; Commercial v Charitable; Autonomous v Accountable; Traditional v Innovative; Local v International; and Public v Private. In the same publication Cubie, Chair of the CUC notes the dichotomies between the entrepreneurial culture and the audit and managerial culture (pp. 14–17). In reality the distinctions are much finer yet deeper. There are basic conceptual as well as ideological confusions about the nature of the entrepreneurial paradigm itself, which fundamentally affect individual academic attitudes (Ma 2000; Maunter 2005).

Despite recent changes, there remains in many organizations a tension between the academic collegiate view of a community of scholars (where disciplines are the 'invisible college') backed up by numerous committee activities and a powerful senate or academic council (in the traditional model of a university) and streamlined executive decision-making teams capable of more rapid response to change (Meyer and Evans 2007). Resources are increasingly scarce and fought over for maintenance rather than change (Clark 2004). The specialized administrative units focused upon outreach activities such as regional development, technology transfer. Knowledge exchange, alumni development and careers, noted above, may compete for resources and endeavor to build their own empires, limiting potential for synergy among them and limiting the capacity to give real ownership to academics. Reaching out internationally, and attracting new resource, demands large amounts of executive time. Thomas, for example, found that seeking external resource in the US could take up to 30 % of deans and heads of department time (Thomas 2004).

Managing a wider range of stakeholders. Multi-actors, multi-interfaces and multi-objectives constitute a major leadership challenge (Maak 2007; Bryman 2007). In the UK the restructuring of university councils and boards and their empowerment has added to this pressure. Despite these changes there is a strong sense of academic independence rooted in departments so that a distinctive leadership characteristic of departmental heads can be seen as their ability to 'defend the department' (Bryman 2007). In this context, the challenge can be seen to encourage innovative leadership throughout the organization (Mcinnis 2001; Greenhalgh 2008). There is, therefore, the issue of challenging certain aspects of the 'new managerialism' particularly those that control rather than stimulate risk and innovation. There is evidence that academics are uncomfortable with over-use of authority, finance led decisions, audit trails involving more paper work, and being cut off from decision making (Deem 2007).

2.4.2 The Entrepreneurial Leadership Concept

A key issue is the degree to which the entrepreneurial leader concept sits with the above challenge. The concept itself must also fit with the entrepreneurial organization framework set out earlier. From the literature (Schein 1992; Kilgour 1992;



Fig. 2.6 The entrepreneurial leader

Kuratko and Hornsby 1999; Dulewicz 2000; Mcinnis 2001; Vecchio 2003; Gupta et al. 2004) a matching frame can be drawn as in Fig. 2.6 below, which contextualizes key characteristics against the challenges above and the frame in Fig. 2.5. The result has much in common with 'transformational leadership' (Bass 1990; Epitropaki 2001). Intellectual and visionary leadership is needed for two major reasons: first to remove ideological and 'concept of a university' barriers associated with the entrepreneurial paradigm; and second to carry this through in the particular context of the nature of the university itself and its existing culture, mission, and strategy. This is not to infer a concentration upon creating 'new' formal strategy statements (Shattock 2000); substituting strategy for leadership has been warned against (Watson 2008). Entrepreneurial change is achieved by doing, not by paper.

In the organizational climate described above, and perhaps in academe in general, leadership is a concept to be earned not formally designated. Managing the balance of relationships among formally engaged stakeholders (the board or council) and other external stakeholders and internal stakeholders is a complex process (Froome 1999). Super complexity (CIHE and SRHE 2008) is within, as well as without, the organization. A key challenge will be to create entrepreneurial role models within departments and gradually to build a culture of rewarding innovation in every department rather than a culture of defence. This will demand capacity to identify potential change agents and build teams around them, encourage risk, and protect them. Shared purpose is thus built by example and reward.

In the UK it has been argued that leadership in the departmental context is low status with relatively few rewards for heads of programs or chairing departmental committees (Bryman 2007). Identifying potential departmental change agents will demand an ability to recognize different styles of leadership and different attitudes associated with potentially enterprising 'clever people' (Goffee and Jones 2007)

with competency to build from them in different ways. As part of vision building there will need to be clear articulation of the concept of innovation and its applicability to all disciplines and departments.

The overall mission would be to infuse departments with entrepreneurial values. The key instrument for creating transformation will be finding resource to support innovation in departments, particularly so in the present climate. The leader in this respect will need to be the bridge between stakeholders and departments and between bottom up and top down initiatives (Kweik 2008): as such the persuader and fixer role will be dominant. Some resource may have to be found for new units some of which may reach across traditional discipline and departmental boundaries. But the key will be in building the entrepreneurial leadership capacity of academics (Blackmore and Blackwell 2006) incrementally from existing practice.

2.4.3 Building Appropriately upon Existing Capacity

In all universities there exists a range of activities that could be broadly described as part of entrepreneurial response to the environments described earlier. Given the diversity of vision, mission, resource, status, and tradition these will vary from one institution to another. A key to the practice of entrepreneurial strategy is an initial appraisal of the existing capacity of the organization upon which to build. Such an appraisal touches upon all of the areas of response to the environment covered above, including an analysis of the way that the existing academic mission of the university, its governance, funding (leverage), strategy, and organization structure fits with, or constrains, an entrepreneurial model and the capacity for change. Among the possible range of existing activity areas to be explored are:

- knowledge and technology transfer policies and activities (Dill 1995; Geuna and Muscio 2008);
- the effectiveness of any physical infrastructure that relates to this, for example, science & technology parks and the associated existence of incubators (Albert and Gaynor 2001) and venture funds;
- new venture programs; embedded entrepreneurship program or enterprising pedagogy activity within departments;
- careers department and student society activity in this respect;
- alumni policies and programs;
- entrepreneurial curriculum and pedagogy development within departments;
- the work of interdisciplinary centers;
- regional and local partnerships;
- focus upon social and community issues (Bloom 2006);
- international activities and relationships;
- links and partnerships with entrepreneurs and business in general including applied research and consultancy activity.

The results of such an appraisal should also reveal the degree of existing interface and potential synergy from different activities. For example, student activities may link with departmental project work, with external project work involving local entrepreneurs and may be used for wider promotional activity. Technology transfer activities can link with new venture education and training programs and engage the entrepreneur community as mentors. Career departments can work in partnership with academic departments. Such an appraisal can also be used to identify potential future entrepreneurial champions in the organization (Mendes et al. 2006).

2.5 Entrepreneurial Leadership Development and Program Design

The distinctive nature of the entrepreneurial leadership challenge arising from the changing paradigm of the university has been described above. Richard Lambert's review of Business-University collaboration in the UK, for example, found that the variety of stakeholders and different demands made upon universities made the leadership role the most complex in the field (Lambert 2003). Any program designed to meet this challenge has to be targeted upon senior personnel with sufficient visibility and status in the organization to take responsibility alongside senior management, or as part of the management team, for facilitating change (Blackmore and Blackwell 2006). Such a program, as befits the nature of an entrepreneurial venture, will need to be focused upon action and learning from action, bringing together all key aspects of the leadership challenge as described above.

The Entrepreneurial University Leadership Programme is therefore structured into a number of three to four day modules with space in between for action learning. The first module aims to build intellectual capacity to absorb the concept of the entrepreneurial university as it is being configured around the world and as it is being adopted and adapted by a diversity of different higher education institutions in different cultural and international policy contexts. A key component is the development of understanding of how in practice different institutions and their leaders are redesigning their organizations to cope with the different national and international pressures; also to understand how this is being supported or otherwise by policy makers and public and private organizations and their perceptions on the key issues. Overall, a key aim is to explore how a university's activity in this sphere creates public value.

The nature of the leadership challenge as described above is also considered, focussing upon personal, relational and institutional development. In particular, the focus is upon the issue of 'leading innovation from the bottom', creating leaders and empowering academics to take risks and build rewards around new ways of doing things. A key component is network and relationship management and building trust-based relationships with the local, regional, national, and international environment.

The next module focuses upon the best concept and practice in key activity areas described in Fig. 2.7, bringing together the best of the UK and international




Fig. 2.7 Exploring best concept and practice

experience. This allows and workshops to discussions leaders to participate in a series of rotating workshops (a carousel) focused upon the important areas of development interest in their own institution. This can include optional tailored international visits to explore in more detail areas of particular interest.

The final module is focused upon individual action plans and strategies for the development of appropriate stakeholder and policy relationships. It provides an opportunity to raise and debate a number of outstanding issues arising from the program with a range of representatives from business, social enterprises, government, NGOs and student bodies. There is also a strong program focus throughout on 21st Century Challenges and their implications for the future of universities.

As noted above, the Entrepreneurial University Leadership Programme includes action learning. Between modules, participants explore relevant issues in their own institutions and work on a change project aimed at developing greater entrepreneurship (in the broadest sense of the word) either for the university as a whole or for their own department. The issues and challenges of implementing the planned changes are discussed in tutor groups and with external experts in the final module of the program.

2.6 Conclusion

The paper began with an acknowledgement that the focus was upon building a strong conceptual base for action, namely, the development of a program focused upon ‘Leading the Entrepreneurial University’. The pressures upon the higher education sector internationally and its responses have been summarized and the related organization development impacts have been set out, along with the resultant leadership challenges. Finally, there was a brief summary of the entrepreneurial university leadership program that has been developed and of the argument that

there is considerable potential in the university sector to create synergy among the many activities currently observed in the responses of individual institutions to the various challenges. The scenario painted in the paper is arguably a global one, with many related references: but there has also been much reference to the UK in the light of the location of the program.

The paper set out to add value to the considerable debate by seeking to conceptualize the concepts of the entrepreneurial organization and entrepreneurial leadership as a basis for analysis. This is needed for a number of reasons. Firstly, to move the debate on the entrepreneurial university away from the narrow focus upon commercialization of intellectual property and the fears of 'prostitution' of the 'idea' of a university that results from this (Bok 2003; Kirp 2003). Entrepreneurship has been located as an individual and organizational behavioral and development response to uncertainty and complexity broadly relevant to citizens and organizations of all kinds, private, public, and autonomous. Secondly, to provide a stronger basis for bringing together all of the activities of a university that are reflective of its response to an environment of growing uncertainty and complexity. The entrepreneurial label is often attached to only certain aspects of an institution's activity, for example knowledge transfer, regional engagement, student or staff new venturing, problem-centered learning, and so on.

Thirdly, to provide a stronger basis for an individual university to 'situate' itself within the concept. It was noted at the beginning of the paper that the university sector now embraces a wide variety of different 'typologies' of institutions with different missions and strategies. Moreover, they are undoubtedly 'led' in a variety of different ways. There are very different 'power' relationships between stakeholder councils/boards and academic 'senates' and different balances of power between the vice chancellor or principal, his/her team, intermediate professionals and the authority of the individual department and autonomy of the individual academic. Any individual on a program faced with the transfer of learning into action will need to adapt the approach taken appropriately to the distinctive existing structure, organizational and leadership characteristics, and values of the organization. The entrepreneurial organization and leadership concepts described above are not therefore recipes for change but frameworks upon which to reflect in guiding change appropriately.

The arguments, concepts and program design issues noted above also have, importantly, to be related to the overall objectives of the UK National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education (NCEE) as the main driver of the programme. Its overall mission is to develop entrepreneurship across all disciplines in all UK universities (www.ncee.org.uk). It pursues this mission in a number of ways including: the creation of widespread student awareness; the building of understanding and motivation of key stakeholders, internal, and external to the university; the development of staff capacities via an international entrepreneurship educators program (IEEP); and the monitoring of practice and progress nationally and internationally to share with all stakeholders. The sustainable impact of these activities is strongly dependent upon associated elements of institutional change within Universities. It is upon this that the Entrepreneurship University Leadership programme is focused.

Bibliography

- Agrawal A (2001) University-to-industry knowledge transfer: literature review and un-answered questions. *Int J Manage Rev* 3(4):285–302
- Alaasarela E, Fallemies M, Halkosaari T, Huhta T, Jansson L, Jylha E, Lahtela M, Nivala K, Nokso-Koivisto P, Telkki M (2002) Higher education as a pathway to entrepreneurship. Keski-Pohjanmaan Ammatikorkeakoulu, Finland
- Albert M (2003) Universities and the market economy: the differential impact on knowledge production in sociology and economics. *High Educ* 45:147–182
- Albert P, Gaynor L (2001) Incubators—growing up, moving out. A review of the literature. Chair of High Tech Entrepreneurship, CERAM, December 2001
- Alperovitz G, Howard T (2005) The next wave: building a university civic engagement service for the twenty-first century. *J High Educ Outreach Engagem* 10(2):141
- Altbach PG, Knight J (2006) The Internationalization of higher education: motivations and realities. The NEA 2006 Almanac of Higher Education. NEA, Washington
- Altbach PG (2005) Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. EPI, 2005. Global Higher Education Rankings. Affordability and Accessibility in Comparative Perspective. Washington, EPI, www.educationalpolicy.org
- Amaral A, Magalhaes A (2003) The triple crisis of the University and its reinvention. *High Educ Policy* 16:239–253
- Arbo P, Benneworth P (2008) Understanding the regional contribution of higher education institutions: a literature review. A research report prepared for the OECD Institutional Management in Higher Education Programme The contribution of higher education to regional development. OECD Paris
- Armbruster C (2008) Research Universities: autonomy and self-reliance after the Entrepreneurial University. *Policy Futures Educ* 6(4):372–389
- AUQA (2005) Proceedings of the Australian Universities quality forum engaging communities, Sydney, Australia, 6–8th July 2005 AUQA Occasional Publications Number 5. Melbourne. Australia. Universities Quality Agency
- Baade RA, Sundberg JO (1996) What determines alumni generosity? *Econ Educ Rev* 15(1):75–81
- Baar NA (1998) Higher education in Australia and Britain—what lessons? *Australian Economic Review*, 31(2):179–188. LSE Research Online, London
- Baldini N et al (2006) Institutional changes and the commercialization of academic knowledge: A study of Italian universities' patenting activities between 1965 and 2002. *Res Policy* 35(2006):518–532
- Barnett R (2000) University knowledge in an age of supercomplexity. *High Educ* 40:409–422
- Barrie SC (2007) A conceptual framework for the teaching and learning of generic graduate attributes. *Stud High Educ* 32(4):439–458
- Barsony J (2003) Towards the Entrepreneurial University. SEFI 2003 Conference—global engineer: education and training for mobility
- Bass B, Riggio RE (2008) Transformational leadership. Taylor and Francis, London
- Becher T, Trowler PR (2007) Academic tribes and territories. Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines, Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press
- Benner M, Sandstrom U (2000) Institutionalizing the triple helix: research funding and norms in the academic system. *Research Policy* 29(2000):291–301
- Bergek A, Norrman C (2008) Incubator best practice: a framework. *Technovation* 28(2008):20–28
- Berglund E (2008) I wanted to be an academic, Not 'A creative': notes on Universities and the new capitalism. *Ephemera Theory Politics Organization* 8(3):232–233
- Bernasconi A (2005) University entrepreneurship in a developing country: the case of the P. Universidad Católica de Chile, 1985–2000. *Higher Education* 50(2):247–274 (Sep 2005)
- Bird BJ, Allen DN (1989) Faculty entrepreneurship in research university environments. *J High Educ* 60(5):583–596 (Sep–Oct 1989)

- Blackmore P, Blackwell P (2006) Strategic leadership in academic development. *Stud High Educ* 31(3):373–387
- Bleiklie I, Kogan M (2007) Organization and governance of universities. *High Educ Policy* 20(20):477–493
- Blenker P et al. (2006) Entrepreneurship education—the new challenge facing the universities. Department of management. Aarhus School of Business Working Paper 2006–02. Aarhus School of Business, Aarhus
- Bleiklie I, Kogan M (2007) Organisation and governance of universities. *High Educ Policy* 20:261–274
- Bloom GM (2006) The social entrepreneurship collaboratory (SE Lab): a university incubator for a rising generation of leading social entrepreneurs. The Hauser Center for Non-profit Organizations and The John F. Kennedy School of Government Harvard University. Working Paper No. 31, Harvard 2006
- Boucher G, Conway C, Van Der Meer E (2003) Tiers of engagement by universities in their region's development. *Reg Stud* 37(9):887–897
- Bok D (2003) Universities in the market place. The commercialisation of higher education. Princeton University Press, USA
- Bourdieu P (1999) Social conditions of the international circulation of ideas. In: Shusterman R (ed) Bourdieu. A critical reader, Blackwell Publishers, UK, pp 220–229
- Braun G, Diensberg C (2007) Cultivating entrepreneurial regions—Cases and studies from the network project, baltic entrepreneurship partners. Rostock Contributions to Regional Science, Vol. 19. Rostock: Universität Rostock, Wirtschafts- und Sozial-wissenschaftliche Fakultät
- Bridges D, Jonathan R (2003) Education and the market, Chapter 7. In: Blake N, Smeyers P, Smith R, Standish P (eds) *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education*, Blackwell Publishing Limited
- Bridgman T (2007) Freedom and autonomy in the university enterprise. *J Organ Change Manage* 20(4):478–490
- Browne T, Jenkins M (2008) Achieving academic engagement? The landscape for educational technology support in two UK institutions. Proceedings ascilite Melbourne 2008: Concise paper: Browne and Jenkins
- Brush CG et al (2003) Doctoral education in the field of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship J Manage* 29(3):309–331
- Bryman A (2007) Effective leadership in higher education: a literature review. *Stud High Educ* 32(6):693–710
- Casson M (1982) *The entrepreneur. An economic theory*. Martin Robertson and Co. Ltd, Oxford
- Campbell WH et al (2002) Institutional and faculty roles and responsibilities in the emerging environment of University-Wide interdisciplinary research structures: report of the 2001–2002 research and graduate affairs committee. *American Journal of Education*, Vol. 66, Winter Supplement 2002
- Carnoy M (1999) Globalization and educational reform: what planners need to know. Paris: UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning
- CEL (2008) Research on diversity and governance in the FE sector recommendations and action plan
- CEL (2007) Leadership skills for governance. 2008–2009 programme and support guide, CEL: <http://www.centreforexcellence.org.uk>
- CEL (2006) World-class leadership for global excellence. CEL: <http://www.centreforexcellence.org.uk>
- Chan KF, Lau T (2005) Assessing technology incubator programs in the science park the good, the bad and the ugly. *Technovation* 25(2005):1215–1228
- Chan D, Lo W (2007) Running universities as enterprises: university governance changes in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific J Educ* 27(3):305–322
- Chapple W, Lockett A, Siegel D, Wright M (2004) Assessing the relative performance of UK university technology transfer offices: parametric and non-parametric evidence. Department of economics, rensselaer polytechnic institute. Working Papers in Economics, No. 0423. Source: <http://www.rpi.edu/dept/economics/www/workingpapers>

- Charles DR (2006) Universities as key knowledge infrastructures in regional innovation systems. *Innovation* 19(1):117–130
- Charles D (2003) Universities and territorial development: reshaping the regional role of UK universities. *Local Economy* 18(1):7–20
- Charney A, Libecap GD (2000) Impact of entrepreneurial education. Insight. A Kauffman research series. Kauffman, Kansas 09005500
- Chen S (2007) The features and trends of University development in Australia and China. *High Educ Policy* 20:223–242
- Cherwitz AR (2005) Creating a culture of intellectual entrepreneurship, *Academe* 91, 5
- Cherwitz AR (2002) Intellectual entrepreneurship. A vision for graduate education. *Change*, November/December
- Council for Industry and Higher Education (CIHE) and the Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE) (2008) *Leadership in the Age of Supercomplexity*, CIHE London
- Clark BR (1998) *Creating entrepreneurial universities, organisational pathways of transformation*. Pergamon IAU Press, Oxford
- Clark BR (2004a) *Sustaining change in universities, society for research into higher education*. Open University Press
- Clark BR (2004b) Delineating the character of the entrepreneurial university. *High Educ Policy* 17:355–370
- Coaldrake P (2001) Responding to changing student expectations. *Expect High Educ Manage* 13(2):75–93 OECD
- Coaldrake P, Stedman L (1999) *Academic work in the twenty-first century. Changing roles and policies*. Higher Education Division, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs Occasional Paper Series. Australia, Higher Education Division, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs: 99H
- Cook T, Dwek TR, Blumberg B, Hockaday T (2008) Commercialising university research: threats and opportunities-The Oxford Model. *Capitalism and Society*, Vol. 3, Issue 1 2008 Article 4
- CVCP (1999) *Technology transfer. The US experience, Report of a Mission of UK Vice Chancellors*, Gatsby Trust London
- Commission of the European Communities (2005) *Mobilising the brainpower of Europe: enabling universities to make their full contribution to the Lisbon Strategy*, Brussels
- Courtney H, Kirkland J, Viguerie P (1999) Strategy under uncertainty, chapter 1 in *Harvard business review Managing Uncertainty on*. Harvard Business School Press, Cambridge
- Covin JG, Slevin DP (1991) A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behaviour *Entrepreneurship. Theory Pract* 16:7–25
- Corbett A (2006) *Universities and the Europe of knowledge: ideas, institutions and policy Entrepreneurship in the European Union, Higher Education Policy, 1955–2005*. Palgrave Ma, London
- Crow MM (2008) *Building an Entrepreneurial University*, in *The future of the research university. meeting the challenges of the global C 21st University*. Paper to 2008 Kauffman-Planck summit on Entrepreneurship research and policy held June 8–11, in Bavaria, Germany. pp 31–41
- Cranmer S (2006) Enhancing graduate employability: best intentions and mixed outcomes. *Stud High Educ* 31(2):169–184
- CUC (2000) *Review of University Governance 1997–2000*. CUC: <http://www.shef.ac.uk/cuc/pubs.html>
- CUC (1999) *Progress report of the working party on the effectiveness of university governing bodies*. CUC: <http://www.shef.ac.uk/cuc/pubs.html>
- Cunningham BM, Cochi-Ficano CK (2000) The determinants of donative revenue flows from Alumni of higher education: an empirical inquiry. *J Hum Resour* 37(3):540–569 (Summer, 2002)
- Currie J (2002) Australian universities as enterprise universities: transformed players on a global stage. In: *Globalisation: what issues are at stake for universities?* Université Laval, Québec Canada, 20 Sept

- Darling AL, England MD, Lang DW, Lopers-Sweetman R (1989) Autonomy and control: a university funding formula as an instrument of public policy. *Higher Education*, 18, pp 559–583, Kluwer Netherlands
- Daumard P (2001) Enterprise culture and university culture. *High Educ Manage* 13(2):67–75 OECD
- Davies JL (2001) The emergence of entrepreneurial cultures in European Universities. *High Educ Manage* 13(2):25–45 OECD
- De Ziva D (2005) Using entrepreneurial activities as a means of survival: investigating the processes used by Australian Universities to diversify their revenue streams. *High Educ* 50(3):387–411
- Dearing R (1997) Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, Higher Education in the Learning Society (The Dearing Report). July. HMSO, Norwich UK
- Deem R (1998) 'New managerialism' and higher education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *Int Stud Sociol Educ* 8(1):47–70
- Deem R (2001) Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entre-preneurialism in universities: is the local dimension important? *Comp Educ* 37(1):7–20
- Deema R (2007) Managing contemporary UK universities-manager-academics and new managerialism, Academic Leadership. Empirical Research pp 1–14 (www.academicleadership.org/empirical_research/Managing_Contemporray_UK)
- Deema R, Ka Ho Mobb, Lucasa L (2008) Transforming higher education in whose Image? Exploring the concept of the 'World-Class' University in Europe and Asia. *High Educ Policy* 21:83–97
- Delanty G (2003) Ideologies of the knowledge society and the cultural contradictions of higher education. *Policy Futures Educ* 1(1)
- Delanty G (2001) Challenging knowledge. The university in the knowledge society. SRHE and Open University Press Imprint, Buckingham
- Dill DD (1995) University-industry entrepreneurship: the organization and management of American University technology transfer units. *High Educ* 29(4):369–384
- Dooley L, Kirk D (2007) University-industry collaboration. Grafting the entrepreneurial paradigm onto academic structures. *Eur J Innovation Manage* 10(3):316–332
- Douglas JA (2008) The big curve: trends in university fees and financing in the EU and US. CSHE centre for studies in higher education. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.19.08
- Doutriaux J, Barker M (1996) University and industry in Canada. A changing relationship. *Ind Higher Educ* 10(1):88–103
- Duberley J, Cohen L, Leeson E (2007) Entrepreneurial academics: developing scientific careers in changing University settings. *High Educ Q* 61(4):479–497
- Dulewicz V (2000) Emotional intelligence. The key to successful corporate leadership. *J Gen Manage* 25:1–15
- Durham University Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning Durham University Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning (2009) A study of graduate aspirations to and understanding of entrepreneurial behaviour. Durham UK
- Edwards L (2001) Are E-Clubs the answer to entrepreneurial learning? WEI working Paper Series No. 17
- Epitropaki O (2001) What is transformational leadership. Institute of Work Psychology, Sheffield England
- ESECT (2005) Enhancing student employability, Higher Education Academy. Learning and Employability Series
- Etzkowitz H, Leydesdorff L (2000) The dynamics of innovation: from National System and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university-industry-government-relations. *Res Policy* 29(2000):109–123
- Etzkowitz H (2003) Research groups as 'quasi-firms': the invention of the entrepreneurial university. *Research Policy* 32:109–121
- Etzkowitz H (2004) The evolution of the entrepreneurial university. *Int J Technol Globalisation* 1(1):64–77

- Etzkowitz H (2008) *The Triple Helix. University– Industry—Government, Innovation in Action*, Routledge, London
- European Commission (1998) *Promoting Entrepreneurship and Competitiveness*, Brussels, September COM (1998) 550 final
- European Commission (2005) *The Competitiveness Challenge*. Enterprise Europe, Jan–March
- EU, Directorate-General for Enterprise (2004) *Helping to create an entrepreneurial culture. A guide on good practices in promoting entrepreneurial attitudes and skills through education*. Directorate-General for Enterprise and Industry. Brussels: EU, Unit B.1: Entrepreneurship (SC27 3/4)
- EU (2006) *Entrepreneurship Education in Europe. Fostering Entrepreneurial Mindsets through Education and Learning*. Final Proceedings of the Oslo Conference 27–27 October, European Commission
- EU Commission of the European Communities (2006) *Implementing the community Lisbon programme: fostering entrepreneurial mindsets through education and learning*. Brussels, EU, COM (2006) 33 final
- EU Commission of the European Communities (2008) *Towards more knowledge-based policy and practice in education and training*. Brussels, EU, SEC (2007)
- EU Commission of the European Communities (2008) *Entrepreneurship in higher education, especially within non-business studies*. Final Report of the Expert Group. Directorate-General for Enterprise and Industry. Brussels: EU, Unit B.1: Entrepreneurship
- Finlay I (2004) *Living in an entrepreneurial university*. *Res Post Compuls Educ* 9(3):417–434
- Franklin SJ, Wright M, Lockett A (2001) *Academic and Surrogate Entrepreneurs in University Spin-out companies*. *J Technol Trans* 26:127–141
- Frooman J (1999) *Stakeholder influence strategies*. *Acad Manage Rev* 24(2):191–205
- Geiger RL (2004) *Knowledge and money: research Universities and the Paradox of the market place*. Stanford University Press, US
- Geiger RL (2006) *The quest for; economic relevance by US research universities*. *High Educ Policy* 19:411–431
- Geuna A, Muscio A (2008) *The governance of University knowledge transfer*. SPRU Electronic Working Paper Series. Paper No. 173, September 2008
- Gibb AA, Scott M (1985) *Strategic awareness, personal commitment and the process and planning in the small business*. *J Manage Stud* 22(6)
- Gibb AA (2007) *Entrepreneurship: unique solutions for unique environments. Is it possible to achieve this with the Existing Paradigm?* *Int J Entrepreneurship Educ* 5:93–142. Senate Hall Academic Publishing
- Gibb AA, Hannon P (2006) *Towards the Entrepreneurial University?* *Int J Entrepreneurship Education* 4:73–110
- Gibbons M, Limoges C, Nowatny H, Schwartzman S, Scott P, Trow M (1994) *The new production of knowledge*. Sage Publications, London
- Gilbert AD (2000) *The Idea of a University beyond 2000*. *Policy Autumn* 2000:31–36
- Goffee R, Jones G (2007) *Leading clever people*. Harvard Business Review, Reprint R0703D
- Graham G (2002) *Universities. The Recovery of an Idea*, Imprint Academic UK
- Green M, Baer M (2000) *What does globalisation mean for teaching and learning?* CHET Transformation Debates July 21
- Green FJ, Saridakis G (2008) *The role of higher education skills and support in graduate self-employment*. *Stud High Educ* 33(6):653–672
- Greenaway D, Haynes M (2003) *Funding higher education in the UK: the role of fees and loans*. *The Economic Journal* 113:F150–F166 Blackwell Publishing UK
- Greenhalgh R (2008) *Perspectives on management and Leadership from HE and Industry*, pp 17–21 in: *Leadership in an Age of Supercomplexity*, Edited by Keith Herrmann. CIHE and SRHE
- Guerrero-Cano M (2008) *The creation and development of Entrepreneurial Universities in Spain. An Institutional approach*, Doctoral Thesis Universitat Autònoma Barcelona Spain
- Gupta V, MacMillan IC, Surie G (2004) *Entrepreneurial leader leadership: developing and measuring a cross- cultural construct*. *J Bus Ventur* 19:241–260

- Habermas J, Blazek JR (1987) The idea of the University: learning processes. *New German Critique*, No. 41, Special Issue on the Critiques of the Enlightenment (Spring–Summer, 1987), pp 3–22
- Hager P, Hyland T (2003) Vocational Education and Training, Chapter 15. In: Blake N, Smeyers P, Smith R, Standish P (eds) *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education*, Blackwell Publishing Limited
- Haggis T (2006) Pedagogies for diversity: retaining critical challenges amidst fears of dumbing down. *Stud High Educ* 31(5):521–535
- Hayrinen-Alesto M (1999) The university under the pressure of Innovation policy—reflecting on European and Finnish experiences. *Sci Stud* 12(1):44–69
- Hearn JC (2003) Diversifying campus revenue streams. Opportunities and risks, American Council of Education, Center for Policy Analysis; USA
- Henkel M (2004) Current science policies and their implications for the formation and maintenance of academic identity. *High Educ Policy* 17:167–182
- Herrmann K (ed) (2008) Leadership in an age of Supercomplexity. Council for Industry in Higher Education, UK
- Higher Education in Europe (2004) *Entrepreneurship in Europe* Vol. XXIX no. 2 Carfax Publishing
- Hughes A (2003) Knowledge Transfer, Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth, ESRC Centre for Business Research Working Paper 273, University Of Cambridge Small Business and Entrepreneurship
- Huisman J (2008) World-Class Universities, *Higher Education Policy*, Vol. 21, (1–4) International Association of Universities 0952-8733/08 \$30.00. www.palgrave-journals.com/hep
- IHEP (2007) Regional Universities and Civil Society Development. A Symposium and Study Tour. IHEP, Washington
- IHEP (2009) Privatization in higher education: cross-country analysis of trends, policies, problems, and solutions. Issue Brief. IHEP, Washington
- International Association of Universities (2005) Key results: 2005 IAU Global survey on internationalisation of higher education. www.unesco.org
- Jack SL, Anderson AR (1999) Entrepreneurship education within the enterprise culture. *Int J Entrepreneurial Behav Res* 5(3):110–125
- Jacob M, Lundqvist M, Hellsmark H (2003) Entrepreneurial transformations in the Swedish University system: the case of Chalmers University of Technology. *Res Policy* 32(2003):1555–1568
- Johnson RN, Deem R (2003) Talking of students: tensions and contradictions for the manager-academic and the university in contemporary higher education. *High Educ* 46:289–314
- Ka Ho Mok (2005) Fostering entrepreneurship: changing role of government and higher education governance in Hong Kong. *Res Policy* 34(2005):537–554
- Kauffman Foundation (2008) The future of the Research University. Meeting the global challenges of the 21st Century. Conference papers from the Kauffmann-Max Planck Annual Summit Rethinking the Role of the University and Public Research for the Entrepreneurial Age, June 8–11 Bavaria Germany
- Keast DA (1995) Entrepreneurship in universities: definitions, practices, and implications. *High Educ Q* 49(3):248–266
- Kelly G, Mulgan G, Muers S (2007) Creating public value. An analytical framework for public service reform, Strategy Unit, Cabinet office, UK Government (www.strategy.gov.uk)
- Kilgour FG (1992) Entrepreneurial Leadership. *Library Trends* 40(3):457–74 (Winter 1992)
- Kinchin IM, Lygo-Baker S, Hay DB (2008) Universities as centres of non-learning. *Stud High Educ* 33(1):89–103
- Kirp DL (2003) Shakespeare, Einstein and the bottom line. The marketing of higher education. Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- Kirby D (2006) Creating entrepreneurial universities in the UK. Applying entrepreneurship theory in practice. *J Technol Transfer* 31:599–603

- Klofsten M, Jones-Evans D (2000) Training entrepreneurship at universities: a Swedish case. *J Eur Ind Training* 24(6):337–344
- Kneale P (2005) Imaginative curriculum guide. Enterprise in the higher education curriculum. Higher Education Academy, UK
- Knight J (2003) Internationalization of higher education practices and priorities: 2003 IAU survey report. IAU: <http://www.unesco.org/iau>
- Kohler J, Huber J (eds) (2006) Higher education governance between democratic culture, academic aspirations and market forces. Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg
- Kolsaker A (2008) Academic professionalism in the managerialist era: a study of English universities. *Stud High Educ* 33(5):513–525
- Kristensen B (1999) The entrepreneurial university as a learning university. *High Educ Europe* 24(1):35–46
- Kuratko DF, Hornsby JS (1999) Corporate entrepreneurial leadership for the 21st Century. *J Leadersh Organisational Stud* 5(2):27–39
- Kwiek M (2001) Globalization and higher education, higher education in Europe, Vol. XXVI(1)
- Kwiek M (2000) The nation-state, globalization and the modern institution of the university. *Theoria. J Soc Polit Theory* 96:74–99
- Kwiek M (2005) Academic Entrepreneurship and private higher education in Europe (in a comparative perspective), Center for Public Policy. Policy Poznan University, Ul. Szamarzews-kiego 89, 60–569 Poznan, Poland. kwiekm@amu.edu.pl, www.cpp.amu.edu.pl
- Kwiek M (2005) The university and the state in a global age: renegotiating the traditional social contract? *Eur Educ Res J* 4(4):324–341
- Kwiek M (2008) Academic entrepreneurship vs. changing governance and institutional management, structures at European Universities. *Policy Futures Educ* 6(6):757–770
- Lambert R (2003) Lambert review of business-industry collaboration. HMSO Norwich, UK
- Lawrence PR, Lorsch JW (1986) Organisation and environment: environment managing differentiation and integration, Harvard Business School Classics
- Lazzeroni M, Piccaluga A (2003) Towards the entrepreneurial university. *Local Economy* 18(1):38–48
- Lee YS (1996) Technology transfer and the research university: a search for the boundaries of university-industry collaboration. *Res Policy* 25(1996):843–863
- Lehrera M, Nell P, Gärber L (2009) A national systems view of university entrepreneurialism: Inferences from comparison of the German and US experience. *Res Policy* 38:268–280
- Leisner A (2006) Education or service? Remarks on teaching and learning in the entrepreneurial university. *Educ Philos Theory* 38(4)
- Leitch S (2006) Prosperity for all in the global economy-world class skills. HMSO Norwich, UK
- Leslie LL, Ramey G (1998) Donor behaviour and voluntary support for higher education institutions. *J High Educ* 59(2):115–132
- Leydesdorff L, Etzkowitz H (2003) The Triple Helix as a model for innovation studies. (Conference Report). *Sci Public Policy* 25(3):195–203
- Leydesdorff L, Meyer M (2003) The Triple Helix of university-industry-government relations. *Scientometrics* 58(2):191–203
- Li-Chuan C (2004) The relationship between university autonomy and funding in England and Taiwan. *High Educ* 48(2):189–212
- Link AN (2006) An empirical analysis of the propensity of academics to engage in informal university technology transfer. Department of Economics, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Working Papers in Economics, No. 0610 Source Phan, P. H., Siegel, D. S. 2006, The Effectiveness of University Technology Transfer. *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship* 2(2):77–144. <http://www.rpi.edu/dept/economics/www/workingpapers>
- Lombardi JV (2002) University organization, governance, and competitiveness. An Annual Report from The Lombardi program on measuring university performance.
- Ma R (2000) Enterprise education and its relationship to enterprising behaviours. A methodological and conceptual investigation. PhD Thesis Durham University UK

- Maak T (2007) Responsible leadership, Stakeholder engagement, and the emergence of social capital. *J Bus Ethics* 74:329–343
- Maskell D, Robinson I (2001) The new idea of a university. Imprint Academic, Thorverton
- Mawditt R (1998) Lest we forget. *High Educ Policy* 11:323–330
- Maunter G (2005) The entrepreneurial university. A discursive profile of a higher education profile. *Crit Discourse Stud* 2(2):95–120
- Mcinnis C (2001) Promoting academic expertise and authority in an entrepreneurial culture. *High Educ Manage* 13(2):45–57. OECD
- Mendes T, Estabrook L, Magelli P, Conlin K (2006) How academics really view entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurial behavior: A study of 2,000 faculty, 10,000 graduate students and 100 Academic administrators at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. University of Illinois, USA
- Mendoza P, Berger JB (2005) Patenting productivity and intellectual property policies at research I Universities: an exploratory comparative study. *Educ Policy Anal Arch* 13(4)
- Meyer LH, Evans IM (2007) Supporting academic staff: meeting new expectations in higher education without compromising traditional faculty values. *High Educ Policy* 20:121–144
- Miclea M (2004) Learning to do as a pillar of education and its links to entrepreneurial studies in higher education: European contexts and approaches. *High Educ Eur* 29(2):221–231
- Miller, M. T. and Katz, M. (2004). Effective shared governance: academic governance as a win-win proposition. The NEA 2004 Almanac of Higher Education. NEA, Washington
- Minshall T, Wicksteed B (2005) University spin-out companies: starting to fill the evidence gap. A report on a pilot research project commissioned by the Gatsby Charitable Foundation, St. John's Innovation Centre Ltd
- Mittelstädt A, Cerri F (2008) Fostering Entrepreneurship for Innovation. OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers, 2008/5. OECD publishing, [10.1787/227624785873](https://doi.org/10.1787/227624785873)
- Mohrman K et al (2008) The Research University in transition: the emerging global model. *High Educ Policy* 2008(21):5–27
- Moore MH (1995) Creating public value: strategic management in government. Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- Mora J-G, Vieira M-J (2009) Governance, organisation change and Entrepreneurialism: is there a connection. In: Shattock M (ed) *Entrepreneurialism in the Universities and the Knowledge Economy*. Open University Press, pp 74–100
- Moreland N (2007) Entrepreneurship and higher education: an employability perspective. The Higher Education Academy, UK
- Moses I (2005) Institutional autonomy revisited. Autonomy justified and accounted. *High Educ Policy* 19:411–431
- National Academy of Science USA (2005) Facilitating interdisciplinary research. National Academies Press, Washington
- Namen JL, Slaven DP (1993) Entrepreneurship and the concept of fit: a model and empirical tests. *Strateg Manag J* 14:137–153
- Navarro JR, Gallardo FO (2003) A model of strategic change: universities and dynamic capabilities. *High Educ Policy* 16:199–212
- Neave G (1998) Growing pains: the Dearing Report from a European Perspective. *High Educ Q* 52(1):118–136
- Nicolaou N, Birley S (2003) Social networks in organizational emergence: the university spinout phenomenon. *Manage Sci* 49(12):1702–1725
- NIRAS Consultants (2008) Survey of entrepreneurship in higher education in Europe, FORA, ECON Pöyry
- Noir sur Blanc (1999) Survey. Internationalisation of Universities. Development Strategies, Noir sur Blanc. Paris
- Nowotny H, Scott P, Gibbons M (2001) Re-Thinking science. Knowledge and the public in the age of uncertainty. Polity Press, USA
- Nowotny H, Scott P, Gibbons M (2003) Mode 2 revisited: the new production of knowledge. *Minerva* 41:179–194

- OECD (2001) Journal of the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education Management. Special Issue: Education and Skills, Vol. 13, No. 2. Paris: OECD Publishing
- OECD (2003) Changing patterns of governance in higher education. In: Education policy analysis. pp 59–78
- OECD (2004) The Internationalisation of Higher Education. Policy Brief August OECD Publishing
- OECD (2005) Higher Education Management and Policy. Special Issue: Entrepreneurship, Vol. 17, No. 3. Paris: OECD Publishing. In particular: entrepreneurial universities and the development of regional societies: a spatial view of the Europe of knowledge, pp 59–86
- OECD (2007) Entrepreneurship Special Issue of Journal of Education Management and Policy, Vol. 17, No. 3-Special Issue. OECD Publishing
- O'Shea RP et al (2007) Delineating the anatomy of an entrepreneurial university: the Massachusetts institute of technology experience. *R&D Management* 37:1
- Olssen M, Peters MA (2005) Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism. *J Educ Policy* 20(3):313–345
- Owen-Smith J et al. (2002) A comparison of US and European university-industry relations in the life sciences. *Manage Sci* 48(1):24–43
- Pan S-Y (2007) Intertwining of academia and officialdom and university autonomy: experience from Tsinghua university in China. *High Educ Policy* 20:207–216
- Papayannakis L, Kastelli I, Damigos D, Mavrotas G (2008) Fostering entrepreneurship education in engineering curricula in Greece. Experiences and challenges for a technical University. *Eur J Eng Educ* 33(2):199–210
- Peters MA (2003) Classical political economy and the role of universities in the new knowledge economy. *Globalisation Soc Educ* 1(2):153–168
- Pilbeam C (2008) Designing an entrepreneurial university in an institutional setting. *High Educ Policy* 21:393–404
- Pirnay F et al (2003) Toward a typology of university spin-offs. *Small Bus Econ* 21:355–369
- Poh-Kam W, Yuen-Ping H, Singh A (2007) Towards an entrepreneurial university, model to support knowledge -based economic development: the case of the national university of Singapore. *World Dev* 35(6):941–958
- Politis D (2005) The process of entrepreneurial learning: a conceptual framework. *Entrepreneurship in theory and practice*, pp 399–424
- Poon TFJ, Hee Ang T (1995) Enhancing entrepreneurial spirit: a resolve for university, graduates. *Manage Res News* 18(1/2):31–52
- Pratt J (2001) Changing patterns of diversity in Europe. Lessons from an OECD study tour. *High Educ Manage* 13(2):93–105
- Prabhu GM (1999) Social entrepreneurial leadership. *Career Development International* 4/3:140–145 MCB University Press
- Rae D, Carswell M (2000) Towards a conceptual understanding of entrepreneurial learning. *J Small Bus Enterp Dev* 8(2)
- Rajan A, van Eupen P, Jaspers A (1997) Britain's flexible labour market. What next? RS50, DfEE and CREATE, Tunbridge Wells
- Ravasi D, Turati C (2005) Exploring entrepreneurial learning: a comparative study of technology development projects. *J Bus Ventur* 20(2005):137–164
- Rinne R, Koivula J (2009) The dilemmas of the changing university, Chapter 10 in Shattock, op.cit
- Rolfe H (2001) University strategy in an age of uncertainty: the effect of higher education funding on old and new universities. National Institute for Economic and Social Research Discussion paper 191 December
- Roman S, Cuestas PJ, Fenollar P (2008) An examination of the interrelationships between self-esteem, others' expectations, family support, learning approaches and academic achievement. *Stud High Educ* 33(2):127–138

- Roos G, Fernstrom F, Gupta O (2005) National innovation systems: Finland, Sweden and Australia Compared. Learnings for Australia, Report for the Australian Business Foundation. Intellectual Capital Service Ltd. 46 Gray's Inn Road, London. WC1X8LR. Email: intcap@intcap.com
- Ropke J (1998) The Entrepreneurial University. Innovation, academic knowledge creation and regional development in a globalized economy, Department of Economics, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Germany. (e-mail: roepke@wiwi.uni-marburg.de)
- Sa CM (2008) Interdisciplinary strategies in US research universities. *Higher Education*, Vol. 55, pp 537–552. Published online: 8 June 2007. Springer Science+ Business Media B.V. 2007
- Sainsbury (Lord) of Turville (2007) The race to the top. A review of government's science and innovation policies. Norwich: Her Majesty's Stationery Office
- Scase R (2007) Global remix. The fight for competitive advantage. Kogan Page, London
- Schein EH (1992) Organisational culture and leadership. Jossey Bass Publishers, San Francisco
- Schonfield A (2009) What is an effective and high performing governing body in UK higher education? LFHE: <http://www.lfhe.ac.uk/publications>
- Schuetze HG (2007) Research universities and the spectre of academic capitalism. *Minerva* 45:435–443
- Schumpeter JA (1934) Theory of economic development. Harvard University Press, Development Cambridge Mass
- Segal QW (1985) The Cambridge phenomena. Enterprise House Histon, Cambridge
- Senges M (2007) Knowledge entrepreneurship in universities. Practice and strategy in the case of internet based innovation appropriation. Doctoral Thesis. Universitat Oberta de Catalunya Barcelona Spain
- Shane S, Stuart T (2002) Organizational Endowments and the performance of University Start-Ups, *Management Science*, Vol. 48, No. 1, Special Issue on University Entrepreneurship and Technology Transfer (Jan 2002), pp 154–170
- Shane S (2004) Encouraging university entrepreneurship? The effect of the Bayh-Dole Act on university patenting in the United States. *J Bus Ventur* 19(2004):127–151
- Shattock M (2000) Strategic management in European universities in an age of increasing institutional self reliance. *Tert Educ Manage* 6:93–104
- Shattock M (ed) (2009) Entrepreneurialism in universities and the knowledge economy. Diversification and organisational change in European higher education, society for research in higher education and the Open University Press, UK
- Shinn T (2002) The Triple Helix and new production of knowledge: prepackaged thinking on science and technology. *Soc Stud Sci* 32:599
- Slaughter S, Leslie LL (1997) Academic capitalism. Politics, policies and the Entrepreneurial University, John Hopkins University Press, London
- Smith D (1999) The changing idea of a university' Chap. 8. In: Smith and Langslow (eds) The idea of a university, Higher Education Policy, Series 51, Jessica Kingsley Publishers London and Philadelphia
- Smith HL (2007) Universities, innovation, and territorial development: a review of the evidence. *Environ Plann C: Gov Policy* 25:98–114
- Sporn B (1996) Managing university culture: an analysis of the relationship between institutional culture and management approaches. *High Educ* 32(1):41–61
- Tadmor Z (2004) The triad research university or a post 20th century research university model. *Int J Educ Adv* 17(2):167–182
- Thomas E (2004) Increasing voluntary giving to Higher Education, Task Force Report to Government, UK Department for Education and Skills
- Thorn K, Soo M (2006) Latin American universities and the third Mission. Trends, challenges and policy options, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4002, August
- Toakley AR (2004) Globalisation. Sustainable development and universities. *High Educ Policy* 17:311–324
- Todorovic WZ et al. (2005) Making university departments more entrepreneurial. The perspective from within. *Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, May 2005, pp 115–122

- UNESCO (2003) Internationalisation of higher education: trends and developments since 1998. Meeting of higher education partners, background paper prepared by the international association of universities. UNESCO Paris,
- UNESCO (2004) Higher education in a globalized society, UNESCO education position paper. UNESCO, Paris
- UNESCO (2007) Main transformations, challenges and emerging patterns in higher education systems. UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge Occasional Paper Series Paper no. 16. UNESCO, Paris
- Universities UK (2007) Spending Review 2007, Securing the Future, Policy Briefing Note
- US Department of Education (2006) A test of leadership. Charting the Future of U. S. Higher Education, A Report of the Commission Appointed by Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings. Washington, Online: <http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/index.html>
- Vaira M (2004) Globalization and higher education organizational change: a framework for analysis. *High Educ* 48:483–510
- van Vught F (2008) Mission Diversity and Reputation in Higher Education. *Higher Education Policy*, 2008, 21, (151–174). International Association of Universities 0952-8733/08 \$30.00. www.palgrave-journals.com/hep
- Vecchio RP (2003) Entrepreneurship and leadership: common trends and common threads. *Human Resour Manage Rev* 13(2003):303–327
- Viale R, Etzkowitz H (2005) Third academic revolution: Polyvalent knowledge; the “DNA” of the Triple Helix.
- Volkman C (2004) Entrepreneurial studies in higher education. *High Educ Eur* 29(2):177–185
- Wasser H (1990) Changes in the European University: from traditional to Entrepreneurial. *High Educ Q* 44(2):110–122
- Watson D (2008) Businesses or Business-like? Some thoughts on cultural convergence, pp 25–28 in Herrmann op cit
- Weerts DJ (2007) Toward an engagement model of institutional advancement at public colleges and universities. *Int J Educ Adv* 7(2)
- Wenger E (1998) *Communities of practice: learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Westwood A (2000) *Winners and losers in the World of Work*. Employment policy institute and academy of enterprise. London, pp 64
- Williams G (2009) Finance and entrepreneurial activity in higher education in the knowledge society. Chapter 2. In: Shattock M (ed) *Entrepreneurialism in universities and the knowledge economy*, Open University Press. McGraw-Hill Education, pp 9–33
- Williams G, Kitaev I (2005) Overview of national policy contexts for entrepreneurialism in higher education institutions. *High Educ Manage Policy* 17(3):125–141
- Williamson T, Read E, Sarmiento T (2009) Enterprise societies—Are they necessary? Article provided by Mr. Williamson
- Wissema JG (2008) Towards the third generation university: managing the university in transition. Edward Elgar
- Ylinenpää H (2001) Science parks, clusters and regional development. Luleå University of Technology; Department of Business Administration and Social Sciences, Division of Industrial Organization & Small Business Academy. Luleå University of Technology: AR 2001: 48. Paper presented at 31st European Small Business Seminar in Dublin, Sept 12–14
- Zhou Ch (2008) Emergence of the entrepreneurial university in evolution of the triple helix. *J Technol Manage China* 3(1):109–126
- Zumeta W (2007) Financing higher education access in challenging times, The NEA 2007 almanac of higher education. NEA, Washington

Universities in Change

Managing Higher Education Institutions in the Age of
Globalization

Altmann, A.; Ebersberger, B. (Eds.)

2013, XVI, 372 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-4614-4589-0