

2018

# Lost in Translation? Non-STEM Academics in the 'Entrepreneurial' University

Dodd, Derek

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/11831>

---

<http://dx.doi.org/10.24382/613>

University of Plymouth

---

*All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.*

*This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognise that its copyright rests with its author and that no quotation from the thesis and no information derived from it may be published without the author's prior consent.*



**UNIVERSITY OF  
PLYMOUTH**

**LOST IN TRANSLATION? NON-STEM ACADEMICS IN THE  
'ENTREPRENEURIAL' UNIVERSITY**

by

**DEREK DODD**

A thesis submitted to Plymouth University  
In partial fulfilment for the degree of

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

Plymouth Institute of Education  
Faculty of Arts and Humanities

**October 2017**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank my Supervisor, Professor Debby Cotton, for her insight, her support, and for the considerable patience she has shown me during the course of this study. Thanks are also owed to the other members of my supervisory theme, Professor Linda LaVelle, Professor Jocey Quinn, and formerly, Professor Liam Gearon, and to my examiners Dr. Andrew Penaluna and Dr. Megan Crawford. I am also grateful for the support of the staff at Plymouth University's Doctoral College, including Sarah Carne and Sarah Kearns, and to the participants who agreed to take part in this study. Furthermore, without the generous studentship that I was provided with by the University of Plymouth, I may not have been able to undertake a research project of this type, and for that I feel very privileged, and extremely grateful.

On a personal note, I am indebted to my wife Louise for her continual love, patience, and support, and to my family, friends, and colleagues in both Dublin and Plymouth. Finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to the memories of Dolly and my Nana Joan.

## **AUTHOR'S DECLARATION**

At no time during the registration for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy has the author been registered for any other University award without prior agreement of the Graduate Sub-Committee.

Work submitted for this research degree at the Plymouth University has not formed part of any other degree either at Plymouth University or at another establishment.

This study was financed with the aid of a studentship from Plymouth University.

Presentation and Conferences Attended:

- 'Technologised Discourse and Performative Labour in the 'Enterprised' University', Conference paper, Discourse Power Resistance (DPR), Plymouth University, 2012.
  
- 'Lost in Translation? Non-STEM Academics in Entrepreneurial Universities', Conference Paper, Sociological Association of Ireland Annual Conference, Dublin Institute of Technology, 2018.

Word count of main body of thesis: 88, 279

Signed: Derek Dodd .....

Date: 03/03/2018.....

## **ABSTRACT**

This study set out to explore the ways in which non-STEM academics, working within UK universities that had positioned themselves publicly as ‘entrepreneurial’ institutions, interpret and negotiate the related concepts of the entrepreneurial academic and university. The entrepreneurial university concept has become a ubiquitous theme in higher education and policy literatures in recent decades, having been described variously as an ‘idea for its time’ (Shattock, 2010) and the ‘end-point of the evolution of the idea of the university’ (Barnett, 2010, p.i). This research set out to interrogate some of the key ways in which this institutional form, and the corresponding concept of the entrepreneurial academic, have been discursively constructed by advocates in the UK and beyond. Further to this, the study aimed to collect narratives of experience from non-STEM academics employed by self-described ‘entrepreneurial’ universities, both to enquire into how they interpreted the ‘entrepreneurial paradigm’, and to invite them to report on how they felt that their university’s assumption of an enterprise mission had, or had not, influenced its organisational ‘culture’ and their subjectively experienced academic work-lives.

The researcher’s interest in the relationship between enterprise discourse and the organisational ‘culture’ of universities stemmed from the apparent consensus within the scholarly and policy literature about the need for universities to develop an integrated ‘entrepreneurial culture’ (Clark, 1998, p.7)(Gibb, 2006b, p.2)(Rae, Gee and Moon, 2009) by pursuing a policy of ‘organisational culture change’, with culture here denoting ‘the realm of ideas, beliefs, and asserted values’ (Kwiek, 2008, p.115) which inhere within institutions. To this end, a series of semi-structured, interpretive interviews were carried out with participants from a range of non-STEM disciplines, working in a variety of university types in the UK. The researcher then employed a discourse-analytic method to delineate some of the ‘discursive repertoires’ that participants used to account for their professional practices, and report on their experiences in - and understandings of - the entrepreneurial university. What emerged from this analysis was a complex picture of ‘enterprise discourse’ within the contemporary university setting, as well as a general tendency amongst participants to adopt a position of ontological scepticism where the issue of ‘university culture’ was concerned. Further to this, it was determined that the ‘inclusive’ interpretation of entrepreneurialism typically employed by advocates for the paradigm had not generally been taken up by participants, for whom it was, for the most part, a phenomenon associated variously with ‘managerialism’, ‘market values’, ‘the business agenda’, ‘income generation’, ‘money making’, and the figure of the ‘individual, lone, romantic, heroic capitalist’. Additionally, where subjects were conversant in broader, more ‘social’ conceptions of academic entrepreneurialism, they typically reported that it was rarely articulated in the internal communications of their respective universities.

## **LIST OF CONTENTS**

LIST OF TABLES.....	1
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	2
1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1. Aims of the Research.....	4
1.2. Mode of Enquiry.....	5
1.3. Structure of the Thesis.....	6
2. CHAPTER TWO: ENTERPRISE CULTURE.....	8
2.1. Introduction.....	8
2.2. Enterprise Culture.....	11
Enterprise Culture at the Societal Level.....	11
The Enterprise Culture as a Political Motif in Britain.....	13
Enterprise as a ‘Master Metaphor’.....	15
2.3. Enterprise Culture at the Organisational Level.....	18
Enterprise and Organisational ‘Culture Change’.....	19
Enterprise, Responsiveness, and Environmental Change.....	21
Enterprise, the Organisation, and the Individual Subject.....	23
2.4. The Entrepreneurial Self.....	25
The Psychology of the Entrepreneurial Subject.....	27
2.5. Critiques of the Enterprise Culture.....	31

Enterprise as ‘Marketisation’ .....	31
The Discursive Ambiguity of Enterprise .....	32
Fairclough’s ‘Three Senses’ .....	33
Isolating the ‘Entrepreneurial Type’ .....	35
Enterprise as a ‘Self-Sealing Discourse’ .....	37
Managerialism and ‘Administratively Imposed Enterprise’ .....	39
Conclusion .....	42
<b>3. CHAPTER THREE: THE ‘ENTREPRENEURIAL’ UNIVERSITY AND ACADEMIC.....</b>	<b>45</b>
3.1. Introduction.....	45
3.2. The ‘Idea’ of the University.....	48
The Influence of Newman.....	49
The ‘Humboldt Myth’ and the ‘First Academic Revolution’ .....	52
Britain’s Universities .....	54
The Emergence of the UK’s ‘University System’ .....	55
3.3. The University ‘Without an Idea’ .....	59
The Idea of the University in ‘Supercomplexity’ .....	60
3.4. The Entrepreneurial University.....	61
The ‘Clarkian’ Model of the Entrepreneurial University.....	63
3.5. The Entrepreneurial Academic .....	71
Etzkowitz and the Rise of ‘Entrepreneurial Science’ .....	71
The ‘Triple’ and ‘Quadruple’ Helix.....	73
Clark and the Entrepreneurial Academic .....	75
Conclusion .....	77
<b>4. CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>80</b>

4.1. Introduction.....	80
4.2. Research Questions.....	81
4.3. Research Paradigm and Philosophical Assumptions .....	82
4.4 Data Collection .....	86
4.4.1 Participants and Research Sites.....	87
4.4.2. Access, Ethics and Informed Consent.....	95
4.4.3 Anonymity and Confidentiality .....	96
4.5. The Interview Schedule .....	97
4.5.1. Schedule Part A - Biographies, Values, and Professional Self-Constructs.....	98
4.5.2. Schedule Part B - The Enterprise Paradigm and University Culture. ....	101
4.6. Pilot Interviews and Methodological Modification .....	103
4.7. The Complexity of Culture .....	103
4.8 Variability and ‘Discursive Repertoires’ .....	106
4.9 Analytical Coding .....	109
4.10 Summary .....	111
5. CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	113
5.1 Introduction.....	113
5.2. Findings - Biographies, Professional Self-Constructs, and Values.....	115
5.2.1. Liberal Education Discourses, the Social Good, and Political Ideologies. ....	118
‘Liberal’ Perspectives .....	118
The ‘Social Good’ .....	121
Political Ideologies.....	123
The Self-Conscious Bracketing of Traditional Academic Identity Discourses .....	124
5.2.2. Stakeholders.....	126

Academic Stakeholders, Scholarship, and Disciplinarily Progress .....	126
Learner Stakeholders.....	126
Academic Stakeholders.....	128
Lay Readerships.....	129
External Stakeholders, Social and Professional Communities. ....	130
Social and Community Stakeholders .....	130
Professional Communities .....	131
5.2.3. Institutional Cultures.....	133
The difficulty of Imagining a Whole University ‘culture’.....	134
Growing Bureaucracy and Administrative Workloads.....	138
‘Centralised ‘managerialist’ and Hierarchical cultures.....	140
‘Marketisation’ and Funding.....	141
Audit, ‘Performance’ Cultures, and Exogenous Factors.....	143
5.3 Findings - The Entrepreneurial University .....	146
The Entrepreneurial University as an Economic Concept.....	146
The Entrepreneurial University and Values Conflict.....	150
Broad Conceptions of the Entrepreneurial University.....	153
Community Engagement and the Social Mission.....	153
Responses to External Factors, including Research Funding and Brand Identity. ....	155
5.4. Findings – The Entrepreneurial Academic .....	162
Values Conflict and the Entrepreneurial Academic as an Economic Concept .....	163
Non-STEM engagement in academic entrepreneurship .....	168
Entrepreneurialism and Academic Role-Complexity .....	169
Broad Definitions of Academic Entrepreneurship.....	172

5.5. Findings – Enterprise & University Culture .....	179
5.5.1 University Culture and Culture Change.....	181
‘Administratively Imposed Enterprise’.....	183
Enterprise Culture and Discursive Change. ....	185
Enterprise, Performance Cultures, and Workloads.....	188
Funding, University Culture and Commercialisation. ....	190
Enterprise Culture and the Social Mission.....	191
5.5.2. The ‘Visibility’ of the Enterprise Culture.....	193
Culture Change and University Governance.....	197
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION .....	201
6.1. The Concepts of the ‘Entrepreneurial’ University and Academic .....	202
6.2. Non-STEM academics and the entrepreneurial paradigm. ....	207
6.2.1. Academic Values & Professional Self-Constructs.....	208
6.2.2. The Entrepreneurial University.....	211
6.2.3. The Entrepreneurial Academic. ....	213
6.3. ‘Culture’ in the Enterprise University.....	217
6.4 Limitations of the Study.....	223
6.5 Implications for Further Research.....	225
REFERENCES. ....	232
APPENDIX A: LIST OF RESEARCH SITES.....	259
APPENDIX B: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS .....	260
APPENDIX C: THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE .....	261
APPENDIX D: TRANSCRIPTION NOTATION.....	264

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Table of Attributes for Universities Visited..... p.90

Table 2: Table of Attributes for Research Participants..... p. 94

Table 3: Transcription Notation.....p.264

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix A: List of Research Site ..... p. 259

Appendix B: List of Participants..... p. 260

Appendix C: The Interview Schedule.....p. 261

Appendix D: Transcription Notation ..... p. 264

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This research set out to explore how non-STEM academics working in UK universities interpret ‘entrepreneurialism’ as a ‘master metaphor’ (Hobbs, 2015) within HEIs that have positioned themselves publicly as being institutionally ‘entrepreneurial’. Historically an ‘unthinkable adjective-noun combination’ (Mautner 2005, p.96), the ‘entrepreneurial university’ has become, in recent decades, part of the *lingua franca* of the Anglophone policy and research literature on higher education, particularly in the United Kingdom. The institutional model most frequently articulated by university leaders, politicians, academic advocates, and non-governmental policy groups describes the ‘entrepreneurial’ university as one that develops a ‘work culture that embraces change’ (Clark, 1998, p.7), harnesses its intellectual capital ‘for the benefit of the economy and society in general’ (NCGE, 2010, p.2), and assumes an active partnership role in the co-production of knowledge as part of the ‘quadruple helix’ of university, government, industry, and civil society relations (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997; Carayannis and Campbell, 2012).

Related to the concept of the entrepreneurial university, the figure of the ‘entrepreneurial academic’, while historically associated with technology transfer, the commercial exploitation of research, and firm-formation, has more recently come to be articulated in a much more inclusive sense to denote an individual who is positively disposed towards innovating new practices and identifying opportunities to leverage their work – including their research *and* teaching - for the benefit of a wide range of external stakeholder groups. Crucially, this iteration of the ‘entrepreneurial’ academic - while linked to engagement in forms of third-stream income generation, commercialisable knowledge-exchange, and other activities with measurable economic impacts – embodies a more expansive conception of ‘entrepreneurship’ which has been semantically unmoored from its origins in a ‘business-related lexis’ (Mautner, 2005) to denote any activity or behaviour which can be characterised as being innovative,

change-oriented, and responsive to internal and external stakeholders of any type, including learners, communities, academic departments, businesses, government, and civil society.

Growing out of the researcher's own background in the humanities - and related interests in organisational discourses, 'culture change', the 'idea' of the university', and 'technologies of the self' (Foucault, 1984) - the purpose of this study was to examine the ways in which the related concepts of the 'entrepreneurial' university and academic are constructed in the contemporary research and policy literatures of UK higher education, and to explore – through the use of research interviews - the ways in which academics in non-STEM disciplines, working within universities that have positioned themselves publicly as 'entrepreneurial', interpret and negotiate the 'entrepreneurial paradigm'. Further to this, because of the emphasis placed by advocates for the entrepreneurial mode on the imperative to change 'culture' institutionally, participants were queried about the impact of their university's positioning as 'entrepreneurial' on the 'culture' of their institution, and their day-to-day academic work-life. Particular attention was also paid – through the analysis of interview data – to the discursive resources, or 'repertoires', used by participants to account for their own sense of what it means (or should mean) to be an academic working in the contemporary UK university.

### **1.1. Aims of the Research**

The study aims, firstly, to delineate the prevailing ways in which the interrelated concepts of the entrepreneurial university and academic – described hereafter as 'the entrepreneurial paradigm' - are articulated in contemporary higher education research and policy literatures in the United Kingdom, after which, it sets out to interrogate the manner in which a purposive sample of non-STEM academics, working in self-described 'entrepreneurial' universities, report on their experiences of, and interpretations of, these same concepts. Lastly, as an 'integrated entrepreneurial culture' (Clark, 1998) is often held up as *the* essential prerequisite for developing entrepreneurial universities, the researcher set out to explore the extent to which participants felt that 'culture' – understood as the intangible cognitive and semiotic dimensions of the 'set of shared values, beliefs, assumptions, and practices' that are assumed to 'shape and guide members' attitudes and behaviour' (Kasensap, 2017, p.335) within

organisations – had been meaningfully influenced by their university’s assumption of an entrepreneurial identity.

This study addresses the key question:

- How do non-STEM academics in ‘entrepreneurial universities’ interpret and negotiate the concepts of the entrepreneurial academic and university?

In addition to this overarching research question, a number of subordinate questions were developed during the pre-empirical phase of the study, which include:

- How are the related concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic constructed in the research and policy literature in the UK?
- How do non-STEM academics conceive of their role in relation to notions of enterprise and entrepreneurship?
- What are their perceptions of the impact of their university’s positioning as ‘entrepreneurial’?

## **1.2. Mode of Enquiry**

As a study both of the manner in which the concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic are constructed in the policy and research literature in the UK, and of non-STEM academics’ interpretations of these constructs, this research has been carried out within a qualitative and interpretive framework. Seventeen interviews were completed - between 2010 and 2012 - at five university sites using a combination of lightly structured biographic-narrative (Chamberlayne, Bornat and Wengraf, 2000; Wengraf, 2004) and semi-structured interview methods. However, as this research is underpinned by a constructivist ontology, participants’ accounts have not been treated as reliable ‘statements about or reflection(s) of’ extra-interview realities, but as ‘part of the reality being studied’ (Alasuutari, 1995, p. 63), based on the premise that the ‘realities’ of academic work-life are, at least in part, subjectively and discursively mediated.

As a study of ‘discourse’, understood as ‘a group of ideas or patterned ways of thinking which can be identified in textual or verbal communications, and can also be located in wider social structures’

(Lupton, 1992, p.145), this research proceeds from a social-constructionist starting point. In this respect, the interview data was treated as a collection of situated and contingent specimens of how participants construct, understand, and represent the realities of academic work-life, rather than as evidence from which can be drawn reliable and generalisable inferences about the complex social realities that lie beyond the interview setting. Despite this methodological caution, however, as discourses are taken to be linguistic expressions of ‘knowledge formations which organize institutional practices and societal reality on a large scale’ (Talja, p. 2), this study also proceeds from the assumption that the accounts provided by participants are ‘*constrained* by past uses’ (Medina, 2006) and so represent ‘specimens of interpretive practices’ (Talja, 1999, p.13) which possess the *possibility* of generalisable significance but are also, in their own right, intrinsically valuable as examples of how academics perceive the entrepreneurial paradigm in terms of the meanings that is has *for them*.

### **1.3. Structure of the Thesis**

This thesis is presented in six chapters. After an initial introduction which outlines the research aims and mode of enquiry, chapter two represents a literature review of the concept of ‘enterprise culture’, both as a wide-ranging ethico-political programme of ‘enterprise’ reforms, typically associated with ‘Thatcherism’ and ‘New Public Management’, and as a paradigm in the literatures on organisations and management more generally. Additionally, it explores some of the literature on the figure of the ‘entrepreneurial self’ and considers some of its manifestations in the rhetorics of successive UK governments, and in the form of the so-called ‘intrapreneur’ (Pinchot and Pellman, 1999). After tracing particular lines of descent between the ‘institutional’ and ‘ethical’ strands (Rose, 1998) of enterprise discourse in the broader phenomenon of ‘enterprise culture’ and the policy and research literature on ‘enterprise’ in higher education, chapter three provides a review of some of the ways in which this literature constructs the related concepts of the entrepreneurial university and academic. Following this, chapter four outlines the study’s methodology, including its aims, philosophical assumptions, and research design, while chapter five provides a presentation of the findings. Lastly, chapter six offers a

discussion of the study's findings, considers its limitations, and provides several avenues for possible future research. Sections 6.4 and 6.5 address the timeliness of the study's findings, given the period that has elapsed between preliminary data-collection and its completion, summarising some more recent developments in the policy literature on entrepreneurial universities and pointing the way to future avenues for research.

## 2. CHAPTER TWO: ENTERPRISE CULTURE

### 2.1. Introduction

This study is, in effect, an exploration of ‘enterprise’ as a ‘master metaphor’ (Hobbs, 2015) for the practices of contemporary academics and higher education institutions (HEIs). ‘Enterprise’ and its cognates have come, in recent years, to represent keywords in a set of discursive tendencies affecting higher education (HE) policy, university marketing, and political rhetoric in which a totalising narrative has come increasingly to metaphorise the individuals and institutions that comprise the university system as ‘entrepreneurial’ (Burton R. Clark, 1998; Philpott *et al.*, 2010; Shattock, 2010) and their activities as forms of ‘entrepreneurship’ (Etzkowitz, 1983; Etzkowitz *et al.*, 2000; Mars and Rios-Aguilar, 2010). Underscoring this development is a decades’ long expansion in the meaning potential of ‘enterprise’ in what Norman Fairclough has referred to as the ‘orders of discourses’ of domains as diverse as politics, public administration, marketing, and management theory (Fairclough, 2003).

An ‘order of discourse’, which Fairclough translated and elaborated from Michel Foucault’s *ordre du discours*, represents ‘the structured totality of discursive practices’ within a particular domain of social practice (Fairclough 1997, p.11), or in simple terms – the dynamic stock of available, sometimes contradictory, discourses which characterise a particular domain at a given historical moment, and the relations between them. Critically, in addition to illuminating the tendency for particular domains of practice to be characterised by a complex ‘deep structure’ of discursive resources that are often articulated in context-dependent, ways, Fairclough’s conceptualisation of ‘orders of discourse’ was also systematic and relational in that it pointed to the porous ‘boundaries and relationships ‘between different social domains (Fairclough 1995, pp.12-13). In this context, it helps explain the historical expansion of the discursive tendencies associated with ‘enterprise’ across a diverse range of social and institutional domains, the broader cultural salience of ‘enterprise’ that has developed out of its gradual unmooring

from its original ‘business-related lexis’ (Mautner, 2005) and its emergence as an increasingly ubiquitous dimension of the ‘discursive repertoire employed by academic leaders, politicians, and the media, as well as parts of higher education research’ (Mautner 2005, p.95) in discussions of the contemporary university.

This chapter will attempt to provide a kind of genealogy of the core concepts of contemporary enterprise discourse – as it pertains to the institutional ‘orders of discourse’ of UK universities – tracing particular lines of descent between the ‘institutional’ and ‘ethical’ strands of enterprise discourse, and their origins in the interrelated but distinct phenomena of the macrosocial political-ethico programme of ‘enterprise’ reforms born from ‘Thatcherism’ and ‘new public management’ in the nineteen eighties, and the contemporaneous development of a related ‘enterprise’ paradigm in the literature on organisational management more generally. In particular, it will look at the ideas of ‘enterprise culture’ and its attendant variants of the ‘enterprising self’, both as leitmotifs in political and policy rhetoric, and as theoretical abstractions in the scholarship on organisational management, as conceptual and discursive antecedents to the models of the ‘enterprise university’ and the ‘entrepreneurial academic’, which will be discussed in chapter three.

‘Enterprise links up a seductive ethic of the self, a powerful critique of contemporary institutional and political reality, and an apparently coherent design for the radical transformation of contemporary social relations’ (Rose 1999, p.5).

The present chapter will trace the development of the interrelated themes of ‘enterprise culture’, ‘entrepreneurial organisations’, and the ‘entrepreneurial self’ through a historical outline and survey of the literature on the political-ethico programme and ‘conceptual enigma’ (Dodd & Anderson 2001, p.14) of the ‘enterprise culture’ in nineteen eighties Britain, including the myth of the traditional entrepreneur as ‘cultural hero’ (Kanter, 1990), the figure of the entrepreneurial self in the ‘ethical’ reform of the welfare state, and the promotion of an entrepreneurial reform paradigm in public administration and provision. Following this, it will review the emergence of a separate but discursively related ‘enterprise’ paradigm in the literature on organisational management, paying particular attention

to the promotion of 'entrepreneurial' forms of governance, and the ascendance of the idea of the 'entrepreneurial' or 'intrapreneurial' worker in late modernity. Lastly, the chapter will consider some of the key critiques of 'enterprise' as it has developed metaphorically 'to address the totality of human behaviour'(Gordon 1991, p.43) across the spheres of public administration, employment, education, workplace management, and welfare provision, as part of a broader discursive-ideological effort to 'produce a new order – pertaining to the self, the economy, the government, and their interrelationships' (Heelas and Morris, 1992, p.10).

Taken together, the concepts of 'enterprise culture', 'entrepreneurial organisations', and the 'enterprising self' provide the framework within which this study has been carried out, based on the premise that 'enterprise discourse' – in both its 'institutional and ethical strands' (Carr & Beaver, 2002, p.108) - has become firmly established in the discursive repertoires employed by universities, higher education researchers, politicians, and higher education policy communities, in recent decades (Clark, 2004a; Mautner, 2005; Gibb *et al.*, 2009). In addition to reviewing some of the extant literature under the three broad headings of 'Enterprise Culture at the Macrosocial Level', 'Enterprise at the Organisational Level', and 'The Entrepreneurial Self', the remainder of this chapter will be given over to detailing some of the core critiques of the enterprise discourse, and the 'enterprise culture paradigm', particularly in relation to the metaphorical generalisation of 'enterprise' 'to all forms of (social) conduct' including that of organisations, government, and individuals (Burchell, 1993, p.275), the tautological and 'self-sealed' character of enterprise discourse (Dodd & Anderson, 2001, p.14), and lastly, the 'empirical *cul-de-sac*' associated with isolating the 'universal entrepreneurial personality' (Gray, 1998) as a behavioural ideal.

## 2.2. Enterprise Culture

### Enterprise Culture at the Societal Level

As a macrosocial concept, 'enterprise culture' has tended to denote an ambitious programme of state-sponsored 'economic (and) cultural reconstruction' (Keat 1991, p. 2), and a broad accompanying 'bundle of ideas and ideologies' (Dodd and Anderson, 2001) aimed at addressing a perceived culturally-induced process of economic decline (Raven 1989, p.179) through market-led reform of public and private sector organisations, and the promotion of an 'entrepreneurial ideal' (Perkin, 1992) as a universal model for managers, employees, and citizens alike. Reputedly coined by conservative politician and former Chancellor of the Exchequer Nigel Lawson (Lawson, 1993), the neologism 'enterprise culture' has been described as both analytically vague, complex and multifaceted' (Della-Gusta and King, 2006) and as an 'insubstantial, ill-defined and moving target' (Bechofer 1992, p. 305) owing to its semantic flexibility and the multiplicity of discursive contexts in which it has been articulated.

Raven has written that the idea of the enterprise culture emerged out of 'the liaison between academic history, populist economics and resurgent nationalism' in response to Britain's declining industrial fortunes in the late nineteen-seventies (Raven, 1989, p.199), with the term itself formulated in response to a thesis advanced by the American historian Martin J. Wiener about England having undergone a culturally-determined 'decline of the industrial spirit' which had made many Britons, particularly those belonging to the middle classes and 'elites', resistant to the industrial-capitalist values of 'economic innovation and growth' (Wiener 2004, p. xvi). Wiener's seminal text *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980* (Wiener, 2004) contributed to a growing sentiment amongst Britain's political classes that the nation was in the grip of a debilitating cultural inertia ascribed to its embrace of collectivism, welfarism and economic interventionism, and to a more long-standing 'general tendency' in British life to 'reject disdainfully the unhealthy vulgarity of capitalist-industrial values' (John Springall, cited in Raven 1989, p.189) despite it being the 'world's first industrial society'

(Wiener, 2004, p.7). Wiener's culturalist treatise painted a picture of a country which, despite its industrial heritage, had remained suspicious of 'material and technological development', and determined to symbolically exclude 'industrialism, technology, capitalism and city life' (Wiener, 2004, p. xvi) from its national cultural imaginary, which instead tended to focus on the pastoral idyll of a 'bucolic, peaceful, little England' (Hunt, 2001, p.157) and to embrace the values of 'stability, tranquillity, closeness to the past', and 'nonmaterialism'(Wiener 2004, p.7).

Wiener described an England that had developed a 'complex, entrenched cultural syndrome' or 'malaise' (Wiener, 2004, p.5) and hypothesised that 'culture, society, and ideology' (Wiener, 2004, p.5) were key to understanding what Corelli Barnett had, elsewhere, described as the 'English Disease' (Anderson, 2006, p.165) of sluggish industrial modernisation. And although Wiener did not offer a precise definition of 'culture' in his text, he alluded throughout to 'complexes of attitudes' (Wiener, 2004, p.ix), 'national values and a (general) *mentalité*' (Wiener, 2004, p.10), to 'class cultures', and to 'myth', 'sentiments', and 'cultural symbols' (Wiener, 2004, p.6) as having determining effects on the pace and trajectory of English economic development. In this respect, Wiener's approach to culture could be said to be both 'idealist' and 'materialist', combining more traditional conceptions of culture 'with a capital C' (Barker and Jane, 2011) with a more socio-anthropological perspective on culture as 'ordinary' and a matter of 'relations between elements in a whole way of life' (Williams, 1983, p.63).

In essence, by using culture as an explanatory device, Wiener's work adopted something akin to a cultural materialist approach to the 'English disease', focussing as it did on the relationship between the country's characteristic myths, customs, attitudes, artistic works, and cultural imaginary, its institutional structures, *and* its material, economic base. His approach has been described by Hickox as 'Weber in Reverse' (Hickox, 2005) (Hickox, 2005) in that it mirrored Max Weber's seminal thesis about the relationship between modern Western European capitalism and the 'Protestant work ethic', while inverting it by establishing a causal link between England's distinctive 'culture' and a process of economic decline and *de*-industrialisation. The 'economic', then, was not, for Wiener, a category that could be considered separately from the cultural values, attitudes, behaviours, shared understandings

and identities of economic actors, which, historically had tended to be elided by the economist's abstract theorisation of the atomised, economic subject of rational capitalism.

### **The Enterprise Culture as a Political Motif in Britain**

In addition to becoming a 'cult book' in British management education and practice (Raven, 1989), Wiener's text came to represent a kind of discursive touchstone in a political debate about the necessity for promoting a nationwide 'enterprise culture', and an ensuing complex and sometimes 'internally contradictory, exercise in *statecraft*' (Marquand, 1992, p.61). In the discursive repertoires of Margaret Thatcher's first government, the idea of the enterprise culture was elevated to the status of a secularised millenarian ideal which – if realised – would deliver Britain from its state of culturally-induced economic malaise through a process of cultural transformation, economic regeneration, and 'spiritual rebirth' (Ritchie, 1991, p.19). And though Wiener himself had alluded to the 'ambiguity of the Victorian achievement' (Wiener, 2004, p.8), his culturalist hypothesis was soon pressed into the service of a backward-looking myth about a need return to the 'heroic optimism of the mid-Victorian years' (Behmler 2000, p.5) and 'the early nineteenth-century 'entrepreneurial ideal' (Marquand, 1992, p.62) as a kind of prelapsarian golden age of British enterprise.

*English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit* has been described, alongside Barnett's 'English disease', as part of a 'Thatcherite theme song' (Letwin, 1992, p.251) and a 'central motif in the political thought and practice' of her successive governments (Keat, 1991, p.1) to the extent that Keith Joseph - former Secretary of State for both Industry, and Education and Science – reportedly 'urged the cabinet to read Wiener's book as a root explanation of Britain's economic difficulties' (Sanderson, 2008, p.32). And though Wiener did not coin the term 'enterprise culture' himself, attributing it instead to the book's 'conservative admirers' (Wiener 1981, p. xvii), his 'carefully qualified hypothesis' about Britain's economic culture would soon be transported, in the hands of conservative political rhetoricians and intellectuals, into the realm of 'incontestable historical fact' (Raven 1989, p.179), where, evidently, it

has remained for decades since as a persistent theme in policy debates as a ‘dominant UK model for economic development’ (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.13). And though it is often critiqued as a historically specific ‘justificatory ideology for radical political and social reform’ associated with ‘Thatcherism’, it continues to be invoked today, most conspicuously, in policy and scholarly literature surrounding education (Patel, 2004; Rae, Gee and Moon, 2009; Coyle *et al.*, 2013), economic policy (BBC, 1999a; Greene, Mole and Storey, 2008; Cameron, 2011a), and business and organisational management (du Gay and Salaman, 1992; Beaver, 2002; Salaman and Storey, 2008).

In the nineteen eighties, Wiener’s thesis was taken up enthusiastically by champions of the ‘enterprise culture’ who disdained Britain’s collectivist ‘post-war-settlement’, the ‘dependency culture’ engendered by the sprawling bureaucracies of the welfare state, and the ‘complacent traditionalism’ of its patrician elites (Hickox 2005, p.140), seeking instead to remould the country along classical liberalist lines. This revolution was to be accomplished, it was often argued, through the transformation of perceptions, attitudes, values, and behaviours as part of what Colin Gray has described as, at least in part, as an attempt at wide-scale ‘social engineering’ (Gray 1998, p.19). In particular, the enterprise culture paradigm promoted the idea that traditional bureaucracies and collectivist institutions were antithetical to the interests of the sovereign individual and repressive of their latent entrepreneurial potential. This type of sociocultural approach to enterprise is sometimes described as proceeding from a ‘Neo-Weberian argument that national values, ideas, and cultural patterns strongly shape the probabilities of economic development’ (Power and González, 2003, p.93).

As an isolatable phenomenon, the ‘enterprise culture’ represented both an ‘ideal future socio-cultural goal’ (Roberts 2002, p.42) in the political imaginary associated with ‘Thatcherism’, *and* an enigmatic discursive phenomenon which accompanied a concrete programme of ‘institutional’ and ‘ethical’ reforms aimed at a widespread ‘economic *and* cultural reconstruction’ (Carr & Beaver 2002, p.108) of late twentieth century Britain. This transformation was to be accomplished, primarily, through the promotion of ‘entrepreneurial’ values and behaviours both in organisations and in individuals, with special emphasis given to ‘enterprising’ traits such as ‘self-reliance, personal responsibility, boldness and a willingness to take risks in the pursuit of goals’ (du Gay 1996). This bundle of ideas, described

by Jacqueline Botterill as reflective of the ‘curious blend of mythical Victorian petty-bourgeois values’ (Botterill 2010, p.23) associated with ‘Thatcherism’, took aim both at the ‘institutional’ reform of the public and private organisations, and the ‘ethical’ transformation of subjects so as to make both more flexible, responsive to change, opportunity-seeking, reflexive, and self-motivated.

### **Enterprise as a ‘Master Metaphor’**

Within this discursive formation, ‘enterprise’ signified not just individual businesses or companies, nor even the more generic sense of a bold or daring undertaking on the part of the exceptional individual, but rather came to signify a kind of universal ‘master metaphor’ (Smircich, 1983; Hobbs, 2015) for representing – and understanding – any domain of social practice. Paul du Gay has labelled this phenomenon ‘the generalization of a particular conception of the enterprise form to all forms of conduct’ (du Gay 2004, p.38), including those that were traditionally non-commercial in nature. Underpinning this generalisation was the idea – central to the enterprise culture concept – that truly ‘enterprising’ organisations and individuals were those that were not custom-bound, bureaucratic and resistant to change, but were instead possessed of a dynamism which allowed them to adapt quickly and voluntarily to disruptive changes in their environment and convert uncertainty and disequilibrium into opportunity and value.

The central innovation, at least rhetorically, of the enterprise culture vision, was that economic growth was to be pursued through the reform – and in some cases dismantling – of state institutions so as to create an appropriate ‘culture’ for the freeing up of individual entrepreneurial spirit, held to be a latent but pent-up facet of human nature, to flourish, with the main obstacle to its realisation represented by the distortions of ‘self-understanding, values, and attitudes’ (Carr & Beaver 2002, p.106) that decades of collectivism, state interference, and ‘dependency’ had wrought on the psyche of the average British subject. The enterprise culture paradigm, then, provided the rhetorical gloss for a radical programme of reform or, according to the discourse - rectification - which was ‘represented in large part as a cultural

crusade, concerned with the attitudes, values and forms of self-understanding embedded in both individuals and institutional activities' (Keat, 1991) spanning the private and public sectors, and civil society.

Much as Margaret Thatcher had herself famously remarked that 'Economics are the method; the object is to change the heart and soul' (Ronald Butt, 1981) and sought to 'link politics to a broad, articulated philosophy of life' (Ernest 2002, p.142), the enterprise culture programme represented a mix of structural reform and moral, 'responsibilising' discourses aimed at the subjectivities, attitudes, and sense-making of individual human beings as much as it was the institutions of the state. Elsewhere, Paul du Gay has described the enterprise culture as a manifestation of the 'difficult, often faltering' attempts of Thatcher's successive governments to weave together the sometimes contradictory 'economic and moral strands' of their ideologies (du Gay, 1996, p.56), particularly with respect to their promotion of both unfettered markets and social discipline. In addition to reversing Britain's industrial decline, the enterprise culture was regarded as the antidote to a related kind of moral crisis, which – if addressed would promote the development of a national 'culture' amenable to the kind of innovative and entrepreneurial capitalism required in an increasingly competitive and dynamic global economy.

However, while the 'enterprise culture' paradigm had its origins in the 'political-ethico project of Thatcherism' (Dorey 2014, p.99), the two are not fully coextensive, with enterprise outlasting Thatcher's governments and entering 'into peoples' daily lives in a number of ways not directly related to the policy initiatives of successive conservation administrations' (du Gay 1996, p.58), such as in the fields of welfare provision and labour activation, human resource management, and education and training. Broadly speaking, Nikolas Rose has described the enterprise culture paradigm as having – irrespective of its specific manifestation – three 'dimensions', which he has labelled as 'political/governmental', 'institutional', and 'ethical' (Rose 1998, p.152). The macrosocial ethico-political enterprise culture programme combined each of these dimensions, as both a vision for transforming the state, a prescriptive programme for reforming institutions, and a specific set of 'cultural technologies' aimed at remaking individuals as subjects.

Despite its regular invocation of a ‘flawed dualism’ (Fournier and Grey, 1999) between ‘enterprise’ and ‘bureaucracy’ – or between individual freedom and hierarchical institutions - the doctrine of the enterprise culture has come to be closely associated, both at the macrosocial and institutional level, with far-reaching governmental or ‘managerialist’ efforts, by the state and its bureaucracies, to effect a top-down and intrusive cultural, moral, social, and economic ‘revolution’ through the revival of a nationwide ‘enterprising spirit’. In this sense, Patricia Carr and Graham Beaver have defined the enterprise culture as a set of ‘strategies and policies drawn upon by government, for the direction of the behaviour of individuals and business’ (Carr and Beaver, 2002, p.111) and, as such, a complex ‘governmental technology’ aimed at embedding ‘administratively imposed enterprise’ (du Gay 2004, p.45) across government departments, schools, universities, and society more broadly, despite its ‘basis’ in a desire to bring about ‘a restoration of the age of the individual’ (Graffham, 1992, p.29).

One of the basic credos of the enterprise culture was that the overbearing British state, and its industrially concentrated economy overpopulated by large, moribund firms and state bureaucracies, had dampened the entrepreneurial spirit of the British people, for engagement in entrepreneurial endeavour, free from government encroachment, was both a right and an obligation. This formulation had much in common with political philosophies which regard the state and the individual subject as competitors in an adversarial zero-sum relationship, casting the former as having an unhelpful, stymieing, and paternalistic relationship with the latter. The entrepreneurial personality ‘type’ is often portrayed within the enterprise culture not as something which needs to be cultivated from nothing, but instead as something latent in the ‘spirit’ and psychology of all individuals, which the liberal state had a special, restitutionary responsibility for nurturing. In addition to portraying the overreach of the interventionist state, and resulting barriers to the proper functioning of free markets, the enterprise culture suggested, ultimately, that there was a kind of general indisposition towards enterprise in the general populace which could only be remedied through the widespread appropriation of an entrepreneurial subjectivity, or what some critics have labelled as ‘the entrepreneurial self’ (Bröckling, 2015) or the ‘entrepreneurial self-identity narrative’ (Down, 2006).

### 2.3. Enterprise Culture at the Organisational Level

In addition to representing a recurring motif in the far-reaching macrosocial programme of economic, social, and cultural transformation associated with ‘Thatcherism’, ‘enterprise culture’ has also historically been used to denote a feature of reforms - both in the public and private sectors – aimed at re-making ‘organizations in ways which are seen as competitive, dynamic and, as managerial rubric would have it, excellent’ (Fournier and Grey, 1999, p.108). Here then, the ‘culture’ which is to be made ‘entrepreneurial’ is located within a specific organisation, rather than a whole macro-level ‘imagined community’ ( Anderson, 2006) such as ‘society’ or the ‘nation’.

One of the main tenets of the ethico-political enterprise culture programme was that the small self-owned business or lean firm represented the institutional setting *par excellence* for the development of a particular ‘set of “self-formation” ascetic practices’ (Carr 2000, p.407) associated with the entrepreneurial ideal. However, in addition to encouraging individuals to become lone entrepreneurs, the small commercial enterprise also took on ‘paradigmatic status’ (Keat, 1991, p.3) in the discourses of the enterprise culture programme, with the result that all organisations, regardless of their size or complexity, were encouraged to adopt a more entrepreneurial posture and to emulate the characteristics of the small, agile business with its greater propensity for risk, nimble flexibility, and capacity for responding more rapidly and proactively to changes in its external environment.

As well as building ‘enterprise capacity’ in the small-firms sector and the general population, the nineteen-eighties enterprise culture programme set out to transform the cultural dimensions of ‘organisations of all shapes and sizes, in both the private and public sectors’ (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.14). Where the state and its agencies were concerned, alongside an extensive programme of privatisation of state-owned industries, and the creation of quasi-markets in state-funded goods, the enterprise culture initiative also involved the promotion new organisational paradigms - drawn from the nascent movement which came to be known as ‘New Public Management’ –intended to encourage both institutions and individuals to behave more ‘entrepreneurially’. This manifested in a recurring contrast being made between, on the one hand, the positively coded entrepreneur, lean organisation, and market

models, and on the other, the 'rigid, bureaucratic and unproductive' cultures of traditional state bureaucracies (Raven, 1989, p.198).

Du Gay has described the enterprise culture, at the organisational level, as an 'abstract political critique of "bureaucracy" most especially, but not exclusively, in the public sector' (du Gay, 2004, p.38). This critique, which tended to trade on a 'flawed dualism between enterprise and bureaucracy' (Fournier and Grey, 1999, p.107) – promoted the idea that with traditional hierarchies 'flattened', and old, inefficient practices abandoned, state organisations could successfully emulate the lean, flexible, characteristics of their nimble and adaptable SME counterparts.

This, in turn, would permit them to respond more quickly to developments in the external environment, and tap into the latent potential of employees, who had previously had their entrepreneurial spirit stifled by rigid, orthodox thinking, and bureaucratic 'red-tape'. Organisations within the public sector were to move towards 'entrepreneurial government', which entailed a rejection of tradition and hierarchical bureaucracy for a flatter and more decentralised control system (Merchant and Ven der Stede, 2007, p.118) in which individual employees were encouraged to become more self-governing, and organisations were given greater latitude to become more outward-facing, independent, and mission or output driven (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992).

### **Enterprise and Organisational 'Culture Change'**

For these reforms to take root, however, a profound 'culture change' was required to take place across the public sector, which would necessitate the use of management technologies to 'structure the way people think, feel and act in organizations' (du Gay, 1996, p.130). The imperative to change 'culture' within organisations – and to make them more 'entrepreneurial' – was predicated on the idea that organisations have distinctive cultures or 'patterns of beliefs and expectations shared by their members' which 'create norms which powerfully shape the behaviour of individuals and groups' (Schwartz and Stanley, 1981, p.33) within them. This perspective on organisations has been described as subscribing to a 'structural realist' ontology (Ashkanasy, Wilderom and Peterson, 2000, p.10; Westwood and

Clegg, 2003, p.8) in which organisations are viewed as ‘structures that have a variety of properties (...) including culture’ (Ashkanasy, Wilderom and Peterson, 2000, p.7), each of which can be effectively ‘managed’. From a ‘realist’ perspective, organisational culture represents a ‘structure’ with an objective existence which can be changed to influence the discourses and sensemaking of organisational members. Developing an enterprise culture, then, involved directing reforms not only at an organisation’s bureaucratic and managerial structures, but at its symbolic practices and the subjectivities of its members, and necessitated the promotion of institutional and individual ‘entrepreneurial ideals’ at governmental, organisational and individual levels (Burchell, 1993, p.275).

In addition to its prescriptions for small businesses, civil society, and the public sector, the ‘enterprise culture’ motif has also emerged, more generally, as a feature of theory and practice in the field of organisational management against the backdrop of what Smircich has described as the ‘cultural metaphor’ for understanding and governing organisations (Smircich, 1983). Here, a drive for entrepreneurial ‘culture change’ within organisations is indicative of a broader tendency - sometimes described as the ‘cultural turn’ in management theory and organisational research (Thompson and Findlay, 1999) – for the ‘substantive concerns’ of organisations to ‘increasingly come to be represented in cultural terms’ (du Gay, 1996, p.40). Within this perspective on organisations, culture is viewed as a key source of productivity, innovation, organisational effectiveness, and competitive advantage, and employees conceptualised ‘as ‘meaning-seeking individuals’ whose preferences and motivations ‘are not subject to purely utilitarian or rational analysis’ (Krause-Jensen, 2010, p.105). Here then, the ‘cultures’ of organisations, and the subjectivities of their members become legitimate targets of management intervention, with organisational culture change exhibiting, again, interrelated ‘institutional and ethical strands’ (Carr & Beaver 2002, p.108) which focus not just on transforming an institution’s structures or communications, but the value orientations, attitudes, and norms of behaviour amongst individual members.

Entrepreneurial Culture change, which has been described as entailing ‘the re-construction and re-imagining of organizations, and the redefining of employee subjectivity’ (Salaman and Storey, 2008, p.315) typically took the form of new technologies of governance designed, primarily, to encourage

entrepreneurial behaviour in individuals and teams (Carr, 2000, p.406). The 'entrepreneurial' organisation is often presented as the antidote – or 'counterfactual' of (Salaman and Storey, 2008, p.315) – classical bureaucracy, which had taken on an almost pejorative sense in the literature on organisations as 'scientific' and administrative management paradigms gave way to more behavioural theories and practices. These emphasised the role of individual motivation, meaningful investment in non-alienating work, the intangibles of work environment and culture, and the 'human side' (McGregor and Joel Cutcher Gershenfeld, 2006) of the organisation as key factors of entrepreneurial productivity, efficiency, and growth.

### **Enterprise, Responsiveness, and Environmental Change**

One of the key characteristics of the entrepreneurial organisation – its 'adaptation ethic' – allowed it to respond swiftly to the challenges of an external environment characterised by continuous change, risk, and uncertainty, which was considered to be unfeasible in a rigid and slow-moving bureaucracy because of its low capacity to 'change, adapt, and relearn' (Farazmand, 2009, p.14). Within this management paradigm, the 'constant presence of change' (Carr and Beaver, 2002, p.109) is regularly invoked as necessitating development of an adaptive entrepreneurial posture which enhances speed of response and embeds a positive orientation towards to uncertainty, which is transformed from a source of discomfort into a driver of agile innovation. A popular idea in the literature on organisations, Thompson wrote, as early as 1967, that uncertainty was 'the fundamental problem for complex organizations and coping with uncertainty (...) the essence of the administrative process' (Thompson, 2003, p.159). This also suggests that those who are resistant to entrepreneurial change or who advocate caution, adherence to tradition, or 'piecemeal reform' lack the requisite dynamism and agility to succeed in an environment of high uncertainty.

Entrepreneurial organisations, in contrast to bureaucracies, were also supposed to develop 'flatter' and more 'participative' hierarchies which created the conditions for employees and managers to fulfil their entrepreneurial 'growth potential' by taking on more responsibility, acting on their own initiative, tasking risks, and 'adding value' by developing creative ways to enhance their contribution towards the

success of their organisation. In the literature on management and organisations, the specific form of entrepreneurial selfhood recommended for employees is often signified by the term 'intrapreneur'. This person did not necessarily start new business ventures, but instead used their entrepreneurial skills and mind-sets to eschew the constraints of bureaucracy to bring about change, innovation, and improvement in existing organisations (Pinchot and Pellman, 1999). Pinchot and Pellman also described intrapreneurs, somewhat romantically, as 'the dreamers who do' (Pinchot and Pellman, 1999, p.16) and who, through their creativity, energy, and self-efficacy, transform organisations in ways which would not have been possible in traditional, hierarchical bureaucracies and management cultures that did not value and promote employee 'creativity' and independence.

For intrapreneurship to flourish, it was argued, an organisation was required to be managed in such a way as to provide a 'focusing vision', and be populated by 'sponsors' who facilitate employees in achieving that vision (Pinchot and Pellman, 1999, p.11). Under these conditions – where 'change' and 'the pursuit of new things' are promoted as 'desirable norms' and 'operating mantra(s)' (Goossen, 2008, p.43) - every member of the organisation, it is argued, is 'free' to develop new ideas which can be translated into innovations, opportunities, or added value for the organisation. Kanter has described this kind of arrangement as the 'post-entrepreneurial' organisation, in that it applies entrepreneurial principles to the traditional corporation, creating a marriage between entrepreneurial creativity and corporate discipline, cooperation, and teamwork' (Kanter, 1990, p.9).

In addition to extracting surplus value through the realisation of employees' entrepreneurial growth potential, entrepreneurial organisations are also typically described as having a 'culture' in which employees are given opportunities to engage in 'the arts of self-realization' for their own enhancement (Rose, 1998, p.161). This decentralised management structure embodies the principle of 'contractual implication' (Donzelot, *cited in* Burchell, 1993, p.29), under which individuals are freed from the constraints of direct management control but at the cost of taking more responsibility for their own work and self-development as part of a 'whole ethos of performance' (Roberts, 2002, p.47). Within this kind of 'contractual' arrangement, individuals and units assume more active responsibility for their own work, and in so doing 'affirm a certain type of identity' which is 'basically entrepreneurial in character'

in that it requires them to adopt a certain relationship to themselves as autonomous, self-governing entities, acting independently and off their own initiative (du Gay, 2000, p.119).

### **Enterprise, the Organisation, and the Individual Subject**

This approach to organisational management articulates a kind of humanistic psychology and humane management rhetoric which emphasises the need for employees to be able to fulfil their potential through work on the basis of the existence of an integral and coherent, though often repressed, ‘entrepreneurial’ self at the core of all human beings. This mirrors a tendency, which Cummins and Hoggett have described in their writings on the co-option of therapeutic discourses in human resource management (HRM), for organisations to articulate a commitment to employees becoming ‘liberated’, ‘actualised’, ‘fulfilled’, and ‘self-realized’ (Cummins and Hoggett, 1995, p.303) and to adopt a therapeutic emphasis on growth over stasis, adaptability over rigidity, and self-development over lethargy’(Cummins and Hoggett, 1995, p.309).

This linkage between entrepreneurial management and employee self-realisation, however, has been criticised as an instrumental strategy for developing employees as a strategic human resource, with the focus on culture and subjectivity enabling ‘an alignment to take place between the technologies of work and the technologies of subjectivity’ (du Gay, 1996, p.133). Thus work, within the entrepreneurial organisation, tends to be framed not as an impediment to employee’s autonomy or creativity, but as an essential element in the path to ‘self-fulfilment’ (Rose, 1998, p.161). Entrepreneurial organisations have also been described as utilising a proliferation of new technologies for ‘governing at a distance’ (Miller and Rose, 2008, p.18) which conceal power differentials by promoting a rhetoric of empowerment and participation while subjecting employees to more indirect ‘forms of regulation’ (Miller and Rose, 2008, p.18). These new forms of seemingly non-bureaucratic control relate to pastoral guidance, auditing, performance measurement, personal development planning, target-setting, and so on (Miller and Rose, 2008, p.18). Organisations themselves are re-imagined as ‘integrative’ rather than ‘aggregative’

institutions; they come to represent spaces in which work is taken up on the basis of ‘commitment to the goals of the organisation’, seen as in harmony with one’s personal self-development, as opposed to participating ‘for personal gain’ (Mascarenhas, 1993).

The ‘enterprise culture’ paradigm, whether as a macrosocial or an organisational phenomenon – both of which apply to the development of entrepreneurial universities - can reasonably be described as a set of discursive governmental technologies which aim to bring about both ‘institutional’ and ‘ethical’ change in organisations and individual subjects, based on the recognition that ‘culture’, rather than an institutional epiphenomenon, represents *the* medium through which the more intangible, symbolic, and human dimensions of an organisation can be strategically leveraged to support the aims of organisational managers.

## 2.4. The Entrepreneurial Self

On its more abstract and ‘inner’ level, the enterprise culture aimed to secure permanent changes in the self-perception, attitudes and behaviour of the whole populace’ (Roberts 2002, p.42).

As an expression of ‘governmentality’ and ‘a cluster of loosely related inspirational values’ (Roberts, 2002), the enterprise culture paradigm was centrally concerned with directing the conduct of individuals, not through direct coercion, but through indirect control, mediated through discursive practices, such as the promotion of particular models of ‘entrepreneurial’ subjectivity. In addition to elevating the entrepreneur to the status of a universal social role model, the enterprise culture ideal also advanced a much broader and abstract discursive construction of what it meant to be ‘enterprising’ that was generalised ‘to all forms of conduct’ (Burchell, 1993). Ulrich Bröckling has likened this, following Michel Foucault, to a process of ‘subjectification’ or self-formation in which an individual, theoretically, turns themselves ‘into a subject’ (Foucault, 1994, p.218) by drawing on a set of available ‘interpretive schemes with which (they ...) are supposed to understand themselves and their lives’ (Bröckling 2015, p. xi). In the context of the enterprise culture, the conceptually indeterminate figure of ‘the enterprising self’ has, despite its ambiguities, been elevated to a ‘society-wide ideal of subjectivity’ (Marttila 2015, p.186).

This form of subjectivity exhorts individuals to become more ‘enterprising’, or in other words more self-reliant, opportunity-seeking, energetic, aspirant, and proactive, but is also a permanent and restless process of ‘working on’ one’s selfhood, as a continuous process of reflexive transformation, ‘the enterprise of the self’ (Rose 1992, p.146)(du Gay, 1996b, p.25; Kelly, 2016). Further to this, the enterprising self adopts a kind of ethical orientation towards a world characterised by risk and uncertainty, viewing these conditions not as an existential threat, but as an invitation for energetic and creative opportunity-seeking (Keat, 1991). Unsurprisingly, in addition to being adaptable to changing economic circumstances, this model subject was also uniquely placed not only to endure the disruption

caused to their life conditions by radical social, political, economic, or institutional reform, but to embrace it.

Elsewhere, Simons and Masschelein have likened entrepreneurial self-governance to a kind of ‘*adaptation ethic*’ which enjoins individual subjects, caught up in the currents of epochal change, to engage in a continuous search for new ways to mobilise their knowledge, skills, and human capital to produce value, ‘not only expressed in financial terms’ but in terms of ‘everything that enables the production of satisfaction of whatever need in whatever environment (Simons & Masschelein, 2008, p.198)’. One of the basic premises of the enterprise culture paradigm was, then, that ‘the entire population is composed of would-be entrepreneurs’ (Dodd & Anderson 2001, p.18) – conceived quite broadly – but that their capacity to make the necessary adaptations to their changing economic environment had been ‘trained out’ of them by the economic culture in which they developed.

At its heart, the enterprise culture paradigm represented a theory about the micro-foundations of macro-economic growth. As such, in addition to of a new ‘cultural hero’ (Kanter, 1990), and a ‘model moral personality’ (du Gay 2004, p.48) exemplifying the values of economic success and social responsibility, the enterprise culture singled out the entrepreneur as *the* mainspring of economic growth in industrialised nations. ‘Enterprise capacity-building’, then, amongst both existing entrepreneurs and the general population became a key policy target of the enterprise culture. Interestingly, while individual entrepreneurial success stories were regularly held up as paragons to be emulated, a belief had also developed that Britain’s existing entrepreneurs had had their ‘entrepreneurial spirit’ thwarted by the anti-industrial values and intrusive regulations of the State, as well as a more general ‘anti-enterprise cultural bias’ (Hetzner 1999, p.117). It might be best, then, to think of the entrepreneur as a mythic or metaphorical construction, who, through their dynamism, risk-taking, and creativity, ‘break the routine, overcome the inherent conservatism of the establishment, and change the economic and social landscape’ (Beaugrand 2004, p.14)

In addition to a justificatory discourse for a complex of radical structural reforms, the enterprise culture programme aimed at what can profitably be described as a kind of large-scale ‘cultural reengineering’ of the British subject, including the fostering, through certain moral techniques, of ‘change in the

innermost identity of individuals and groups' (Roberts 2002, p.41) to bring about a wide-scale personal and social renewal that would drive entrepreneurially led economic recovery. As a programme of political reform, it was distinguished by its strong focus on culture and on psychological concepts such as 'personal motivation, attitude shifts and behavioural change', and on enterprising 'traits, as 'both instruments and targets of economic policy' (Gray 1998, p.6). Rhetorically, it promoted 'enterprise' as a nostrum for a seemingly inexhaustible list of social and economic policy problems, as well as a guaranteed pathway towards the liberation of individual subjects. In a sense, then, despite being a large-scale, top-down government programme, the enterprise culture appeared to tap, at least discursively, into a rich seam of popular sentiment around the idea of authentic individualism during a period when selfhood came to be viewed, increasingly, as either a reflexive project set free from its determination by 'collective and abstract structures' (Beck, Giddens and Lash, 1994, p.155) or a matter of self-creation under the destabilising conditions of 'liquid modernity' (Bauman, 2007).

### **The Psychology of the Entrepreneurial Subject**

Crucially, the model of the enterprising self promoted by the enterprise culture was, in many ways, a psychological concept, concerned as it was with the motivations, behaviours, and mind-sets of modern Britons. The American psychologist David McClelland is typically invoked as the originator of the idea that economic development in industrialised societies depends, in large part, on the presence of 'enterprising and achievement-oriented attitudes in society', with his work seen as 'providing important psychological underpinning for enterprise culture policies' (Gray 1998, p.108).

McClelland's psychologically determinist explanations of entrepreneur-driven economic growth appear to have had considerable influence on the enterprise culture paradigm in Britain, particularly in relation to the view that 'individual psychology' was 'the precious fuel of economic progress' (Herman 1995, p.139), which, if ignited could revive Britain's flagging entrepreneurial spirit (Gray 1998, p.18). This model of the enterprising, achievement-oriented self was a recurring theme in enterprise culture policies

regarding welfare, education and training, and public sector management , as part of a broader governmental rationality which prioritised interventions directed at the subjectivity, conduct, and values of employees, welfare recipients, and citizens more generally (Rose 1998). Accompanying this however, conversely, was a kind of psychological pathologising of the British welfare subject whose entrepreneurial potential had been hamstrung by the ‘dependency culture’ to which they had become habituated, with advocates tending to ‘focus their spleen on the welfare state’ (Nixon 1997, p.108), rather than on public administration or industrial concentration, as *the* key obstacle to the nationwide flourishing of an ‘enterprise culture’ .

Elsewhere, Adams elaborated a typology of risk-taking personality types divided into four groups: ‘fatalists’, who felt that they had little chance of controlling their lives or their external environments, and so were resigned to accepting their circumstances; ‘hierarchists’ who were comfortable inhabiting a world with a hierarchy in which each individual knows their place and enacts their roles as set out; ‘egalitarians’ who have ‘strong group loyalties but ‘little respect for externally imposed rules’ and who value ‘trust and fairness’ and ‘cooperative, caring, and sharing’ behaviours; and lastly ‘individualists’, who are ‘enterprising, self-made people, relatively free from control by others, but who strive to exert control over their environment’ (Adams, 2001). Where the enterprise culture was concerned, ‘individualists’ were regarded as the positive antithesis of the non-entrepreneurial hierarchists in what were perceived as the rigid and moribund organisations of the state and private sectors, as well as the ‘fatalist’ subjects of the welfare state, who regarded themselves as having little chance of controlling their own lives, being content to look to paternalistic interventions as a means for changing their circumstances, having less personal agency and what David McClelland might refer to as a strong ‘external locus of control’ (McClelland, 1987).

The concept of the locus of control then, provides a kind of psychological scientificity to the tendency, within the entrepreneurial culture, to privilege the self-reliant and self-efficacious opportunity-seeker, who will typically be frustrated by efforts to manage and direct them, over subjects with pronounced ‘external loci of control’ who tend to ‘attribute life conditions and consequences to external forces’ beyond their control (Chung, 2006, p.209). Within this paradigm, independent and dependent subjects,

with their respective ‘internal’ and ‘external’ loci of control, were presented as ‘mutually exclusive ways of being human’ (Roberts 2002, p.47), with the former portrayed as *the way* for individual subjects to achieve self-realisation and take up their proper place in an envisaged entrepreneurial social and economic order.

The responsabilising discourses associated with the political-ethico ideal of the enterprising self reflects an approach to liberal government which has been described as embodying what Jacques Donzelot has termed the ‘contractual implication’ (Donzelot, *cited in* Burchell 1993, p.29). In this contractarian and ethical relationship, the state sets clear expectations, objectives, and tasks for the self-governing citizen as a condition of their welfare and promotes a form of individualised ethical freedom and self-reliance viewed as the antidote to the perceived enervating effects of the traditional welfare ‘dependency culture’. This individualist, contractarian philosophy of the responsibility of the state *vis-à-vis* its citizens, and *vice-versa*, has been described by Graham Burchell, following Michel Foucault, as indicative of prevailing late-twentieth century forms of liberal ‘governmentality’, which denotes a form of power – expressed through knowledge, assemblages, and disciplinary techniques designed to ‘affect the way in which individuals *conduct themselves*, as opposed to more direct forms of control or interdiction’ (Burchell 1993, p.20).

This is not of course to say that there is no place for considerations of psychological and behavioural factors in economic theorising and policy-formation, but rather to point to the significance of the ‘entrepreneurial’ subject as a normative identity type in enterprise culture discourse. Rather than merely reform the contemporary subject to adapt to the changing economic circumstances of the nineteen eighties, then, the enterprise culture initiative appeared to have a more ambitious goal, to create a nation made of subjects who were committed to a process of constant self-reinvention in anticipation of a future in which uncertainty, economic disruption, and disequilibrium would become inescapable facts of life.

On a macro-level, then, the enterprise culture paradigm had a strong human capital thrust, particular in its self-description as a means for ‘the liberation of the resources locked away in an unemployed or deskilled workforce’ (Bailey 1993, p.191) discouraged to adopt self-starting entrepreneurial

dispositions by the dependency culture of the welfare state, and the rigid bureaucracies of extant industry. In the context of a more atomised, post-traditional social order, and a 'risk society' characterised by greater precarity, economic instability, and progressive uncertainty, entrepreneurial traits such as self-reliance, personal vitality and dynamism, risk-taking and initiative, flexibility, and 'daring spirit' (Carr & Beaver 2002, p.147), represent not only moral virtues in the sealed discourse of entrepreneurialism, but essential tools for survival. In this context, the model of the 'enterprising self' emerges out of the enterprise culture to define the kind of 'relation an individual should have' with themselves, and the 'habits of action he or she should acquire and exhibit' to adapt and succeed under the market conditions of late modernity (du Gay 1996, p.56). Like Giddens' concept of the post-traditional self, the enterprising subject must work to sustain a 'coherent, yet continuously revised, biographical narrative' (Giddens 1991, p.5) as they work to continuously adapt and renew their relationship with the productive apparatus of a changing society and economy.

## 2.5. Critiques of the Enterprise Culture

The enterprise culture paradigm, and the related concept of the enterprise self, have been described as representing a ‘modality of control’ (Beck, 1998) developed for the purpose of shaping and regulating conduct and subjectivity both at the organisational and macrosocial, political level. It is also often associated with the generalisation of the ‘enterprise form’ to ‘*all* forms of conduct’ – as part of ‘the progressive enlargement of the territory of economic theory’ (Gordon, 1991, p.153) – such that ‘quasi-economic’ models of action and competitive market values have been extended to previously non-commercial domains (Burchell, 2013, p.29). The enterprise culture, then, is considered as promoting an economic rationality for understanding all forms of social behaviour, coupled with a moral and political rhetoric which, ideologically, elevates the idea of the enterprise of the self to a universal categorical imperative, framed by Roberts as a kind of imposed ‘inner-conversion process’ with a ‘quasi-religious’ character (Roberts 2002, p.41).

### Enterprise as ‘Marketisation’

In addition, ‘enterprise culture’ has been critiqued as a method of emulating ‘certain paradigmatic conceptions of appropriate market-based relations and subjectivities’ (Law, 2002, p.34) through the introduction of new forms of accountability, performance monitoring, and self-audit that imitate the commercial enterprise as *the* ‘preferred model for any form of institutional organization’ (Keat, 1991, p.3) based on the assumption that smaller, lean enterprises are better equipped to respond proactively, and in a more opportunity-driven way, to the presence of change, disruption, and insecurity in their external environments.

Although the enterprise culture was ideologically premised on the generalisation of market entrepreneurship to all forms of social practice, many have argued that, in practical terms, it resulted in a range of new governmental practices in public administration, welfare provision, and state economic

policy that had ‘no necessary association’ with ‘entrepreneurship’ (Bechofer, 1992). Du Gay has also proffered that the enterprise culture’s directives for institutions and individuals to become more ‘entrepreneurial’ have ‘next to no relationship to existing commercial discourses on “entrepreneurship”’ (du Gay, 2004, p.45), while Carr and Beaver have described it as something which is ‘not connected to the lived experience of small business owners’ (Carr and Beaver, 2002, p.107) in any more than a metaphorical way. Elsewhere, John Hendry has described the entrepreneurial ‘identity’ intended for employees in the public and private sectors as ‘a bureaucratically sanitized fiction that differed in critical respects from the real thing’ (Hendry, 2004, p.53).

Dodd and Anderson, meanwhile, in a study of ‘Blairite enterprise policies’ have proffered that ‘top-down’ and ‘nationally coordinated’ efforts to promote entrepreneurialism were likely to be viewed with suspicion by ‘those of an independent and entrepreneurially-oriented outlook’ –ironically especially when they share the ‘antipathy towards the large-scale and the bureaucratic’ (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.19) which the enterprise culture promotes. Further to this, they have also pointed to an inherent contradiction in the attempt, by advocates for the enterprise culture, to ‘derive a collectivist ideology’ from ‘the individual act of the entrepreneur’, especially when, rhetorically, the two phenomena are presented as so strongly antithetical, adding that it is equally flawed to assume that ‘actually existing entrepreneurs’, as a class of people, share a homogenous culture which has any similarity to the ‘manufactured enterprise culture of politicians’ (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.17).

### **The Discursive Ambiguity of Enterprise**

Instead, enterprise culture represents a distinctive tendency, affecting a number of orders of discourse, which has its own immanent intelligibility and clusters of values which have little to do with the actual behaviours of small businesses and entrepreneurs. In this regard, du Gay suggests that the ‘critical tactic’ of judging the enterprise culture in terms of our understandings of entrepreneurship - in its more restricted business-related sense – loses its usefulness (du Gay, 2004, p.41). The inclusive conception

of enterprise advanced by the advocates of the enterprise culture, and traditional definitions associated with a 'business-related lexis' (Mautner, 2005) are, then, 'different and non-reducible' (du Gay, 2004, p.41). In this sense, enterprise culture has been described as 'a social construction of a family of concepts' marked by the 'disparity, ambiguity, paradox and ambivalence of its components' (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.15) which deploys terms such as 'enterprise' in expansive and nebulous ways.

Further to this, Salaman and Storey (Salaman and Storey, 2008, p.280) have argued that, in practical settings, subjects are likely to 'mediate the construct' of enterprise in diverse ways depending on their own contexts, 'meanings and interests'.

### **Fairclough's 'Three Senses'.**

A useful framework developed to account for the complex ways in which enterprise - and its cognates – tend to be articulated within the discourses of the enterprise culture has been elaborated by Fairclough. Through analysing a number of speeches given in the 1980s by Lord Young of Graffham, Fairclough elaborated three distinct 'meanings' attached to enterprise which tend to be articulated, alongside one another, in a variety of combinations depending on the particular communicative context (Fairclough, 1991). He labels these three senses '(1) activity', '(2) quality', and '(3) business', and describes them as follows:

1. 'Engagement in bold, arduous or momentous undertakings' (*OED* gives as examples 'times of national enterprise' and 'men fond of intellectual enterprise').
2. 'Disposition or readiness to engage in undertakings of difficulty, risk or danger; daring spirit' (e.g. 'enterprise supplies the want of discipline', 'his lack of enterprise').
3. (In collocation with 'private' or 'free') 'private business', as a collective noun (Fairclough, 1991, p.113).

By classifying the ‘meanings’ attached to enterprise and its cognates, or the ‘senses in which it is used, in this way, Fairclough provides a useful framework for accounting for its semantic complexity. Although, in principle, Fairclough states that ‘any occurrence of the word is open to being interpreted in any of the three senses or any combination of them’, this interpretive ambivalence is what makes ‘enterprise discourse’ a ‘resource that is open to strategic exploitation’ (Fairclough, 1991, p.113) with a peculiar power to enlarge the scope of its signification well beyond its original ‘business-related lexis’ (Mautner, 2005, p.95). For Fairclough, then, ‘enterprise’ has a broad ‘meaning potential’, which refers to the range of significations that a particular figure of speech, keyword, or other analytical unit might be interpreted connoting, as well as a high ‘ambivalence potential’. The semantic ambivalence of enterprise discourse, he adds, is crucial to its power as a strategic rhetorical ‘resource ‘that can be flexibly adapted to a range of communicative contexts and referential objects. Critically, for Fairclough, it was the apparent generalisability of ‘enterprise’ to other dimensions of social life and previously distinct ‘discoursal domains’ that gave it its peculiar ideological power.

‘Enterprise discourse’ is, for Fairclough, particularly interesting because of the investment in its vocabulary and narratives of a ‘particular personal morality’ which calls upon all subjects and organisations, at every level of society, to adopt an entrepreneurial disposition as a means by which to adapt and succeed in an era characterised – at least discursively – by precarity, uncertainty, and ‘flux’. The ‘entrepreneurial’ subject – which is a central motif in enterprise discourse – promotes the idea of ‘adaptability to changing conditions and constant change as its modus operandi’ (Mentinis, 2016) , welcoming change and competition, and embracing an ethos of independence and self-reliance.

In a discussion of rhetoric and conceptual change, Skinner has suggested that the more people are ‘persuaded that a given evaluative term applies in circumstances in which they may never have thought of applying it’, the more ‘broad and inclusive’ its usage will become, eventually leading to a change in the ‘underlying concept’ as it comes to take on ‘a new prominence and a new salience’ in society (Skinner, 1999, p.7). In this sense, many have pointed to the ‘elasticity’ and ‘plasticity’ (Keat, 1991) of enterprise as itself performing ‘important ideological functions’ (Armstrong, 2005, p.6). In the context of the discursive phenomena of the ‘enterprise culture’ and its many variations of the ‘enterprise self’,

it can reasonably be argued, then, that it is Fairclough's 'activity' and 'quality' senses which tend to be most commonly deployed as part of the generalisation of 'enterprise' – as a 'master discourse' (du Gay, 1996, p.184) - to all forms of social institution and activity.

### **Isolating the 'Entrepreneurial Type'**

'The difficulty of identifying personal characteristics that explain or predict entrepreneurship is well known: the notion that such traits are not only identifiable, but latent in all, defies any extant psychology of entrepreneurship' (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.18).

Another criticism of the enterprise paradigm has emerged out of debates about the difficulties associated with identifying the common characteristics of the 'entrepreneurial type'. One area in which the 'quality' sense of enterprise (Fairclough, 1991) tends to be most widely articulated is in the construction – within enterprise culture discourse – of various types of psychological and behavioural 'types', including the intrapreneur, the entrepreneurial manager, and the enterprising self. In this regard, the enterprise culture paradigm tends to reflect a tendency within entrepreneurship research to seek to isolate an ideal, context-independent or 'E-type' or 'universal entrepreneurial' personality, which critics have labelled as a theoretical and empirical 'cul-de-sac' (Gray, 1998, p.21) or as the 'sublime object' or 'absent centre' of entrepreneurship discourse (Jones and Spicer, 2005) on the basis that popular and academic representations of the entrepreneur construct abstract fictions (Hendry, 2004, p.53) which are completely detached from the context-dependent and 'socially embedded' nature of actually-existing forms of entrepreneurship (Jones and Spicer, 1999).

Elsewhere, Armstrong has described an expanding 'genre of research' oriented, seemingly, towards 'confirming the mythos of the entrepreneur' through a 'largely fruitless' endeavour to furnish it with an empirical evidence base (Armstrong, 2005, p.42). Similarly, several critics have compared efforts to identify the personality characteristics of the entrepreneur to 'hunting the Heffalump' (Kilby, 1971; Hull, Bosley and Udell, 1980), a fictional elephant from A.A. Milne's 'Winnie the Pooh' series, on the

basis that ‘no one has been able to precisely describe them or state with certainty what they are’ (Kent, 1990, p.2) despite their best efforts to isolate and capture one.

One of the more popular methods for isolating the characteristics of the entrepreneur is the psychological micro-level ‘traits theory’ approach, which represented the ‘prevailing approach in empirical research in the seventies and eighties’ (Veciana, 2007, p.42). Here, research departed from earlier economic approaches in its empirical focus on the ‘traits’ of successful ‘flesh and blood’ entrepreneurs, rather than the methodological abstractions of economic theorising. Some of the basic assumptions of this paradigm were that entrepreneurs had ‘different psychological profiles’ to the general population (Veciana, 2007, p.41) and that, if successful entrepreneurs were treated as individual case studies, a nomothetic ‘science’ of entrepreneurship could be developed. Despite the difficulties associating with identifying the shared psychological ‘traits’ of existing entrepreneurs, something approaching a consensus on entrepreneurial traits has emerged from the scholarship on entrepreneurship which emphasises characteristics such as strong ‘internal locus of control’ and ‘achievement-orientation (Miner, 1997, p.14)’, ‘need of independence’, ‘risk taking-propensity’, ‘intuition’, boldness, ‘tolerance of ambiguity’ (Veciana, 2007, p.42), ‘desire to compete’, ‘self-efficacy’, ‘self-initiative’, ‘future-optimism’, preternatural alertness to opportunities (Kirzner, 1973), comfort with change and disruption (Schumpeter, 1934), and a propensity for creative ‘problem-solving.’

Entrepreneurialism is also often connected with Type-A’ behaviour, typically associated with ambition, competitiveness, drive, and impatience (Begley and Boyd, 1987). Regardless, the search for a ‘standard psychological profile’ for entrepreneurialism has been branded as ‘futile’ by some (Low and Macmillan, 1988), and critiqued by others as likely to lead to a psychological ‘profile’ so abstract and complex as to ‘portray someone larger than life, full of contradictions, and, conversely, someone so full of traits that (s)he would have to be a sort of generic “Everyman”’ (Garter, *cited in* Miner, 1997, pp. 14-15). Aside from being rather vaguely articulated, the traits associated with the model of the enterprising person are, crucially, socio-psychological and behavioural, rather than ‘economic’. As such, the model of the entrepreneur, in a broader sense, has come to represent not a business-person or

other economic actor, but a generic personality type and a normative goal for ‘self-actualisation’ – described by some as leading the ultimate form of entrepreneurialism, ‘the enterprise of the self’ (Rose 1992, p.146)(du Gay, 1996b, p.25; Kelly, 2016).

A central tension at the heart of ‘enterprise culture’ discourses on the entrepreneurial self resides in its drawing both on a psychological perspective on entrepreneurs as exceptional individuals with distinctive traits, *and* a behaviourist approach which leaves the door open for entrepreneurialism being something that can be learned by anybody. If entrepreneurialism was something that could not be learned, it would follow that there would be very little meaningful scope available for policy or managerial interventions designed to foster enterprise. As such, enterprise culture discourse obscures the nature/nurture distinction, enveloping it in a rhetoric which contends, simultaneously, that entrepreneurs are extraordinary, heroic individuals *and* that entrepreneurialism also represents a latent, unrealised potentiality in all social subjects. Additionally, a contradiction emerges out of the rhetorical construction of the entrepreneur as a natural behavioural ‘type’, and political-administrative efforts to encourage people to reinvent themselves *as* entrepreneurs, the latter of which appears to reveal an acknowledgement of the essentially contingent and malleable nature of economic identities. However, it might be useful here to consider that the respective ‘enterprise’ of the traditional entrepreneur, and that of the subject of ‘enterprise culture’ governmentality, are unlike and non-reducible, referring, instead, to quite different phenomena.

### **Enterprise as a ‘Self-Sealing Discourse’**

‘The enterprise culture is broad but nebulous, familiar but elusive. The very idea of a culture is problematic, and grasping the inherent paradoxes of the enterprise culture invokes a series of conceptual difficulties (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.14).

Critics have also pointed to the often ambiguous and circular qualities of enterprise discourse, with Ritchie describing it as representing both a kind of ‘self-sealing discourse’ and ‘tautological circle of

self-justification and fulfilment' (Ritchie, *cited in* Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.14) based on the premise that its definitions of entrepreneurialism are so broad as to encompass any kind of behaviour or quality which the advocates of the enterprise culture deem fit to label as such. In terms of its specific outputs then, the link between enterprise culture reforms and 'entrepreneurial' behaviour is 'anything but clear cut, unless the latter is simply taken by fiat to be a consequence and proof of the existence of the former' (Bechofer, 1992, p.305).

Often the concept of the 'enterprise culture', despite appearing to be based on a nomothetic foundation of 'scientific' knowledge, is critiqued as a kind of amorphous, ideological formation and as 'a simple justificatory discourse' (Carr and Beaver, 2002, p.105) deployed by its advocates for whatever kind of structural reform they can imagine. To make matters more complicated, the phrase 'enterprise culture' itself is a compound of two notoriously slippery and contested terms, the latter of which has been described by Williams as 'one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language' because of its deployment as a signifier within 'several distinct and incompatible systems of thought' (Williams, 2011, p.49).

In the form of a 'master metaphor' (Hobbs, 2015), which can be applied to any object, practice, actor, or institution, 'enterprise' has become a kind of 'cultural framework' with its own characteristic myths, values, and concepts, which has universal applicability and can endow any form of human action with a particular, entrepreneurial significance. Enterprise' – in its most inclusive and abstract sense – appears simply to denote a capacity to be comfortable with uncertainty, to respond positively to change, to have a propensity for thinking and doing things in new ways, to develop 'a better way of doing something in the face of adversity' (Patel, 2004, p.7) and to commit oneself to taking responsibility for one's personal and economic destinies. In fact, the National Council for Entrepreneurship in Education has described the 'enterprising person' as an individual with 'a set of personal skills, attributes, behavioural and motivational capacities (...) which can be used in any context'. For them, an entrepreneur is any individual with 'self-efficacy', who can identify opportunities, work autonomously, and engage in 'creative problem solving', 'networking', and 'strategic thinking'. This person, they argue, is also possessed of an 'entrepreneurial mindset', which here denotes a capacity to cope with change and

uncertainty in an ‘unpredictable external environment’, but also entails very vaguely articulated ‘entrepreneurial ways of doing, thinking, feeling, communicating, organising and learning’ (Coyle *et al.*, 2013, p.10). In abstracting the meaning of enterprise from ‘didactic understandings of business and economics’ (Patel, 2004, p.7), advocates have exploited its inherent ‘conceptual ambiguity’ (Dodd and Anderson, 2001) or inclusive ‘meaning potential’ (Fairclough, 1991) achieve a certain ideological hegemony among policy-makers, politicians, and researchers.

### **Managerialism and ‘Administratively Imposed Enterprise’**

Another contradiction of enterprise culture discourse relates to the manner in which, despite its rhetorical opposition to bureaucracy and its celebration of individual sovereignty, as a programme of political reform of organisational ‘culture change’ it is ultimately a state or management sponsored rationality’ which operates through ‘political-administrative’ rather than ‘market’ mechanisms (du Gay, 2004, p.45). (du Gay, 2004, p.45). As such it is typically imposed in a ‘top-down’ way through various ‘rational, professional, managed and strategic’ approaches’ (Carr and Beaver, 2002, p.108) which discursively prescribe certain circumscribed models of what it means to be ‘entrepreneurial’. Enterprise culture, it has been argued, has persisted largely as a kind of ‘cultural technology’ for shaping and regulating subjects in decentralized ‘post-fordist’ bureaucracies. In the critical literature on organisations, cultural change, and identity, these kinds of ‘governmental technologies’ are often presented as manifesting in the use of discursive techniques designed to influence what Michel Foucault has referred to ‘technologies of the self’, or ‘specific techniques’ which human beings use to ‘effect by their own means or with the help of others’ meaningful forms of personal and professional subjectivity (Foucault, 1988, p.18). In fact, in an effort to define exactly what ‘enterprise culture’ *is*, Carr and Beaver have argued that it might best be understood not as the mythic abstraction from which it takes its name, but as ‘a set of institutionally embedded relations of government, established during a particular historical period, which aim to influence and transform the mindset and conduct of a

population (Carr and Beaver, 2002, p.109), either at the societal level, or less ambitiously, within individual organisations.

In a similar vein, Raven argues that successive British governments have appeared to ‘subscribe to a *managerial* rather than an enterprise culture’ (Raven, 1989), with much of the energy of enterprise initiatives being expended on making ‘successful managers in both small and large enterprises’ more ‘capable, efficient or even enterprising, but not entrepreneurial’, in the traditional sense (Raven, 1989). As such, despite the grand rhetorical vision of the Thatcherite enterprise culture as a programme for cultural reconstruction, in many cases its most lasting manifestations have been in the managerial ‘modernisation’ of public sector institutions where, arguably, the state is best able to see measurable results from efforts to affect ‘cultural’ change, such as in the form of the so-called ‘new public management’. For Richard H. Roberts, the effect of this is that, where the enterprise culture vision is concerned, ‘the bang of triumphant capitalism ends in the whimper of the pervasive banality of managerialism’ (Roberts, 2002, p.41) or as Dodd and Anderson have put it, ‘enterprise policy produces unenterprising corporatist initiatives’ (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.23). For despite the emphasis of the enterprise culture on minimal state interference in economic life, this initiative has led to a profusion of new reform programmes and governmental strategies that, rather than diminishing state control, in their efforts to mould and direct the behaviour of individuals and organisations, have ‘resulted in ‘a more intrusive and extensive power than heretofore’ (Marquand, 1998).

In addition to its paradoxical pursuit of possessive individual freedom through top-down state intervention, another contradiction within the enterprise culture initiative related to its aim of cultivating entrepreneurial independence and self-reliance through the transformation of collective, cultural values and institutions, suggesting, contrary to the classic liberalist emphasis of enterprise culture rhetoric on the separateness and sovereignty of the individual, that subjects derive their identities and values from their membership in a collective. The inference is that subjectivities are sufficiently malleable to be become the objects of a large-scale programme of state-led cultural reform, though critics have argued that it is difficult to reconcile the idea of a culture, understood as a ‘collective ideology’ and ‘way of

making sense of the everyday', with the individual, 'intensely particular, and oftentimes idiosyncratic nature of actually-existing entrepreneurialism (Dodd & Anderson 2001, p.17).

Finally, the evolution of forms of 'entrepreneurial governance' or 'new public management' in public services institutions, which draw on 'market values' and purport to make institutions and services more 'business-like', have tended to promote the idea that individuals employed within the sector ought to become more 'entrepreneurial' in their actions and their outlook. However this conceals a central paradox which revolves around the twin demands for employees to become more independent, self-reliant, and self-motivated, while simultaneously being 'fully accountable and conformant to the goals set for them' by their government and immediate managers and the difficulties associated with 'the problem of reconciling creativity and control' (Hendry, 2004, p.56). This can be viewed as a reflection of a more deeply-rooted paradox identified by Dodd and Anderson, around which 'a top-down or manufactured culture is incompatible with the anthropological concept of culture as a way of life' (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.14). Elsewhere, Salaman and Storey have argued the organisational arrangements that are 'conducive to enterprise' may rely on 'forms of control conventionally associated with ... bureaucracy' (Salaman and Storey, 2008, p.318), adding that if the realisation of enterprise is dependent on bureaucratic methods, it generates what David Courpasson has labelled an 'ambivalent structure of governance' (Courpasson, 2000). Advocates often soften the paternalistic thrust of the enterprise culture by invoking an emancipatory rhetoric about enterprise as a universal good and a latent potential in all human beings, and by appealing to a democratic desire for subjects to 'own the transformation' (Patel, 2004)

Despite its internal contradictions, however, the enterprise culture paradigm has endured as a policy theme in the discursive practices of successive UK governments (BBC, 1999a; Armstrong, 2005, p.1; Greene, Mole and Storey, 2007; Cameron, 2011a) as what has been called a 'pseudo-paradigm masquerading as an explanation' for all manner of social, economic, educational, and cultural policy problems' (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.15). In particular, critics point to the indiscriminate way in which terms such as 'entrepreneur' and 'enterprise' have come to be applied to a seemingly inexhaustible accumulation of actors, institutions, and entities in contemporary life, and framed as an

almost universal ‘nostrum for a variety of policy problems’ (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p. 14). As such, enterprise culture discourse shows no sign of abating as its reach has spread through different domains of social practice as part of a proliferation of ‘a novel language and set of techniques for thinking about the objects, targets, mechanisms and limits of government that different political groups could articulate to their own ends’ (du Gay, 2004, p.40).

In effect, then, the ‘enterprise culture’ paradigm has persisted, and indeed become more pervasive, as a kind of pliable discursive formation which can be articulated according to a range of governmental aims in a variety of domains of practice where enterprise and entrepreneurialism have become salient as master metaphors. As a result, John Hendry has argued that the ‘entrepreneurial governance’ identified by Osborne and Gaebler in the early 1990s is ‘now deeply embedded in all areas of public service and administration’ (Hendry, 2004, p.53), having evolved from its origins in the nineteen eighties ethico-political enterprise culture programme to become ‘a set of seemingly neutral organizational techniques’ which have become ubiquitous in the governance of both public and private sector institutions, and long since ceased to be ‘the ideological property of the New Right’ (du Gay, 2004, p.40).

## **Conclusion**

The preceding chapter set out to provide a condensed ‘genealogy’ of some of the core concepts of contemporary enterprise discourse as it is articulated in higher education policy and governance in the United Kingdom and beyond. In doing so, it identified key lines of descent connecting contemporary ‘enterprise discourse’ and its historical antecedents in the political rhetoric of ‘Thatcherism’, the ‘new public management’ model of public-service reform, and academic research on entrepreneurship, industrial history, and organisational management. What emerged from this genealogy was a complex picture of ‘enterprise discourse’ as a diverse array of regulated forms of language use which serve both to ‘construct’ the objects which they represent – including individual subjects, institutions of various types, and even entire social orders – while also generating a range of normative prescriptions for their

reform or transformation. A consistent feature of ‘enterprise discourse’, wherever it manifests, can be found in its parallel emphasis on what Rose has described as its ‘institutional, ethical, and political strands’ (Rose, 1999, p.5), meaning that ‘enterprise’ or ‘entrepreneurialism’ is typically deployed as a metaphor for understanding - and reforming – organisations, individual subjects, and governance and the state respectively. In the following chapters, these three strands will be further explored in the context of their discursive construction of ‘entrepreneurial’ universities, ‘entrepreneurial’ academics, and ‘entrepreneurial’ networks of HEIs, businesses, governance, and civil society in national and international innovation ecosystems (or what is commonly referred to as the ‘triple’ or ‘quadruple’ helix).

In addition to tracing out this genealogy, the foregoing chapter highlighted a number of critiques of what the researcher has labelled the ‘entrepreneurial paradigm’ in the contemporary orders of discourse of politics, management, scholarship, and education. These critiques related, broadly, to the association of enterprise discourse with ‘marketisation’, and to accounts of its tendency to ambiguously deploy different and non-reducible’ (du Gay, 2004, p.41) conceptions of ‘enterprise’, ‘entrepreneurship’, and ‘entrepreneurialism’ with the result that Dodd and Anderson have described enterprise discourse as tautological, inchoate, and marked by the ‘disparity, ambiguity, paradox and ambivalence of its components’ (Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.15). This chapter also provided a summary of Norman Fairclough’s ‘three senses’ of enterprise, which will be used in subsequent chapters as a framework for exploring the inherent ambiguities of enterprise discourse as it pertains to the field of higher education. Another key critique of the entrepreneurial paradigm which was outlined related to how it has manifested as a so-called ‘managerial technology’ in modern organisations and, in particular, the contradictions inherent in the top-down ‘administrative imposition’ (du Gay 2004, p.45) of ‘enterprise’, given its association with freeing entrepreneurial subjects from the ills of bureaucratic, managerial, and state intervention.

Lastly, chapter two also surveyed some of the literature on the ‘psychology’ of the ‘entrepreneurial subject’ and on ‘entrepreneurial management’ in the public and private sectors. From this, two key motifs were identified which have significance for contemporary university governance and higher

education policy, namely, the related ideas of ‘enterprise culture’ and ‘the entrepreneurial self’. Both of these themes - it will be shown – have become firmly established in the discursive tendencies of advocates for the ‘entrepreneurial university’ model and can be most clearly identified in the prevailing tendency for proponents to stress the need for universities embracing this model to fundamentally change their organisational ‘cultures’ and, in so doing, to transform the attitudes, behaviours, and values of individual staff members and learners along more ‘entrepreneurial’ lines. In the literature surveyed, a core characteristic linking entrepreneurial institutions and subjects can be found in what has been defined here as the ‘adaptation ethic’, which is best described as a moral principle which compels actors and organisations to accept continuous adjustment to change, risk, and uncertainty in their environments as a categorical imperative. The ‘constant presence of change’ (Carr and Beaver, 2002, p.109) in contemporary life, and the need for academics and universities to respond proactively and reflexively to this challenge is a theme that will be taken up in chapter three’s exploration of the prevailing model of the entrepreneurial university to be found in the higher education literature.

The following chapter will build on the genealogy and literature review provided in chapter two by exploring some of the most influential conceptions of the ‘entrepreneurial university’ and ‘entrepreneurial academic’ in circulation today, while also providing a separate genealogy of the ‘idea’ of the university and an account of how the entrepreneurial model has taken on the status of a unifying university concept in an age characterised by uncertainty, doubt, and disagreement concerning its wider social role as an institution.

### **3. CHAPTER THREE: THE ‘ENTREPRENEURIAL’ UNIVERSITY AND ACADEMIC**

Having explored the literature on the enterprise culture as both a ‘macrosocial’ and organisational phenomenon and examined the concept of the ‘enterprising self’ and some of its incarnations in the Thatcherite enterprise culture and scholarship on management and organisations, this chapter will turn to the two central themes underpinning this study, that of the ‘entrepreneurial university’ and the ‘entrepreneurial academic’.

#### **3.1. Introduction**

Described variously as an ‘idea for its time’ (Shattock, 2010), a ‘higher education buzzword’ (Mautner, 2005), and a harbinger of marketisation and the ‘encroachment of the profit motive into the academy’ (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997, p.9), the idea of the entrepreneurial university, despite its ‘fuzziness’ (Barnett, 2011, p.33), has become a ubiquitous and widely cited model of university transformation in an expansive scholarly and policy literature (Röpke, 1998; Clark, 2001; Barnett, 2010; Shattock, 2010; Coyle *et al.*, 2013; Fayolle and Redford, 2014; Taylor, 2014; Foss and Gibson, 2015) and a model which is regularly invoked as ‘*the* solution to the problems facing contemporary higher education systems’ in the present age (Pinheiro & Stensaker 2014, my emphasis).

UK universities – as publicly funded institutions - have already experienced previous ‘waves’ of state-sponsored enterprise culture reforms in the form of ‘shifts towards greater managerialism as well as quasi-markets’ (Ferlie *et al.*, 1996, p.65) in the 1980s, as well as ‘more focused policies on innovation, university-industry collaboration, technology, and knowledge transfer in the Labour period’ (Karataş-Özkan and Chell, 2010, p.25). However, in recent decades a new interpretation of the ‘entrepreneurial university’ concept, heavily influenced by the writings of Clark (1998, 2004) has come to permeate the

discourses of university marketing, and HE policy and research (Gibb, Haskins and Robertson, 2009; Shattock, 2010; Coyle *et al.*, 2013).

The late modern university has been referred to as an institution ‘without an idea’ (Fish, 2005), suffering from both internal and external legitimation crises, and existing under conditions of ‘supercomplexity’ (Barnett, 2000a) with its missions now entangled in a web of conflicting and often contradictory ‘stakeholder’ expectations. As such, it has been proffered that the question of its ‘wider social role’ as an institution is very much ‘up for grabs’. (Readings, 1996, p.2). In this context, it has become increasingly difficult to think of the university in terms of a single, unifying ‘idea’ (Barnett and Standish, 2002). Clark’s idea of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university, however, which suggests that ‘enterprise’ – broadly conceived, can become an all-university capacity, promised to transcend its postmodern condition as a space of relativism, and a ‘community of dissensus’ (Readings, 1996, p.180) made up of disparate ‘tribes and territories’ (Becher and Trowler, 2001) in which the performative criteria of ‘excellence’ represents the only benchmark by which the value and performance of universities can be measured.

For Clark, ‘entrepreneurial’ universities were those institutions which, like their counterparts in the enterprising firm, accepted ‘the risk of experimental change’ over tradition and the *status quo* (Clark, 1998, p. xiv), engaged in the self-instituted ‘transformation’ of their ‘organization and practices’ (Clark, 1998, p. xv), diversifying their funding base to become more independent, and creating a niche institutional ‘idea’ which became elaborated into a set of beliefs that became a new culture’ (Clark, 1998, p.xvi). Here, then, Clark appears to have invoked what Norman Fairclough describes as the ‘quality’ sense of entrepreneurialism, which denotes ‘disposition or readiness to engage in undertakings of great difficulty, risk or danger’ (Fairclough, 1991, p.113). In this light, what makes a university ‘entrepreneurial’ is a willingness to respond flexibly, reflexively, and proactively to changes in its environment, and to embark, like the entrepreneurial self, on self-realising ‘pathway of transformation’ (Clark, 1998, p.3). By actively seeking ‘to innovate in how it goes about its business’ and becoming an institution with a strong internal locus of control, relatively un beholden to the state, the entrepreneurial university possesses a degree of autonomy which, for Clark, was uncommon in institutions which

responded passively and acquiescently to changes and challenges in its external environment (Clark, 1998).

This chapter will review some of the literature on the entrepreneurial university and the related concept of the entrepreneurial academic, historically associated with the academic as ‘consultant, patent holder and firm founder’ (Boehm, 2008, p.29) engaged in technology transfer and ‘transforming knowledge into intellectual property’ (Etzkowitz, 2001, p.18). (Etzkowitz, 2001, p.18). This definition of an entrepreneurial academic has subsequently evolved to take on a much broader ‘meaning potential’ (Fairclough, 1991) associated with some of the more expansive definitions of enterprise which prevail in contemporary orders of discourse. In this respect, the label ‘entrepreneurial’ is often applied to universities and academics in contemporary policy discourses in ways designed to transcend ‘straightjacketed business definitions’ (Patel, 2004, p.1) and ‘embrace application to a wide range of contexts’ (Coyle *et al.*, 2013, p.10). In keeping with the figure of the entrepreneurial self articulated in the ethico-political 1980s enterprise culture, the ‘entrepreneurialism’ generally cited in the literature on the enterprise university denotes ‘a set of personal ‘attributes, behavioural and motivational capacities (...) which can be used in any context’ (Coyle *et al.*, 2013, p.10) regardless of whether or not their activities will ensure a financial return.

From this perspective, the entrepreneurial academic is broadly conceived, and defined by a willingness to respond creatively to complex external demands by reflexively innovating new practices, engaging in various forms of outreach, adopting an outward-facing orientation, and are committed to identifying opportunities to produce and share knowledge in ways which are produce value for their university, local communities, and – if possible – the economy. This inclusive definition of academic enterprise, it could be argued, is flexible – or ambiguous – enough for universities to develop a ‘unified entrepreneurial identity’ that might go some way to addressing the ‘uneven adoption of the entrepreneurial paradigm’ (Dooley and Philpott, 2017, p.42). However, this can be an issue where the association of enterprise with its ‘business sense’ (Fairclough, 1991), leads academics to see the entrepreneurial paradigm ‘as heralding practices and conceptions that are anathema to anything that could be said to be constitutive of a university’ (Barnett, 2011, p.33). Recognising this, Clark proffered

that if the entrepreneurial paradigm was to be more than a principle of governance, or a management fad, universities were required to develop an ‘integrated entrepreneurial culture’ characterised by an unforced ‘blending of traditional collegial academic cultures and values held by academics (...) with new entrepreneurial values’ (de Zilwa, 2007, p.157).

### **3.2. The ‘Idea’ of the University**

This study is, primarily, an exploration of what it ‘means’ to be an academic working within the contemporary University, with a particular emphasis on those which have chosen, at least in the rhetoric of their governance, policy, and external marketing, to designate themselves as ‘entrepreneurial’ institutions. Before proceeding to offer an explanation of what is meant by the idea of the ‘entrepreneurial’ University, however, it seems fitting first to explore some of the other ways in which scholars, theorists, and policy makers have sought, historically, both in the United Kingdom and abroad, to conceptualise the university, as a complex macro-societal institution, in terms of an ‘idea’.

The University has been described as one of ‘the most time-honoured of all present-day macro-societal institutions’ (Wittrock, 1993). Originally a Medieval European development, it has evolved, isomorphically, in diverse national contexts and traditions, to become one of the defining, and most enduring, of modern institutions. Despite its ubiquity, however, the University is perhaps best thought of in conceptual terms, as an ideal which is invoked whenever the designation ‘University’ is applied to any institution of HE, under whose roof students study for degrees, and research is carried out. Presently, many varieties of organisation exist internationally which have been given the title ‘University’, and even a cursory survey of the heterogeneous entities that we call ‘Universities’ today in the United Kingdom invites any number of definitional and conceptual complexities with respect to what a University properly *is* or *does*.

While the literature on Universities often acknowledges the differentiated and plural nature of contemporary Universities (Charle, 2004, p.53)(Mountford, 2014), these institutions - both in scholarship and policy, and in the popular cultural imaginary – still often denote a particular ideal,

founded on a deeply-rooted romantic image of them as prestigious, historic, and independent centres of academic excellence, steeped in tradition, and dedicated to fostering a romantic and idealised atmosphere of unfettered intellectual enquiry and discourse, in the service both of the national need and the imperatives of disinterested, liberal knowledge creation .

In his exploration of the ‘romantic university’ in England and Germany, Hofstetter, quoting Kant, writes that ‘An idea is nothing other than a concept of perfection which is not yet found in experience’ (Hofstetter 2001, p.x), arguing that though many ideas of the university have become reified over the centuries of their existence, and that these ideas manifest themselves ‘in human action’ and can ‘have a key role in history’, they remain as abstract conceptions, with no ‘real’ existence in the physical world. While, in any iteration, a University typically signifies a space wherein a community of scholars and students engage in the highest form of educational endeavour, thoroughgoing discussion of the ‘University’ will invariably be beset by definitional problems, arising out of the sheer diversity of organisational types which carry that name, and the internal complexity of any single stand-alone institution. Nevertheless, all social institutions require their legitimising narratives, myths, and discourses, and the traditional ‘idea’ of the University appears, with some modification, to have survived the transition to the post-traditional society relatively unscathed – at least in the popular imagination.

### **The Influence of Newman**

That the university is often framed in terms of an ‘idea’ comes as a result perhaps of the influence of Cardinal John Henry Newman and his now seminal treatise on the ‘The Idea of the University’ (Newman, 2008). Though this this set of discourses was published several centuries after the founding of England’s first University at Oxford, Newman’s text remains, for many, ‘the most influential vision of the university in the English language (Fallis 2016, p. 21)’ which has ‘long been the friend of academic speech makers’ (McDowall, 2016). Newman’s blueprint for a Catholic University in Ireland has, since his lecture series of the same name, given in the mid-nineteenth century, gone on to become ‘the touchstone for contemporary debate about higher education, quoted – often wildly out of context –

by almost everyone who has something to say about universities'(Whyte 2015, p.15). In the Anglophone world, Newman's model of the liberal university is often taken up as a yardstick for evaluating the state of contemporary HE by reminding us 'of the university's true purposes and historical destiny' (Rothblatt, 2006). However, his vision of the University, which he elaborates by 'pushing things up to their first principles' (Pelikan, 1992), is often critiqued as too philosophically pure, and as being guided more by ideals and abstraction, than by practical considerations. Furthermore, some critics credit Newman's influence with 'reifying' the traditional ideal of the university, and stultifying debate by 'turning a real place into an imagined idea', with the result that discussion of universities and their missions are often loaded with 'nostalgia (...) for a lost golden age', yearning for an impractical institutional ideal, and a constant sense of crisis (Whyte, 2015).

Of course, any description of the university - without an idea – would result in what Simon has labelled 'the totally value-neutral' and 'normatively sterile' university' (Simon, 1994, p.4). And although Newman's vision has, arguably, been rendered anachronistic by the complex transformations that universities have undergone in the subsequent centuries, the ideals that he advocates for – such as impartiality, academic freedom, and the disinterested or 'liberal' pursuit of knowledge – are still today core values of a 'normative code' which distinguishes universities from the other social institutions with which it has increasingly become enmeshed (Simon, 1994). (Simon, 1994). The traditional idea of the University thus provides an institutional ideal, a legitimising metanarrative, and in some cases, a practical target, for contemporary HEIs, in an age in which they are often described as undergoing a significant identity crisis.

Under Newman's influence, the rhetoric and mythos which has traditionally accompanied debates about Universities has typically portrayed them as singular institutions of great social, cultural, economic, and national value, whose utility has always been subordinate to its ethical, moral, and cultural contributions as a sovereign space of free intellectual enquiry, scholarship, collegiality, critical consciousness, and character formation. In Newman's nine discourses, he proposed that the 'intellect', 'intellectual culture' and the 'true enlargement of mind' were the proper remit of the University (Newman, 2015, p.6), though these would deliver secondary practical benefits – or in contemporary economic parlance, 'positive

externalities' - to public and private life by dint of the cultivated intellectual powers of University graduates. Newman's high-minded – and sometimes stylistically hyperbolic - defence of the University – in which he proselytized his vision of an autonomous and heterogenous enterprise in the advancement of a classical, liberal education – has been described as 'surely the most serene and beautiful vindication that we have of the old idea of scholarly life' (Scruton, 2010). His treatise, in which he celebrates an institutional enterprise of which there can be 'none higher or nobler' (Newman, 1982) has become, over the last one and a half centuries, a kind of discursive and philosophical touchstone in debates around the question of what Universities are *for*, with his particular answer tending to serve as a reference point in contemporary discussions of HE, as either exemplar or anachronism.

Newman, it might reasonably be argued, today occupies the place of a mythic figure in discourses on liberal education, with his ideas widely referenced in contemporary discussions of the university, centred on the image of the traditional, autonomous, liberal university, and the type of learning it provides. His humanist and classicist ideology is still to be found today in higher education discourses which draw a direct line of continuity between classical antiquity, medieval seats of learning, and the contemporary university, and his emphasis on disinterested learning, 'liberal knowledge', autonomy, and parity between the disciplines, still forms the thematic backbone of the traditional idea of the university as an institution. And while, in the UK at least, the arts, philosophy, literature, and *Belles-lettres*, have long since lost their privileged position at the centre of university learning, Newman's idea of the cultivated intellect – in possession of a 'connected view or grasp of things' and a 'good sense, sobriety of thought, reasonableness, and candour, self-command, and steadiness of view' applicable in any context (Newman, 1982) still persists in debates around the balance to be struck, in HE, between intellectual development, and vocational skills-training. Newman's banishment of research from the university enterprise however, and his insistence on Universities as pure teaching institutions, now appears considerably anachronistic.

An important part of Newman's influence relates – at the discursive level – to the manner in which he 'established a vocabulary and framework for future debates' (Chaddock and Cooke, 2015) to the extent that Briggs has asserted that the diversity of nineteenth century debate about the university 'all too often

is discussed only in terms of Newman's *Idea of the University*' (Briggs, 1991). As such, Newman's discursive influence is something that will be taken up in the remainder of this chapter, particularly in relation to the tendency for academics and policy makers to conceptualise the university in terms of 'an idea', an impulse which, it will be shown, has become increasingly problematic both because of the current institutional complexity of universities, and in the context of widespread uncertainty about macro-societal institutions, more generally.

### **The 'Humboldt Myth' and the 'First Academic Revolution'**

Another 'idea' of the university frequently invoked in the literature on HE, and generally considered to represent the prototype for the modern research university is associated with the Prussian scholar, philosopher and civil servant Wilhelm von Humboldt. His vision for the research and teaching university, and his broader educational philosophy, were outlined in '*On the Internal and External Organization of the Higher Scientific Institutions of Berlin*', which he wrote after being tasked - as head of the Prussian Ministry of the Interior's Section for Culture and Public Education -with the foundation of a new public university in Berlin (Humboldt, 1810). Often depicted as 'the pre-eminent university reformer'(Josephsen, Karlsohn and Östling, 2014) and as *the* creator of the modernity university, Humboldt has been described as 'striding into the picture as a saviour'(Josephsen, Karlsohn and Östling, 2014) to transform German universities, which at that point in history, were considered to be remote and elitist scholastic medieval institutions in a state of decline and ossification. Of course, this research university 'origin myth', like many histories has been described as reductive, and by all accounts an invention of the 20<sup>th</sup> century - with Humboldt's famous treatise largely ignored until its discovery and publication in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century by historian Bruno Gebhardt, and his vision subsequently popularised as a result of its association with the 1910 centenary of the University of Berlin (Östling, 2014, p.205).

Like Newman though, Von Humboldt, despite his limited success in HE governance, has become synonymous with the modern university, albeit with a very different university 'idea'. Described as 'perhaps the most discussed document in the modern history of Universities' (Wittrock 1993, p.317),

Humboldt's short, visionary report is notable for placing a synthesis of both teaching and research at the heart of the university enterprise, and is considered by many to represent the origin of the modern idea of the research university, particularly with respect to its research mission (Fallis, 2007; Josephson, Karlshon and Östling, 2014). Humboldt's vision, influenced by the philosophies of the German 'idealists', was of the university as a site for scholarly *Bildung*, or self-cultivation, and of the academic as committed both to advancing scientific knowledge, and continuous self-improvement, but also to sharing this knowledge with others, and serving society. This scholar could not exist in isolation, engaged in the navel-gazing of rational reflection, but had a duty to apply his or her knowledge for the 'benefit of society' as an 'educator of mankind' and as someone who 'exercises an influence on society' through their contribution to 'the progress of science' (Fichte, 1988).

The 'idea' associated with the Humboldtian tradition, in short, is that universities should continue to operate as sites of disinterested learning and *Bildung*, but that they had a special obligation to integrate research as a core mission, both for the enrichment of their teaching, and the progress of science, and for the benefit of society. Most significantly, Humboldt wrote that universities, though they were in the service of 'the moral culture of the nation', were best left to engage in 'intellectual and moral education' without state interference (Humboldt, 1810). For him, the interests of the university and state were closely interrelated, but the general aims of the former could only be pursued without a guarantee of independence from any state intervention that could be 'damaging to the essence of science and scholarship' ('University Reform in Germany', 1970). Rather than serving the state directly, Humboldt's contention was that the University was better placed to serve 'the people' and 'intellectual life' of Prussian society, as efforts by the state to direct or interfere in this would, ultimately, 'corrupt' and 'impede' its development, and drag 'the spiritual and lofty down into the material and lower reality' (Humboldt, 1810). Humboldt, it seemed, despite his emphasis on the integration of teaching and research, was equally averse to what Newman had labelled the 'low-utilitarianism' of efforts to make the university more practically useful (Newman, 2015).

The revival of Humboldt's model of the university is typically invoked alongside the idea of the ongoing 'first academic revolution' which led to the 'inclusion of research, next to education, into the university

mission' (Ranga and Etzkowitz, 2011, p.254). Some have described the twentieth century 'rebirth' of Humboldt and his idea of the university as a kind of 'Humboldt Myth' which was developed to 'strengthen corporate identity' during the University of Berlin's centenary (Morozov, 2016), before going on to become popularised as a university ideal globally during a time when increased public spending on universities made the 'notion of the teaching/research nexus at the heart of academic labour' (Marginson, 2013, p.12) and the German-American model of the research university attractive to governments who sought to ensure a greater public return from an institution which had historically 'prided itself on its separateness from society' (Barnett, 2015, p.78).

### **Britain's Universities**

Of course, the establishment of Britain's 'ancient' universities precedes the publication of Humboldt and Newman's influential tracts by a good number of centuries and Oxford – the oldest university in the English-speaking world – is without an explicit foundational document. As such, British universities can be said to have been without a philosophical urtext, with one needing to look at the piecemeal development of the Universities' statutes, their internal philosophical and pedagogical debates, and later to various acts of government and royal charters to get a broad sense of the British 'idea' of the University, if there can be said to any evolving consensus prior to the call for the establishment of a national education 'system' after the Robbins report (Robbins and Education, 1963). Hofstetter has written that, particularly from the eighteenth century onwards, a conservative, 'romantic' or 'idealist' idea of the University rooted in a 'romantic idea of the human mind' and the necessity for its cultivation took shape in England's elite institutions and centred on the moral and intellectual cultivation of an educated clerisy (Hofstetter, 2001).

Here, education was conceived in quite 'liberal' terms, denoting a system within which students approached learning in a non-utilitarian way, and as a consequence learned 'how to think', and through the mastery of abstract ideas and the sharpening of the intellect, became more discerning, more disciplined, and more conscientious. The 'romantic' perspective on HE, Hofstetter argued, drew on a humanistic belief – shared by figures as diverse as Fichte, Schelling, Coleridge, and Byron - to make

learners ‘more moral, more cultured and (in Coleridge’s eyes at least) more Christian’ (Hofstetter 2001, p.xii). Furthermore, a new contribution to the public sphere was imagined for universities, based on the idea that a liberal education would have transformative effects not only on its direct recipients, but on society at large. Mass education was not proposed, but instead English universities were imagined as elite institutions that would ‘train ‘a core of cultured *Gelehrten*, or perhaps a godly clerisy (Hofstetter, 2001)’ to perform the function as a kind of intellectual vanguard to ‘preserve civilization and combat social and moral ills’ (Hofstetter, 2001).

That universities should prepare the next generation of clerics, politicians and state bureaucrats for public life was not a novel idea, but the accompanying romantic, humanistic, and often secular discourses surrounding universities and their public missions during this time, was. During the late-Victorian period, in particular, Oxford and Cambridge saw further modernisation of their respective curricula, and began to embrace a ‘public-school ideal of character-formation’ and a ‘new self-consciousness (...) about educating the governing and administrating class of the future’, while ‘the sense of the universities’ place in the national culture grew’ (Collini 2012, p. 28). So, though the English university model remained relatively ‘conservative’ and ‘explicitly religious in articulation’ compared to its continental cousins, new attitudes towards learning and the role of the university began to enter HE discourse in England in the 18th and 19th century, and played a significant part in ‘preserving the colleges and the liberal arts curriculum from utilitarian assault’, albeit in an ‘aristocratic, socially stratified atmosphere’(Hofstetter 2001, p. 62), well into the twentieth century.

### **The Emergence of the UK’s ‘University System’**

While the Oxbridge paradigm continued for some time, unplanned piece-meal developments in other HEIs around Britain saw the development of an unofficial ‘system’ of education comprising civic universities, specialised technical, commercial and art colleges, and centres for teacher training, which would evolve independent of one another until Lord Robbin’s 1963 report of the Committee on Higher Education called for government to begin conceptualising HE in Britain in ‘system’ terms (Robbins and Education, 1963). Despite ‘Oxbridge’ continuing to embody, for many, the romantic myth of the

university in England, in fits and starts a kind of ‘polycentric’ HE system began to emerge in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries which raised important questions about the nature and purpose of HE in Britain. Outside the ancient institutions, the emergence of their ‘civic’ or ‘red brick’ counterparts offer what has been called an ‘alternative history’ to the ‘old, outmoded, conservative university tradition’ (Whyte, 2015, p.281) in which ‘there is room for a multitude of competing visions’ of what a university could be (Whyte, 2015, p.28).

Bligh *et al* have described the foundation of the civic universities as a ‘second tradition of British higher education’, which, in contrast to the ‘aristocratic, clerical, elitist’, ‘liberal’ and ‘non-vocational’ Oxbridge paradigm, were ‘locally supported, vocationally oriented, closely related to, and dependent upon, local business and industry’ and typically catered to middle-class students, living at home, rather than elites living in residences (Bligh et al. 1999, p.21). Generally set up in the industrial cities of Britain and given royal charters in the early 1900s, the ‘Redbricks’(Bruce Truscot (pseud.), 1943), as they later came to be known, arose as a result of rising populations, urbanisation, and a growing need ‘for scientific and technical manpower for the industries’ of the cities and regions they served (Sanderson 2002, p.3). In debates around HE in Britain, the ‘ancient’ and ‘redbrick’ universities started, respectively, to embody two sides of ‘a conflict between the ideals of liberal education and a vocational education’ (Bligh et al. 1999, p.21) which persists to this day, even if some of the civic universities were not always as narrowly-utilitarian as this formulation would suppose. Rather, it might be suggested, that each institutional type came to represent a competing ideal, as part of a conflict which, essentially, can be said to be ‘in our minds, not between institutions’(Bligh et al. 1999, 21).

Despite the inadequacy of these generalisations however, the Redbricks could be distinguished, at least during the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, for their embrace of ‘practical’ subjects, commerce, and industry, in sharp contrast to the traditional, romantic ideal upheld at their ‘ancient’ counterparts. Collini has written that the emergence of these vocational, non-residential, civic institutions necessitated the emergence of ‘a different ‘idea’ of the university’ (Collini, 2012) , quite distinct from that which had traditionally characterised HE discourses up until that point in Britain. What this meant, in effect, was that despite the ideological dominance of the Oxbridge model, the ‘meaning potential’ of the term

‘University’ was substantially broadened in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries in Britain, incorporating a more diverse range of institutional types and allowing for a larger degree of differentiation, while engendering important debates about what Universities were ‘for’. Of course, ‘ancients and ‘Redbricks’ were not the only types of higher education institutions to develop in Britain, with the nation housing any number of specialist vocational schools throughout its history, from medical schools, and art schools, to teacher training colleges and various colleges of advanced technology and academies, not to mention what Collini has referred to as the ‘Scottish/London model’, which he describes as being ‘metropolitan, professorial, (and) meritocratic’ (Collini 2012, p. 28). However, this diversity was, historically speaking, short-lived, as in the latter half of the twentieth century, and with successive acts of state legislation, ‘the newer and different types of institution increasingly shed their distinctiveness and more and more conformed to the culturally dominant model’ of the traditional university (Collini 2012, p. 28).

Ultimately, the HE landscape in Britain in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries could be described as one characterised by unplanned, piecemeal development and a diversity of very different institutional types. In fact, to speak of a British HE ‘system’ during this period, was, according to the authors of the 1963 Robbins Report, a ‘misnomer’ (Robbins and Education, 1963). Because of the variegated and disorganised nature of this ‘system’ then, one cannot say, with any credibility, that a consensus ‘idea’ of the university prevailed in modern Britain, despite the traditional ‘romantic’ Oxbridge model’s strong influence on the public imagination.

In the late 1960s, tasked with reviewing ‘the pattern of full-time higher education in Great Britain’, in light of ‘national needs’, and with a view towards ‘long-term development’, the Robbin’s report (Robbins and Education, 1963) would represent a watershed in British HE policy. This document has been heralded as one of the most significant in HE history, primarily because, against the backdrop of emergent massification and increased public spending on universities, it articulated a perspective on HE as a national ‘system’, the cost of which needed to ‘be justified in relation to tangible, preferably public benefits’ (Williams 2016, p. 59). The authors of the report, surveying the landscape and evolution of higher education in Britain argued that there was a lack of ‘consciously co-ordinated organisation’

in UK HE. Instead, they identified a diverse range of institutional types that had ‘grown up separately’ - including ‘the universities, the technical, commercial and art colleges, the colleges for the education and training of teachers’ (Robbins and Education, 1963). And though the Robbins report upheld the idea of university autonomy from the state, it also reported that it was ‘only natural that the general direction of their development has come to be regarded as a matter of public interest’, particularly with respect to the growing acknowledgment of the nation’s ‘economic dependence upon the education of its population’ (Robbins and Education, 1963).

In one of several lengthy preambles to the document, in which the authors set out their ‘conceptions of higher education’, they wrote that ‘the aims of higher education’, and its ‘general social ends’ pose a complex question, which cannot be answered with a ‘simple formula’, instead acknowledging that ‘eclecticism’ is a characteristic of higher education in Britain, and as such, ‘to do justice to the complexity of things, it is necessary to acknowledge a plurality of aims’ (Robbins and Education, 1963). Interestingly then, while Robbins called for the establishment of a coordinated system of national HE, it repeatedly expressed a respect for diversity across the institutional landscape and a reluctance to advance a particular ‘idea’ of what a university should be, beyond citing the importance of such factors as ‘national competitiveness’, ‘equality of opportunity’, and the preservation and transmission of ‘a common culture and common standards of citizenship’ (Robbins and Education, 1963).

After the expansion of the university system in 1992, its institutional diversity was significantly reduced, though it has been suggested that, where the ‘idea’ of the university is concerned, the system remains largely influenced by ‘elite values’ (Scott, 2009). Scott, writing about the development of a unified, mass system of tertiary education in Britain in the 1990s, has argued that Newman’s ‘ideal university had only existed in the imagination’ (Scott, 1995, p.3), and that, despite the UK HE system having always been characterised by institutional diversity, any ‘totalising theme’ was difficult to sustain under the conditions of a mass university system which universities are no longer ‘exceptional’ and ‘resist all but the most ephemeral classification’ (Scott, 1995, p.3). Despite this however, Scott suggested that UK universities were still troubled by a ‘reluctance to accept that it has become impossible to construct a grand unifying theme’ (Scott, 1995, p.3). As such, he argued that the

university, 'because of its title', could not easily jettison the ideological 'burden of past ambitions and expectations' and so, in a sense, must maintain some form of ideal mode 'to which less 'noble' institutions continue to aspire' (Scott, 1995, p.42). Here then, Scott seems to suggest even though totalising 'talk of 'ideas' and 'systems' is no long feasible in a postmodern, massified and pluralised higher education landscape, discursively it is difficult to get way from the university, as an institution, as being articulated in the form of an 'idea'.

### **3.3. The University 'Without an Idea'.**

'We have to recognize that the University is a ruined institution, while thinking what it means to dwell in those ruins without recourse to romantic nostalgia' (Readings 1996, p. 196)

In a 1996 treatise on the subject, Readings, rather than lament the decline of traditional grand narratives about the university, took up an 'ambivalent' position in which he proffered that there was 'no longer clear what the place of the University is within society', nor for that matter, 'what the exact nature of society is' (Readings, 1996, p.2). In Readings' view, universities had come increasingly to be administered in terms of the 'techno-bureaucratic' and performative criterion of 'excellence', which he described as an idea that 'has no *content*' (Readings, 1996, p.13). As such, one of the primary measures by which university activities had come to be evaluated had been emptied of any specific normative meaning. The university of 'excellence', then, did not have an animating 'idea' *per se*, in the form of 'an ahistorical transcendent model' from which it could derive 'a mission and a goal' (Miller and Asensi, 1999, p.4) but rather was administered according to an idea which was essentially content-less and 'tautological'. It was in this sense, having had its foundational idea of 'culture' replaced with the empty standard of 'excellence', that Readings (1996) considered the university had become a 'ruined institution', which had 'lost its historical reason for being' (Hall, 2002, p.119).

Citing Reading's argument, Fish has criticised the typical 'plot' of contemporary declinist narratives about 'once great' universities being colonised by alien ideologies which have diverted them from their true *raison d'être* – typically articulated in the form of a noble idea such as the cultivation of the liberal subject or critical citizenry, the preservation of a national culture, or the pursuit of disinterested learning or discovery (Fish, 2005). Fish and Readings' contributions to the debate on the idea of the university are notable for their refusal to employ a rhetoric of 'crisis', and their relative comfort with describing the late modern university as existing 'without an idea' (Fish, 2005). However, both acknowledge that, under present conditions, there exists great uncertainty around the standards by which the university should be judged as an institution and the question of what the university, as a whole, is *for*. Elsewhere, Scott has alluded to the sustainability of grand narratives about universities in the context of 'the velocity and reflexivity of modern society' (Scott, 1995, p.4), citing Lyotard's hypothesis on the collapse of teleological 'metanarratives' under the conditions of postmodernity (Lyotard and Massumi, 1984), while Barnett has pointed to universities existing within a milieu of 'supercomplexity' in which they are subject to 'multiple frames of understanding, of action and of self-identity' with the 'frameworks by which we might understand the world' – and by extension, the university - continuously 'multiplying' (Barnett, 2000, p.6). Under these conditions, Barnett adds, the university's status as an exceptional institution is diminished, and they simply take their 'place amid the proliferating knowledges that society has now to offer' (Barnett, 2000c, p.410).

### **The Idea of the University in 'Supercomplexity'**

Operating in a world 'subject to infinite interpretability', Barnett questioned whether one could 'identify a general view as to the place of the university in the contemporary era' and whether or not that view would have 'any continuity with what might be said to be the Western idea of the university' (Barnett, 2000a, pp.5-6). However, after initially rejecting the premise that there 'could be a set of ideas that carried the university forward' (Barnett, 2000a, p.166) under the conditions of late modernity, he ultimately settled for a perspective on the university which was appropriate to the supercomplex 'age

of contestation', which was to say that if one accepted that for any 'large idea' about the university - of which there were many - there was a 'multitude of interpretations, improvisations and extensions', the meta-concept of 'supercomplexity' was itself an appropriate guiding idea for the contemporary university enterprise (Barnett, 2000a, p.167). In this sense, Barnett's argument was to suggest that a capacity to 'embrace multiple and conflicting frameworks' was a necessity and that the university could not recoil from this challenge by taking recourse to one of the many traditional universal ideas which have historically been attached to it, further to which he suggested that the universality implicit in the institution's title had always been somewhat unwarranted, and was an 'outworn' concept which had always eschewed the diversity which actually inhered within them.

Others have remarked that 'crisis' is the University's 'usual condition' (Schelsky 1963, cited in Liesner 2006) and that, historically, attempts to answer the question of what the University is *for* have, with few exceptions, proceeded from an appeal to crisis and advanced, as a panacea, some discourse on the 'true' nature and role of the institution *vis a vis* society. One such solution, which has achieved 'hegemonic status' (Mautner, 2005) in the HE academic and policy literature on in recent years is the model of the 'enterprise' or 'entrepreneurial' university. This conception, like its historical counterparts, offers a new and guiding grand narrative on the University and its mission(s), from which an extensive corpus of prescriptive writings has emerged, each heralding the 'entrepreneurial' paradigm as imperative to the success, and indeed survival, of the university in the globalised knowledge economy.

### **3.4. The Entrepreneurial University**

The model of the 'entrepreneurial' university has primarily been derived from scholars looking at isomorphic shifts in organisational forms and university systems internationally (Burton R Clark, 1998; Clark, 2004b; Shattock, 2010) with the entrepreneurial model coming to represent - at least in the relevant research and policy literature - a 'way of capturing common features of university development' (Barnett, 2011, p.33) that provides empirical evidence that the entrepreneurial university

is, as Shattock calls it, ‘an idea for its time’ (Shattock, 2010). Clark, whose conception of the entrepreneurial university has proven to be the most influential, has written that these kinds of institutions are, above all else, distinguished by ‘a work culture that embraces change’ (Clark, 1998, p.7) and that in the context of the rapid change, growing instability, and economic uncertainty which characterises late modernity - this kind of culture is presented as key to universities assuming the appropriate ‘organizational footing’ (Clark, 1998, p.128). Like ‘excellence’ and ‘supercomplexity’ before it, then, ‘enterprise’ or ‘entrepreneurialism’ does not represent an ‘idea’ of the university, in the conventional sense, but a kind of meta-concept for thinking about - and exhorting universities to embrace- institutional change which is often ‘presented with a missionary zeal’ (Deem, 2004, p.16) as the best way for universities ‘to control their own destinies’ (Clark, 1998, p.146).

In spite of the ostensibly expansive and neutral conception of ‘enterprise’ which accompanies the entrepreneurial university, however, the paradigm has never fully been able to escape from the origins of its discursive keywords in a market and business related lexis, with the effect that it is often critiqued as a form of ‘stealth privatisation’ (Jessop, 2017) and marketisation (Subotzky, 1999; Mautner, 2005) operating under the banner of an objective scientific paradigm. These criticisms have not diminished the popularity of the entrepreneurial university as a policy idea, however, particularly in the United Kingdom (Gibb, 2006b; Woollard, Zhang and Jones, 2007; Council, 2008; Gibb, Haskins and Robertson, 2009; OECD and EC, 2012; Coyle *et al.*, 2013)

Though popularised by Clark in the mid 1990’s, the concept of the ‘entrepreneurial university’ is generally considered to have entered into academic discourse in the early 1980s, most notably in the work of American sociologist and scholar of innovation studies Etzkowitz (Guerrero, Kirby and Urbano, 2006; Shattock, 2010). Although individual HEIs were rarely Etzkowitz’s primary analytical focus, he elaborated a model of the ‘exemplary’ entrepreneurial university in his earlier research into academic science, technology transfer and innovation policy in US research universities (Etzkowitz, 1983, 1998; Etzkowitz *et al.*, 2000) and his later - often collaborative – work on what would come to be known as the ‘triple helix’ model of academic-industry-government relations (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff 1997; Leydesdorff and Etzkowitz 1998). Foreshadowing the methodology of Clark’s later

‘organisational approach’ (Shattock, 2010) to entrepreneurial universities, Etzkowitz combined policy analysis, institutional case studies and qualitative interviewing as part of an ongoing sociological study of ‘entrepreneurialism’ in US research universities in the 1980’s and early 1990’s. Although he defined ‘entrepreneurialism’ rather narrowly in his earlier work as the engagement of individual academics in ‘commercialisation’, ‘knowledge capitalisation’ and ‘profit-seeking’ activities (Etzkowitz, 1983), his research was historically unique in its approach to emergent ‘entrepreneurial’ tendencies as matters not merely of ‘system level’ changes acting on ‘passive’ universities but as the product of endogenous developments within universities and academic ‘cultures’ themselves (Etzkowitz 1983).

### **The ‘Clarkian’ Model of the Entrepreneurial University**

Though Etzkowitz originated the concept of the ‘entrepreneurial university’, and his ‘triple-helix’ model of university-industry-government relations remains influential in policy discourses and academic literature, Clark’s more inclusive definition of ‘entrepreneurialism’ as an ‘all-university capacity’ and his traits-based models of entrepreneurial institutions has, arguably, found greater expression in literature and advocacy related to the embedding of an ‘enterprise culture’ in European HE. Although ‘enterprise’ and ‘entrepreneurialism’ had been master signifiers in international policy discourses on HE for over a decade (Keat, 1991; du Gay, 1993; Fairclough, 1993), the publication of Clark’s *Creating entrepreneurial universities: organizational pathways of transformation* (Burton R Clark, 1998) is often heralded as a watershed moment in the history of scholarship and policy on entrepreneurialism in universities – particularly in Europe (Barnett, 2010; Shattock, 2010), with Clark credited with making the concept of the entrepreneurial university – as a ‘previously unthinkable adjective-noun combination’ (Mautner, 2005, p.96) - ‘intellectually acceptable’ (Shattock, 2010) to academics, policy makers and university managers concerned about its association with ‘marketisation’, state interference, ‘managerialism’, and public fiscal austerity.

Such is Clark's influence that his text has been described as 'one of the most internationally influential books' in higher education (Rhoades & Stensaker, 2017, p.129) and as the 'hub of an intertextual network of cross-references' (Mautner, 2005, p.101) permeating the global literature on HE, and his entrepreneurial model as a hegemonic 'benchmark of institutional innovation' (Subotzky, 2005, p.132). His ideas have featured heavily in the publications of UNESCO's European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES) (CEPES, 2006) and gave rise to a special edition of the OECD/IMHE journal Higher Education Management and Policy (OECD, 2005). His conception of the entrepreneurial university would also figure as a recurring motif in the European Commission's *Mobilising the Brain Power of Europe* (COM, 2005) as part of its long-term strategic 'Lisbon' framework. Additionally, Clark's thesis would inspire a Europe-wide study of entrepreneurship in universities carried out under the heading 'European Universities for Entrepreneurship - their Role in the Europe of Knowledge' (EUEREK) (Shattock, SRHE and UNESCO, 2008).

The concept of the entrepreneurial university to which Clark's theories gave impetus offered a corrective to the notion that 'entrepreneurialism' was the preserve of certain types of universities and academics and advanced an expanded definition of what it meant to be 'entrepreneurial' both for institutions and for individual academic workers that was not narrowly 'economic'. For Clark, organisational 'entrepreneurialism' denoted any forms of behaviour or practice that could be described as 'innovative' or 'transformational' (Clark 1998). Further to this, he argued that the entrepreneurial university was characterised by a particular 'posture'- defined as a positive and proactive orientation towards change and innovation. This orientation was further described as imperative to the success and survival of universities against the backdrop of declining state subvention, growing mission complexity, and radical economic uncertainty.

Clark also emphasised the requirement to 'stimulate' practitioners and departments in the traditional 'academic heartland' to adopt entrepreneurial attitudes and participate in collective 'entrepreneurially led change', as an alternative to the paradigm being imposed in a 'top-down' fashion. This would be achieved through the creation of an 'integrated entrepreneurial culture' with 'entrepreneurial collegiality' at its heart (Clark 1998). Because 'entrepreneurially led' change in the university sector

had been tarnished by its association with ‘new managerialism’ (Barry, Chandler and Clark, 2001; Anderson, 2008; Winter, 2009) in the 1980’s and early 1990’s, Clark was keen to propose a blueprint for ‘entrepreneurial transformation’ that reconciled the enterprise imperative with the traditional values and collegial power structures of academe. And while his inclusive conception of the entrepreneurial university has received widespread criticism (Louis *et al.*, 1989; Smith, 1999; Finlaye, 2004; Mautner, 2005), it is often credited with renovating the ‘tarnished’ concept of ‘entrepreneurialism’ in higher education discourse and making it ‘intellectually acceptable’ (Shattock, 2010).

Clark based his oft-cited book on case studies of five European universities, including two in the UK – considered to have engaged in sustained and ‘self-instituting’ efforts to ‘change their general character’ - in the decade prior to his 1994-1996 fieldwork (Clark 1998). He visited these five institutions, already considered relatively ‘enterprising’ and ‘self-reliant’ for their time, and set about collecting data from institutional records, ethnographic observation, and qualitative interviews with managers, faculty and administrators, with the goal of inductively ‘reconstructing’ the ‘complex stories’ of their developmental trajectory towards a more independent and ‘entrepreneurial’ mode. Rejecting the sweeping expressions’ and ‘platitudes’ of the ‘dominant managerial literature of the 1980s and 1990s’ (Burton R Clark, 1998), Clark sought to ground his elaboration of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university model in rigorous empirical fieldwork in actual universities. This more inductive focus, he claimed, would better capture the ‘organic flow of university internal development’ (Clark, 2004b) and demonstrate some of the diversity of ways in which real organisations and academic units had pursued their niche entrepreneurial ‘pathways’. He rejected the view that entrepreneurialism needed to be a ‘top down’ phenomena driven by state diktats and ‘one-size-fits-all’ solutions by prioritising the ‘deliberate local efforts’ of discrete groups and individuals working independently and collectively to transform institutions and practices in distinctive and ‘highly-localised’ ways. The extent, however, to which Clark’s concept of entrepreneurialism was either an *a priori* category, or something genuinely derived inductively from his diverse case studies is a matter of debate. In any case, the diverse, localised ‘developmental pathways’ taken by each of his universities are treated as evidence for what Barnett has described as the view that ‘all paths of university development lead to entrepreneurialism’ (Barnett, 2011, p.33).

For Clark, entrepreneurialism was not only a localised, ‘bottom-up’, and voluntaristic phenomenon, but represented *the* appropriate posture for universities to assume both to ensure their survival in a time of great change and uncertainty, and in the context of Europe at least, over-dependence on the conditional patronage of the state as a single source of funding. For Clark, university ‘autonomy’, then, was best pursued through the entrepreneurial pursuit of institutional ‘self-reliance’, which meant proactively establishing a ‘diversified funding base’, not because of the pressures of marketisation, but as a greater independence and self-steering. Further to this, he framed the entrepreneurial posture as a matter of universities enhancing their ‘response capacity’ in an environment characterised by a complex ‘cross-fire of expectations’ and accelerated change. Conscious of the tendency – in Europe at least – for ‘entrepreneurialism’ to be associated with state power and steering, as well as marketisation, he sought to reclaim it as a means through which universities might achieve institutional independence, against the backdrop of European university systems which he viewed as committed to ‘top-down’ initiatives, centralised control and conditional funding regimes that ‘worked to induce institutional passivity and weak local leadership’ (Clark, 1998, p.134).

Common state funding systems’ and the attendant accountability to centrally defined objectives, Clark claimed, bolstered state dominance and perpetuated institutional stagnancy, stifling organisational self-sufficiency and undermining the capacity of universities to address their growing ‘demand-response’ imbalances. While the onus on universities to ‘do more with less’ in the context of a reduction of core funding from government had already pushed them into ‘diversifying’ their sources of income, the increasing conditionality of the funding that remained meant that universities tended to be particularly vulnerable to the whims and directives of government. With universities being forced to ‘compete in similar terms for similar resources’ Clark made the case that they should be actively encouraged to strike out on their own, follow their own ‘independent paths’, and to ‘differentiate and specialize’ (Poole 2005) by assuming a ‘lasting entrepreneurial posture’.

Despite its ambiguities, a common thread in contemporary debates surrounding the idea of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university is that it represents a logical, and natural, response to a widespread ambivalence about its proper social and economic roles in a globalised economy marked by intensifying

and unpredictable change, and radical uncertainty. The effect of this rhetoric is that the entrepreneurial mode is held up as a categorical imperative – for both institutions and individual actors – in our present age. Alan Gibb, a proponent of the entrepreneurial university, describes it as the necessary response to ‘pressures of globalisation’, which have led to ‘the creation of greater uncertainty and complexity for individuals in all walks of life and for all kinds of organisations’(Gibb, 2006a). A consensus in the literature on entrepreneurial universities is that this new paradigm represents an opportunity to respond to higher education’s current crisis by pursuing radical, entrepreneurially-led reform, ‘of both the internal organisational structure of universities and the changing role of universities in society’ (Taylor, 2012).

Furthermore, the challenges facing universities are generally described as being both endogenous and exogenous in nature (Etzkowitz and Zhou, 2008), with the contemporary university depicted as tested not only by changes in its external environment, but by a more fundamental crisis of legitimacy regarding its ‘mission(s)’ or ‘role(s)’, resulting in widespread discontent amongst its internal and external stakeholders. The upshot of all of this is that contemporary universities are portrayed as stagnant and tradition-bound bureaucratic edifices that are ill-prepared to embrace the kind of flexible, reflexive, and change-oriented disposition that the current epoch requires. This is consistent with Paul du Gay’s writing on the ‘change, epochalism, and organizational casuistry’ (du Gay, 2003) wherein he identifies in much contemporary organisational theory a Fetishisation of change, and ‘the need to change dramatically and immediately’, which he describes as ‘one of the axioms of the present age’ (DuGay, 1997).

Guerrero-Kano, Kirby, and Urbano – in a wide-ranging literature review, and argument for, the paradigm - describe a move towards the ‘entrepreneurial’ mode as a necessary adaptation to the complex range of external challenges that universities now face globally, particularly reductions in public funding, and a pervasive consensus that, as institutions, they have an imperative to embrace their role as central ‘agents of social and economic change’ regionally and nationally (Guerrero-Cano, Kirby and Urbano, 2006). Pinheiro and Stensaker have written, quite simply, that ‘becoming an entrepreneurial university’ has been identified as *the* solution to the ‘problems facing higher education systems’, which for them include ‘decreased funding’, and ‘perceptions of ‘decreased quality, lack of efficiency and

poor relevance' as part of a broader 'perceived crisis' in European universities generally. Accordingly, they argue that the entrepreneurial university now represents a hegemonic 'uniform idea' about what higher education institutions 'should do and how they should be organised' to meet the challenges of the uncertain and complex epoch in which we find ourselves (Pinheiro and Stensaker, 2014).

Elsewhere, Allan Gibb has argued that the 'increased political rhetoric focused on the need for the creation of an enterprise culture' in higher education, and more broadly, 'derives its force and urgency from the pressures of uncertainty and complexity associated with globalisation' (Gibb, 2006a), with universities coming increasingly to be viewed as *the* answer to the innovation, human capital, and national competitiveness challenges faced by the nation state. Accordingly, a citizenry and labour force which is 'more flexible, creative, opportunity-seeking, achievement-oriented and capable of taking initiatives' is likely only to be engendered by universities with similar, 'entrepreneurial' traits (Gibb, 2006a). In a less normative vein, Deanna de Zilwa has proffered that contemporary universities - in this case Australian - have had to adopt an entrepreneurial orientation in recent decades, not as a courageous and entrepreneurial response to fundamental changes in their external environment, but merely as a 'means of survival' in the face of a manufactured 'crisis' brought about by declining state subvention (de Zilwa, 2007). Associating the new entrepreneurial university - with its relative autonomy and diversified funding base - with a previous drift towards 'marketization' in the public university system, de Zilwa argues that it is understandable 'given the prevailing operating paradigm', why Australian universities have 'chosen' to focus on 'generating independent revenue' - which is typically held up as one of the hallmarks of the idealised entrepreneurial organisation.

Further to this, Clark argued that enterprise values could be reconciled with 'academic norms' and 'traditional outlooks' in the 'academic heartland' (Clark, 1998, p. 142) through the embedding of an 'integrated entrepreneurial culture' in which departments and disciplines did not have enterprise imposed on them, but voluntarily became 'entrepreneurial unit(s), reaching more strongly to the outside with new programmes and relationships and promoting third-stream income' (Clark, 1998, p.7). However, the differential capacity that disciplinary units have for income generation and the

commercialisation of academic knowledge has also been acknowledged, thus being ‘entrepreneurial’ has also been interpreted as engaging in outreach and developing innovative ways to collaborate with groups outside of the university in ways which are not ‘unfavourable to academic life’ (Fitzgerald, 2006, p.120). The entrepreneurial university, then, is often defined as one that embraces the so-called ‘third mission’ of engaging in ‘dissemination or outreach activities’ (Gulbrandsen and Slipersaeter, 2007, p.112), pursuing knowledge transfer, application, and ‘mode 3 knowledge production’ (Ćulum, Rončević and Ledić, 2013, p.171), and contributing to local and regional economic *and* social development.

This broader conception of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university, which Gibb has describe as being linked to the fostering, in both students and staff, of the ‘behaviours, skills and attributes needed to respond to problems and opportunities in the wider social environment’(Gibb, 2006a) is one that is frequently employed in the policy and governance literature of UK higher education (Hagen, 2012; Coyle *et al.*, 2013) where it is associated both with ‘the commercialization of university know-how’ (Gibb, Haskins and Robertson, 2009, p.3) and more broadly what is variously described as ‘the ability to adapt to new circumstances’ in environments subject to ‘increasing’ and ‘accelerating’ change (Hagen, 2012) and to work collaboratively with external groups to ‘harness’ intellectual capital ‘for the benefit of the economy and society in general’ (NCGE, 2010, p.2). This concept is also described as ‘embracing universities of all types’ and promoting entrepreneurialism amongst staff, and amongst students in a manner ‘far from the conventional business school model (Gibb, Haskins and Robertson, 2009, p.8). In keeping with the vision articulated by Clark, Gibb *et al.*, writing for the National Council for Entrepreneurship in Education have alluded to ridding the ‘entrepreneurship concept’ of its restricted relationship with ‘business’ and the ‘commercialisation of knowledge’ so that it can connote ‘freedom to innovate across the broad spectrum of university activity’ (Gibb, Haskins and Robertson, 2009, p.19).

In the judging criteria associated with the Times Higher Education and National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education’s (NCEE) ‘Entrepreneurial University of the Year Award’ emphasis is place on institutions transforming their cultures to make them ‘conducive environments’ for entrepreneurship, on the promotion of ‘entrepreneurial behaviours and mindsets’ amongst students, on

‘innovation’, ‘growth’ and ‘excellence in practice’, and on ‘entrepreneurial outcomes’ for staff and students, as well as contribution to ‘regional and national entrepreneurship goals’ (NCEE, 2012, p.3) . And though institutions competing for the award highlight such entrepreneurial activities as paid consultancy, venture capital funding, spin-out companies, research funding, industry collaborations, student enterprise, and entrepreneurs in residence, all of which, arguably, align more closely with ‘enterprise’ in the ‘business sense’ (Fairclough, 1991), these entrepreneurial accomplishments tend to be articulated alongside descriptions of institutions that are imbued with a culture of change, and which provide opportunities for students and staff to engage in ‘entrepreneurial’ activities that not only generate income but contribute to ‘social and cultural development’, pursue ‘social enterprise’, establish ‘links to the wider community’, and engage in ‘personal development’ (NCEE, 2012).

Additionally, a strong emphasis tends to be placed, as per Clark’s enterprise model, on ‘engagement across all academic schools and through embedding enterprise into staff values’ and ‘into the fabric of the institution’ (NCEE, 2016). In one of its more recent policy papers on developing the entrepreneurial university, the NCEE reports that ‘shared values and culture’ are more critical to the development of an entrepreneurial university, than management control and ‘highly formal planning systems’ (Coyle *et al.*, 2013, p.16), and describes the truly entrepreneurial university as an institution that is committed, at all levels, to ‘engaging and learning from all key stakeholders internally and externally’ through various forms of ‘partnership’ that contribute towards the pursuit of ‘innovation’ and ‘national, regional and local economic and social development’ (Coyle *et al.*, 2013, p.11). As such, it can be said that the model of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university articulated in the contemporary discourses of UK higher education reflects Etzkowitz’s vision of an outward-facing institution committed to ‘mode 3’ knowledge production within the ‘triple’ or ‘quadruple helix’ as a driver ‘of national and regional competitive advantage’ (Styhre and Lind, 2010), alongside Clark’s inclusive perspective on entrepreneurialism as an ‘all-university capacity’ linked to a ‘culture’ of change which is the antithesis of the ‘simplistic understanding(s) of the university as a business’ (Clark, 2001b, p.10). In terms of the discursive articulation of ‘enterprise’, ‘entrepreneurialism’ and ‘entrepreneurship’, current trends appear to exhibit the same ‘semantic ambivalence’ and broad ‘meaning potential’ earlier identified by Fairclough,

whereby the ‘business’, ‘activity’, and ‘quality’ senses of enterprise and its cognates tend to be employed together in different combinations with different degrees of ‘salience’ (Fairclough, 1991).

### **3.5. The Entrepreneurial Academic**

Both Etzkowitz and Clark also described features of the ‘entrepreneurial academic’ alongside their account of the entrepreneurial university. According to Etzkowitz, the emergence of a new breed of ‘academic entrepreneur’ in US research universities could be attributed not only to changes in national HE and innovation policies, market expectations or institutional directives, but to the initiative of academic scientists themselves and their willingness to depart from accepted academic paradigms emphasizing basic research, disinterested scholarship and an aversion to the ‘profit motive’ (Etzkowitz, 1983). His archetypal ‘entrepreneurial’ academic was more of an active and self-directed agent than a passive labourer and bore some resemblance to the holistic concept of the ‘enterprising individual’ or ‘enterprising self’ depicted in ‘new right’ cultural discourses (Heelas, 1991; Peters, 2001).

### **Etzkowitz and the Rise of ‘Entrepreneurial Science’**

Etzkowitz’s accounts of the development of a commercial ethos within his institutional case studies were not without tension or conflict; the cultural and normative shifts he describes had a tendency to engender ‘creative tensions’ between traditional and emergent value-orientations, and between academics and institutions. He suggested however, that as individual academics became exposed to new practices and ways of thinking associated with commercial activities, there was a tendency for their values to re-align. Writing about the ‘cognitive effects’ of new university-industry linkages on academic scientists he hypothesised that ‘the way scientists view research’ and ‘interpret the scientific role’ were changing as a result of new forms of interaction and practice associated with commercialisation (Etzkowitz, 1998) Here Etzkowitz’s assertion is that even where academic scientists have not actively

sought out engagement in enterprise activities, participation has enlightened them as to ease with which they can reconcile their conventional disciplinary values with new expectations to be ‘enterprising’. Consequently, in such cases the ‘normative shifts’ that Etzkowitz claimed to have observed could still be interpreted as primarily agent-driven, largely un-coerced, and proceeding ‘from the bottom up’.

He recounted interviews with academic scientists (from a set of 150 carried out in the 1980s and 1990s in selected US research universities) who reported positive orientations towards ‘knowledge capitalization’, despite some initial degree of resistance, and from this extrapolated a dialectic model of normative change in which previously antithetical ideologies – namely the ‘extension of knowledge’ and the ‘capitalisation of knowledge’ – were synthesised to form a new ‘consistent identity’ for academic scientists (Etzkowitz, 1998). From this data he hinted at a ‘common conclusion’ (Etzkowitz, 1998) reached by participants that these two previously polarised missions – ‘doing good science’ and ‘making money’ – could now be pursued with little or no conflict or ambivalence. His main thesis here was that academic scientists were adopting an ‘entrepreneurial’ orientation not merely because of institutional or environmental pressures, but because many of them were losing faith in the doctrine of the ‘necessity of an isolated ‘ivory tower’ to the working out of the logic of scientific discovery’ (Etzkowitz, 1998). As such, it was proposed that conservatism and disciplinary boundaries had given way to a new culture of ‘openness’ in which the ‘negative attributes’ and ‘ambivalence’ attached to terms such as ‘entrepreneurial scientist’ were losing credibility and where ‘entrepreneurialism’ was no longer defined as ‘deviant’ (Etzkowitz, 1998). At least where academic scientists in US research universities were concerned Etzkowitz’s research suggested an emergent trend towards applied research, commercialisation and profit-making ‘taking increasing precedence over disinterestedness as a norm of (academic) science’ (Etzkowitz *et al.*, 2000).

Analytically, Etzkowitz’s research tended to emphasise the individual academic as a driver of ‘entrepreneurial’ change – with institutional structures evaluated by the degree to which they enabled or constrained the latent entrepreneurialism of individual actors. Crucially he would suggest that – in the case of academic science – behaviours and values were not determined solely by the socialisation of individuals into institutional cultures or their interpellation by disciplinary discourses, but

increasingly as a result of their engagement with external ‘stakeholders’ outside of the university system. In addition to cultivating ‘enterprise’, universities were judged to be ‘entrepreneurial’ if they were sufficiently adaptable and responsive to the new practices and expectations of entrepreneurial academics. Thus conceived, a university did not have to be coercive to encourage enterprise, but merely needed to provide a supportive environment by shifting from a predominantly ‘integrative’ mode (requiring individuals to work in the interests of the institutional culture) toward a more liberal and contractual ‘aggregative’ mode which afforded institutional constituents the space to assert their own values and interests (March and Olsen, 1989), thereby ‘letting loose’ their entrepreneurial initiative for the benefit of the University, external stakeholders both public and private, and the academics themselves. This emphasis on the university as a primarily facilitative structure for individual academics and their relationships with external stakeholders would foreshadow Etzkowitz’s later turn away from a primarily ‘actor and institution’ based analytical focus towards the more global inter-institutional ‘networks perspective’ (Leydesdorff and Etzkowitz 1998) underpinning research on the ‘triple-helix of university-government-industry relations (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997; Etzkowitz and Manoel, 2002; Viale and Henry Etzkowitz, 2005; Etzkowitz and Zhou, 2017).

### **The ‘Triple’ and ‘Quadruple’ Helix**

According to the ‘triple helix’ thesis, as new bilateral and trilateral ‘inter-institutional linkages’ begin to traverse the old borderlines that had previously served to keep the entities in each institutional sphere ‘at arm’s length’ (Etzkowitz *et al.*, 2000), individuals and collectives within institutions participate in networks of relations that expose them to new values, world-views and behaviours, with the effect that interests and cultures converge in novel ways and a degree of ‘dedifferentiation’ (Jameson, 1992) blurs the cultural and functional boundaries between the university, the state and the industrial sector. From this perspective the individual agent is still a key unit of analysis but it is their position within complex ‘trans-institutional’ social networks that has the most profound structuring effect on organisations. For triple helix theorists the “functional differentiation of institutions” that had characterised prior

settlements was gradually being displaced by 'hybridization' and integration into national and trans-national network structures (Viale and Henry Etzkowitz, 2005). This perspective aligns with a view of our present age analogous to what has elsewhere been described as 'Liquid modern ambivalence' (Bauman, 2007) in which established social institutions begin to lose their salience as frames of reference for individual or collective action. As such 'triple helix' research appears to do little to dispel the charge that 'entrepreneurialism' within universities privileges both macro-social 'system solutions' and what Clark would later describe as 'socially divisive' models of enterprise associated with 'raw individualistic striving' (Burton R Clark, 1998).

More recently, the triple-helix model of university-state-industry relations has evolved a fourth strand in the form of what typically entails the active involvement of groups such as 'civil society' and 'communities', as well as 'media-based and culture-based publics' as co-producers of knowledge in an 'innovation system' that spans (Carayannis and Campbell, 2012) the university, government, industry, and 'society'. This vision of the place of the university within society is inextricably linked by advocates with the concept of 'mode three knowledge production' which refers to multilateral ways of 'producing' knowledge which involve partnerships between universities, industry, that state, and civil society within an innovation ecosystem that fosters the 'co-existence and co-evolution of different knowledge and innovation paradigms for a mature and competitive enhancement of societies, economies, and democracies' (Campbell and Carayannis, 2012, p.33) . In essence, what this entails is a shift away from the exclusive use of conventional forms of university-based disciplinary knowledge production and dissemination (mode 1), and from the forms of knowledge transfer and application associated with 'mode 2' knowledge production, towards a dynamic in which the entrepreneurial university opens itself up fully – as part of its third mission for local social and economic development - to working in equal partnership with external groups in the participative co-production of knowledge for any number of applied or innovatory purposes.

## **Clark and the Entrepreneurial Academic**

Clark's model of the 'entrepreneurial academic' was somewhat wider and emphasised the need to 'reconcile new managerial values with traditional academic values' (Burton R Clark, 1998) in ways that were inclusive and respectful of existing traditions and 'institutional peculiarities'. While he did assert that academics would increasingly have to accept the overall need for generating income (Burton R Clark, 1998) he defined entrepreneurialism quite broadly and emphasised that it should be pursued in a manner which served the interest both of the institution and of the traditional values of the 'academic heartland', and the diverse disciplinary cultures which populated it. As such, he argued that academics in disciplines that had fewer natural opportunities to engage in commercialisation should take on a more holistic "entrepreneurial outlook" (Burton R Clark, 1998) and be entrepreneurial 'in their own way'.

For the most part 'traditional' academics could demonstrate enterprise by adopting an 'entrepreneurial posture', adding 'public value' (Cole and Parston, 2006; Benington and Moore, 2011) to their work, seeking out new and innovative ways to share their knowledge and expertise, and engaging in a range of other 'third stream' activities (Clark, 2001b). It was not necessary to engage in technology transfer or firm formation to be considered 'entrepreneurial'; instead academics could utilise a range of ways to make their work more socially and economically useful to a wide range of institutional stakeholders, including learners, local businesses, civil society groups, and communities. As opposed to focusing on specific goals or 'outputs', Clark characterised entrepreneurial action as encompassing any form of behaviour that could be described as positively 'innovative' or transformational, he also used the term to refer to a kind of 'disposition' – defined as a positive orientation towards change, experimentation and new challenges.

“Entrepreneurial” is an embracing but pointed term for referencing the attitudes and procedure that most dependably lead to the modern self-reliant, self-steering university. When we also stress that entrepreneurial action comes in collegial as well as personal forms – nailing the flag of ‘collegial entrepreneurship’ to the masthead – we are at the core of the complicated business of changing universities in the early twenty-first century’ (Clark, 2004a, p.7).

Clark also developed the concept of 'entrepreneurial collegiality' (Clark, 2001b) in which entrepreneurial transformation within universities took the form of a 'collective, participative (and) long-term process' (Poole, 2005) which could 'strengthen university collegiality, university autonomy, and university educational achievement' (Clark, 2001b, p.10). Crucially, for Clark, entrepreneurialism was not something that 'stifled the collegial spirit', make universities the 'handmaidens of industry', or insist on academic engagement in commercialisation, but rather represented a progressive development, and indeed a 'counter-narrative' to 'simplistic understanding(s) of the university as a business'(Clark, 2001b, p.10). Entrepreneurialism, claimed Clark, offered greater 'freedom' and 'self-steering' capacity to universities and academics who, by assuming an entrepreneurial posture could exercise more control over the strategic responses that they developed, a situation which he compared favourably to the 'homogenizing' effects of 'national uniformity and institutional equity' associated with state-run university systems. In effect, a collegial atmosphere of shared responsibility, collaboration, and shared work values was something which the entrepreneurial model protected as it gave institutions and individuals 'greater freedom to make their own way' (Clark, 2001b, p.11).

Ultimately, for Clark, entrepreneurialism was something that needed to be 'owned' by academics, as it was only through the development of an authentic and 'integrated' enterprise 'culture' and 'effective, collective entrepreneurship' involving the whole university that this model could be cultivated without taking the institution 'beyond the boundaries of academic legitimacy' (Clark, 1998, p.4). Conscious of the tendency for entrepreneurialism to 'spread unevenly' in the 'traditional academic heartland', Clark contended that his case studies indicated that, with the right strategy, entrepreneurialism could indeed be an 'all-university capacity' (Clark 1998) – a bottom up phenomenon guided by academic values and imperatives. In Clark's view, then, the key to this would be 'entrepreneurial collegiality' - an approach to organisational transformation that respected the forms of embedded collegiality that characterised existing university cultures. Though his ideal model required a strong 'central steering core' to drive organisational change, he emphasised collective action over the lone scholar or manager and highlighted the necessity for university managers to marshal every institutional constituent non-coercively around an 'integrated entrepreneurial culture' (Clark 1998). Though becoming 'entrepreneurial' meant accepting the 'creative destruction' both of organisational structures and of individual work practices,

Clark believed that through embracing ‘collegial entrepreneurialism’ this could be achieved in a manner which served the institution and its stakeholders, without displacing existing academic missions.

## **Conclusion**

Building on the more general exploration of ‘enterprise discourse’ presented in chapter two, the preceding chapter provided an outline of the related concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic in contemporary higher education discourse, as well as an account of their theoretical antecedents in the scholarship of figures such as Burton R. Clark and Henry Etzkowitz, among others. The concept of the ‘entrepreneurial university’ was also critically examined within the context of late-modern doubts about traditional unifying ‘ideas’ and legitimising narratives associated with the university as a macro-social institution. A number of theories about the contemporary ‘legitimation crisis’ affecting the university were discussed, including Barnett’s account of universities operating within environments of accelerated change and ‘supercomplexity’ (Barnett, 2000a) and Fish’s exploration of the university as an institution ‘without an idea’ (Fish, 2005). In the context of contemporary doubts about the sustainability of any ‘grand unifying theme’ (Scott, 1995, p.3) for conceptualising the university and its wider social role, the ‘entrepreneurial’ model was presented as a vision for the university which is unique for its emphasis on the imperative for HEI’s to alter their institutional forms and internal cultures for the purpose of adapting to the ‘constant presence of change’ (Carr and Beaver, 2002, p.109) in their external environments.

In contrast with traditional ‘ideas’ of the university, such as those associated with John Henry Newman and Wilhelm Von Humboldt, the ‘entrepreneurial’ model, considered by Clark to be distinguished by a ‘culture that embraces change’ (Clark, 1998, p.7), was described as a kind of post-ideological understanding of the university as an institution defined not by a single, unitary identity but by disposition towards continuous, reflexive transformation. Here then, the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic are typically framed not as an ‘idea’ but as a kind of ‘posture’ or ‘disposition’ which, like

their conceptual cousin ‘the entrepreneurial self’, are defined not by what they *are*, but by a readiness to take on ‘the risk of experimental change’ (Clark, 1998, p. xiv) and continually seek radical transformation in their own practices and composition. This is not to say, however, that the concepts of the entrepreneurial university and academic are empty of normative content, and as this chapter has demonstrated, the entrepreneurial paradigm is predicated on a particular set of beliefs about the responsibilities that academic institutions and professionals have to make a greater contribution to local, regional, and national social and economic development. From reviewing some of the most influential scholarship on the subject, this chapter has also shown that the entrepreneurial paradigm is characterised by the use of an inclusive and semantically flexible understanding of enterprise which, by transcending ‘straightjacketed business definitions’ (Patel, 2004, p.1) and its origins in a ‘business-related lexis’ (Mautner, 2005, p.95), makes entrepreneurialism a pliable and generalisable concept which can be used to represent – and make prescriptions for – universities, departments, disciplines, and professionals of all stripes. One of the key discursive features, in fact, of Clark’s seminal conceptualisation of the entrepreneurial university lies in its claims that this paradigm, when properly communicated and administered, can apply to – and be identified with – by every member of the university’s ‘academic heartland’, irrespective of their established professional norms. Crucially, Clark’s model also depends for its success on the broadening of the concept of ‘entrepreneurialism’ to denote any forms of behaviour or practice that could be described as ‘innovative’ or ‘transformational’ (Clark 1998), rendering it as what might be described as a tautological criterion by which any activity, institution, or individual might be judged, rather than an ideological norm. In addition to its broad application, this chapter also demonstrated that, in the policy and scholarship literature on the entrepreneurial paradigm, it is frequently presented as a natural evolution of the university form and a necessary response to the inexorable environmental challenges faced by contemporary HEI’s of all types, lending it an air of inevitability which services to foreclose alternative discourses. The next chapter will outline the methodology used in the empirical data collection and analysis carried out for this research, which took the form of a set of interviews with academics working in non-STEM disciplines in self-described ‘entrepreneurial’ universities, and set out to explore both how they constructed their own practices and

understandings of the university missions discursively, and how they report on their experiences with, and understandings of, the concepts of the 'entrepreneurial' university and academic.

## **4. CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY**

### **4.1. Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to explore – through the use of research interviews - the ways in which academics in non-STEM disciplines reported on their experiences with, and understandings of, the concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic, and to ascertain the extent to which they had observed the ‘entrepreneurial paradigm’ materialise in the ‘culture’ of their respective institutions. The researcher’s interest in the relationship between enterprise discourse and the organisational ‘culture’ of universities stemmed from the apparent consensus within the scholarly and policy literature about the need for universities to develop an integrated ‘entrepreneurial culture’ (Clark, 1998, p.7)(Gibb, 2006b, p.2)(Rae, Gee and Moon, 2009) by pursuing a policy of ‘organisational culture change’, with culture here denoting ‘the realm of ideas, beliefs, and asserted values’ (Kwiek, 2008, p.115) which inhere within institutions.

In addition to enquiring into how participants interpreted the concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic, the interviews were also oriented towards interrogating the ways in which participants felt that ‘enterprise culture’ had been mediated and ‘embedded’ in their institutions, and the extent to which this may or may not have impact on their role perceptions. Further to this, interviewees were asked a series of semi-structured and biographic-narrative questions aimed at drawing out discursive constructions of their own professional self-concepts and perspectives on what it meant, for them, to be an academic. The rationale for utilising this separate, more lightly-structured interview component was that it might produce a complementary data set, relatively unaffected by the theoretical and substantive concerns of the research, which could be used to compare participants’ perspectives on academic work to those of the advocates for the entrepreneurial higher education paradigm.

## 4.2. Research Questions

This study addresses the key question:

- How do non-STEM academics in ‘entrepreneurial universities’ interpret and negotiate the concepts of the entrepreneurial academic and university?

In addition to this overarching research question, a number of subordinate questions were developed during the pre-empirical phase of the study, which include:

- How are the related concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic constructed in the research and policy literature in the UK?
- How do non-STEM academics conceive of their role in relation to notions of enterprise and entrepreneurship?
- What are their perceptions of the impact of their university’s positioning as ‘entrepreneurial’?

### 4.3. Research Paradigm and Philosophical Assumptions

As a study both of the manner in which the concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic are constructed in the policy and research literature in the UK, and of non-STEM academics’ interpretations of these constructs, this research has been carried out within a qualitative and interpretive framework. In addition, then, to providing an outline of enterprise as a ‘master metaphor’ (Hobbs, 2015) in contemporary higher education discourses, the research is concerned – as a qualitative study – with exploring how participants construct their own role-perceptions as academics, and how they interpret and give meaning to their experiences of contemporary university work-life. In basic terms, as a piece of qualitative research, it is oriented towards ‘*understanding* how people make sense of their lives and their experiences’ (Merriam, 2009, p.23) and as a study which sets out to ‘see the social world from the point of view of the actor’ (Bryman, 1984, p.77) it can also be described as, ontologically and epistemologically, ‘interpretive’. Specifically, it is underpinned by a constructivist ontology in that participants’ accounts have not been treated as reliable ‘statements about or reflection(s) of’ extra-interview realities, but as ‘part of the reality being studied’ (c, 1996, p. 63) based on the premise that the ‘realities’ of academic work-life are, at least in part, subjectively and discursively mediated. As such, the ‘reality’ that this study takes as its object of research is not waiting to be ‘discovered’ but is rather viewed as being actively ‘constructed’ by participants themselves.

As a study of ‘discourse’, which has been described as ‘a group of ideas or patterned ways of thinking which can be identified in textual or verbal communications, and can also be located in wider social structures’ (Lupton, 1992, p.145), this study - like much discourse-analytical research – proceeds from a ‘social constructionist starting point’ (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002. p.22). From this perspective, language is not viewed as a neutral medium for conveying ‘direct and unmediated access to reality as it is in itself’ (Shakespeare, 2001, p.24) but as constitutive of it, or as Michel Foucault has put it: ‘discourse constructs the object of which it speaks’ (Pihl, 2015, p.54).

In this respect, the interview data was treated as a collection of situated and contingent ‘specimens’ of how participants construct, understand, and represent the realities of academic work-life, rather than as

evidence from which reliable inferences about ‘extra-interview realities’ can be drawn (Wengraf, 2004, 70). As such, this research departs from the traditional ‘factist’ approach to qualitative interview data, wherein participants’ accounts are treated as a ‘neutral record of secondary phenomena’ (Potter and Wetherell, 1987) in the world ‘out there’, or as permitting ‘entrance to the “real” experiences, attitudes, opinions, and emotions of the interviewee’ (Berg et al. 2003, p.4).

Gromm and Hammersley have outlined a growing scepticism about the value of qualitative interviews as data collection instruments which can provide researchers with ‘a window into the minds of informants’ and ‘give access to information about the social worlds in which informants live’ (Hammersley and Gromm, 2008, p.89), or as Sanna Talja has described them, participants’ ‘inner’ and ‘external’ realities (Talja, 1999). The ‘factist’ perspective on qualitative interviews, which Pertti Alasuutari has described as a ‘variant of empiricism’, values participants’ statements only insofar as they are believed ‘to reflect truth “out there”’ (Alasuutari, 1995, p.48) and so inclines researchers to treat interview data as ‘a set of stable “social facts” that have objective existence independent of the linguistic and contextual settings in which they are “expressed”’ (Briggs, 2003, p.499). An interpretive, social constructionist approach to research interviews, however, is required to regard participants’ accounts as ‘secondary’ and ‘interpreted’ (Talja, 1999, p.12) representations or constructions that are contingent on the specific interactional context of the interview setting, rather than authentic manifestations of their beliefs, attitudes, and experiences. In this context, this research treats interview talk as having a situated and ‘performative’ character (Hammersley and Gromm, 2008, p.90) which participants make use of to recount real-life experiences and construct stable and coherent identities which, as *extempore* discursive ‘productions’, cannot be treated as ‘social facts’.

However, in spite of the benefits of treating research interviews as ‘active sites where meaning is created and performed’ (Frost, 2011), taken to its extreme, the epistemological scepticism associated with the critique of the factist approach to research interviews (Alasuutari, 1995; Talja, 1999a; Hammersley and Gromm, 2008) can lead researchers into an epistemological *cul-de-sac* in which a constructionist paradigm – which views ‘reality’ as being constituted within discourse – gives rise to ‘a general scepticism about the very possibility of knowledge’ which, in turn, ‘undermines the viability of inquiry

as a specialised activity' (Hammersley and Gromm, 2008, p.35). Further to this, the epistemological scepticism which follows from any critical application of social constructionist discourse theory to interview data directly contradicts the assumption, underpinning most discourse-analytical research, that 'discourses' represent the linguistic expressions of 'knowledge formations which organize institutional practices and societal reality on a large scale' (Talja, p. 2). And though there is a 'great deal of fluidity in the range of reference' of the theoretical and analytical term 'discourse' (Mills, 1997), most forms of discourse-analytical research share the assumptions that discourses represent the semiotic manifestations of the ways in which knowledge is 'always inextricably enmeshed in relations of (social) power' (Hall, 2001, p.75).

The post-structuralist philosopher Jacques Derrida has written that 'objects and events come into existence for us as meaningful entities through their representation in discourse' (Derrida, 1976, p.158) , which is to say that while there does- unquestionably - exist a real world independent of human experience, our apprehension of it is generally mediated through our signifying practices and our associated systems of knowledge and beliefs. In effect, what this suggests is that while there does exist a 'pre-discursive' reality, the moment one tries to make sense of things in the world, or to describe them, recourse must be taken to patterned styles of language – or 'discourses' – which are, inescapably, socially structured. 'Discourse' then, far from being a neutral matter of stylistic variation in subjects' writing and speech, is very often conceptualised as a vehicle for power to manifest within the 'everyday mechanisms of linguistic communication' (Kirkpatrick, 2008, p.82).

This study proceeds from the assumption that 'enterprise discourses' have become 'increasingly hegemonic' (Mautner, 2005, p.97) in the research and policy literature on higher education and, as such, if discourse is 'endowed with the performative power to bring into being the very realities it claims to describe' (Fairclough, 2003, p. 203-204), it follows that the set of 'diffuse (...) discursive tendencies' (Fairclough, 1991, p.112) denoted by the term 'enterprise discourse' have the potential to transform and recontextualise practices, subjectivities, and institutional culture within universities. However, while it is not assumed in advance that enterprise discourse - and the creation of 'entrepreneurial cultures' within universities – have necessarily had a meaningful impact on those interviewed, by asking participants

about how they interpret and negotiate the concepts of the entrepreneurial academic and university the researcher has implicitly presupposed that the 'enterprise paradigm' has, to varying degrees, permeated the discursive practices of their universities. As such, the research, despite abandoning the 'factist' approach to interview data, is concerned with exploring how participants conceive of their role in relation to notions of enterprise and entrepreneurship and so specifically invites them to report on a particular 'extra-interview reality', namely: that of the relationship between their own professional discourses and those of their institutions' internal and external communications.

Based on the view that discourses represent 'socially and institutionally originating ideology, encoded in language' (Fowler, 1991, p.42), this study has set out to explore the extent to which institutionally hegemonic 'enterprise discourses' – which have as their explicit aim the construction of new 'entrepreneurial subjectivities' for academics, and the recontextualisation of their practices as 'entrepreneurship' – have indeed, at least from the perspective of those interviewed, come to permeate their respective universities' 'cultures', understood as their 'expressive and affective dimensions in a system of shared and meaningful symbols' (Allaire and Firsirotu, 1984, p.213). Further to this, participants were asked to reflect on whether they had been able to, or were expected to, form a meaningful identity connected to the concept of 'entrepreneurialism', and what they felt that it meant - more generally - to be an 'entrepreneurial academic.' The general aim in using qualitative interviews however, given their empirical and epistemological limitations, was not to arrive at definitive, generalisable conclusions about the extent to which participants had or had not been 'interpellated' by enterprise discourses. Instead, they were oriented towards developing an understanding of how participants interpret the entrepreneurial paradigm, at least within the context of the interview conceived as a highly constructed and situated type of interpretive 'social interaction' (Neuman, 2012, p.229) rather than a tool for 'developing the empirical foundations of social scientific knowledge' (Berg, Wetherell and Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2003).

Despite adopting a sceptical position on the empirical and epistemological validity of research interviews, the study does not, however, subscribe fully to 'the proposition that interview talk is meaningfulness beyond the context in which it occurs' (Sarangi, 2003, p.67), opting instead to accept

the perspective that the accounts provided by participants, even if they are relatively improvisational, are ‘shaped by prior cultural understandings’ (Denzin, 1991, p.68) and represent – as speech acts – a ‘resignification’ of particular discursive resources which are, inescapably, ‘*constrained* by past uses’ (Medina, 2006). In basic terms then, the broader significance of the discursive constructions created by participants in these interviews derives from the fact that when they use their ‘discursive agency’ (Butler, 1997) to create relatively novel accounts of their professional identities, experiences within the university, or understandings of the meaning of ‘enterprise’ in higher education, they are, in fact ‘speaking from elsewhere’ (Medina, 2006). For example, one cannot generally engage in a discussion of what it ‘means’ to be an academic’ or advance a perspective on the ‘idea’ of the university, without drawing, at least partially, on the discursive resources made available to you by prior speakers. In this respect, the data drawn from the interviews carried out for this research have been treated as ‘specimens of interpretive practices’ (Talja, 1999, p.13) which possess the *possibility* of generalisable significance but are also, in their own right, intrinsically valuable as examples of how academics perceive the entrepreneurial paradigm in terms of the meanings that is has *for them*.

#### **4.4 Data Collection**

In the initial plan for this study it was proposed to carry out a series of semi-structured interviews with non-STEM academics working in UK universities that had positioned themselves publicly as ‘entrepreneurial’ institutions. The ‘entrepreneurial’ model is one of several ‘contending concepts that speak to the idea of the university’ in late modernity (Barnett, 2010, p.1) and has – alongside a broader elevation of ‘entrepreneurialism’ to the status of a cultural ‘master signifier’ (Jones and Spicer, 2006, p.181) – become an ‘increasingly hegemonic’ (Mautner, 2005) feature of policy, governance, marketing, and research discourse in recent decades, particularly in the United Kingdom (Kirby, 2006; Gibb, Haskins and Robertson, 2009; Shattock, 2010; Coyle *et al.*, 2013).

The researcher carried out seventeen interviews across five university sites between 2011 and 2012, using a combination of lightly structured biographic-narrative (Chamberlayne, Bornat and Wengraf, 2000; Wengraf, 2004) and semi-structured interview methods. These interviews were then transcribed and coded using QSR NVivo QDA software (QSR, 2012), before being analysed using a discourse-analytic technique designed to accommodate patterns of variability within participants' responses by delineating some of the 'discursive repertoires' (Potter and Wetherell, 1988) employed in the discussion of particular topics. In the context of this research, a 'discursive repertoire' represents the variable stock of sometimes contradictory linguistic and symbolic resources drawn upon by participants in the accounts and interpretations they provide within the interview setting.

#### **4.4.1 Participants and Research Sites**

##### **Research Sites & Sampling Rationale**

One of the primary aims of the research was to interview non-STEM academics working in universities that had positioned themselves publicly as 'entrepreneurial'. Historically an 'unthinkable adjective-noun combination' (Mautner 2005, p.96), the idea of the 'entrepreneurial university' has – in recent decades – become 'part of the *lingua franca* of higher education' (Shattock 2010, p.269). And although there are many different ways in which universities can describe themselves as being 'entrepreneurial', a broad consensus has arisen within the research and policy literature on the enterprise model as a matter of 'university adaptation to changes in the higher education environment' (Goddard and Vallance, 2013, p.43) and an increasingly competitive global economy characterised by accelerated rates of change and uncertainty. In effect, the entrepreneurial university is regarded as an institution that is driven by a strong adaptation ethic, and like its metaphorical counterparts in the entrepreneurial self and firm, is committed to developing a permanent posture of flexibility and responsiveness to change which will allow it to 'adapt to changing times and make good with less than perfect situations' (Hildebolt, 2010, p.127). Burton R. Clark, whose work has been particularly influential in popularising the model of the

‘entrepreneurial university’ and making it ‘intellectually acceptable’ (Shattock, 2010) to academics, policy makers, and university managers, described the entrepreneurial ‘pathway’ as a means by which universities - faced with the often contradictory expectations and demands of their internal and external stakeholders in the context of gradually reduced or conditional state funding - might correct their ‘demand-response balance’ (Clark, 1998, p.140) by embracing the freedom that accompanies a more autonomous or ‘self-reliant’ posture.

Although an expansive policy and research literature has developed around the model of the entrepreneurial university both in the UK and beyond (Shattock and OECD, 2005; Gibb, 2006b; Shattock, SRHE and UNESCO, 2008; Gibb, Haskins and Robertson, 2009; Shattock, 2010; OECD and EC, 2012), one of the more conspicuous manifestations of this idea in the UK can be found in the annual Times Higher Education (THE) ‘Outstanding University Entrepreneurship Award’ (NCEE, 2016), previously known as the ‘Entrepreneurial University of the Year Award’ (NCEE, 2011), offered in conjunction with the National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (NCGE), operating under the ‘trading name’ of the National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education (NCEE) (NCGE, 2011). This award, which recognises institutions which have ‘developed and delivered an exceptional approach to embedding entrepreneurship within its culture and programmes’ (NCEE, 2016) typically employs an expansive definition of the entrepreneurial university - consistent with Clark’s (Clark, 1998) and Shattock’s (Shattock, 2010)- which eschews a ‘business-related lexis’ (Mautner, 2005, p.95) and describes an institutional ideal which is ‘proactive’, ‘self-reliant’, develops a ‘work culture which embraces change’ (Clark, 1998, p.7), and is committed to taking ‘the necessary adaptive actions (to) correct the imbalance between the institution and their environment’ (Shattock, 2010, p.165).

As this study was aimed at interviewing non-STEM academics working in universities which had declared themselves, publicly, as having an ‘entrepreneurial’ character, it was decided to approach participants in institutions which had been shortlisted for – or won – the THE/NCGE ‘Entrepreneurial University of the Year Award’ (NCGE, 2010). Six sites were chosen on the basis that they had both positioned themselves publicly - or been recognised – as ‘entrepreneurial’, and because, taken together, the sample comprised institutions that could be typified as being ‘Ancient’, ‘Red-brick’, ‘Plate-glass’

or 'Post-92'. As such, they constituted a diverse cross-section of institutional types that could be considered to be representative of the heterogeneity of the UK university system.

As complex 'ambiguity-prone' organisations with diverse 'culturally differentiated' (Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2008) internal communities and relatively diffuse power structures, universities present 'particular problems for management, leadership and strategy processes' (Jarzabkowski, Sillince and Shaw, 2010), and it is for this reason perhaps that the shift towards an entrepreneurial mould is usually associated with cumulative, 'bottom-up' change in which 'actors adapt to functioning in new situations' voluntarily (Rinne and Koivula, 2005, p.103) rather than in response to top-down management impositions. Clark, in fact, proposed that 'strong central control actively mitigates against the development of an entrepreneurial culture' (Rowlands, 2017, p.213), invoking a perspective on organisational culture as emerging organically from the 'grass roots', rather than as something which is changed through management intervention and 'hierarchically defined in an attempt to control aspects of organizational life and improve performance' (French *et al.*, 2008, p.346).

A central contradiction, then, in advocacy for the entrepreneurial model derives from the fact that it is most conspicuously found in higher education policy and governance literatures, despite being regularly framed as something which cannot be successfully developed by a top-down, management-led approach. As a result, the creation of 'integrated entrepreneurial cultures' within universities is often associated not with management but with charismatic forms of 'leadership' oriented towards 'managing change by setting a direction' and 'developing a vision' (Ghuman, 2010, p.122) which can secure voluntary 'buy in'. In this respect – when selecting institutional sites for research interviewing - it was difficult to ascertain the extent to which individual universities' had, in fact, embedded an 'integrated, entrepreneurial culture' (Clark, 1998). Instead, the researcher settled on choosing universities which, having featured in the THE/NCEE shortlists for 'Entrepreneurial University of the Year' and had been recognised, or had sought to publicly cultivate, a reputation for being 'entrepreneurial' in their external communications. Further to this, in an effort to interrogate participants' perceptions of the impact of their university's positioning as 'entrepreneurial' both on their academic-work-lives and on their institution's internal communications, a segment of the schedule was dedicated to exploring whether or

not interviewees were ‘familiar’ with the enterprise model, and the extent to which the entrepreneurial paradigm had become ‘visible’ within their universities.

Of the six university sites visited, four could be described as ‘New’ or ‘Post-92’ institutions, one as ‘Red Brick’ (Bruce Truscot (pseud.), 1943) or ‘Civic’, one as ‘Plate Glass’ (Beloff, 1968), and one other as ‘Ancient’. A decision was made during the pre-empirical phase of the research to anonymise each university in the interest of protecting the anonymity of participants. As such, these institutions have simply been labelled numerically from ‘one’ to ‘six’. A table which provides a list of their attributes and the number of interviews carried out in each can be found below.

	<b>Institutional Type</b>	<b>Interviews</b>
1.	A ‘post-92’ regional urban university, formerly a polytechnic, primarily focussed on teaching, but with a growing research capacity.	4.
2.	A ‘plate-glass’ public research university, formerly a technical college, located in a large urban centre, and founded in the nineteen sixties.	3.
3.	A ‘post-92’ public research university, formerly a polytechnic, located in a regional and formerly industrially significant urban centre.	2.
4.	A ‘red brick’ regional public research university, and part of the Russell Group,	4.
5.	A ‘post-92’ university, formerly a technical college, based in the ‘home counties’, primarily focussed on teaching, but with a growing research capacity.	2.
6.	One of England’s ‘Ancient’ collegiate public research Universities.	2.

**Table 1: A Table of Attributes for Universities Visited.**

## **Participants & Sampling Rationale**

After receiving ethical approval from the University of Plymouth's Research Ethics Committee (UREC), the researcher went about identifying departments, schools, or faculties within each university that could properly be described as housing academics practising 'non-STEM' disciplines. The rationale for choosing non-STEM academics arose from the historical association of academic 'entrepreneurship' with university-industry technology transfer, the commercialisation of knowledge, firm-foundation, consultancy, and university 'spin-outs', and the more recent emergence of an inclusive definition of academic 'entrepreneurialism' which emphasises outreach, external collaboration, 'mode 3 knowledge production' (Carayannis and Campbell, 2012), and a general willingness to innovate and 'embrace change' (Clark, 1998).

Disciplines which come under the admittedly reductive label of 'Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics' (STEM) are generally perceived to have had a less fraught relationship with entrepreneurship because of their history of engaging in the commercialisation of intellectual property through applied 'industrial-academic' collaborations (Rappert and Webster, 1997). And though the range of disciplines in which participants operated was broad and heterogeneous, they shared in common the fact they could be described as working outside of academic departments which might be characterised as falling under the 'STEM' designation. In addition to excluding STEM disciplines – for the reasons described above – it was also decided not to approach participants belonging to what might be described as 'business' disciplines and departments, primarily because advocates for the more expansive definitions of entrepreneurialism that this research is interrogating tend to argue that the 'anchoring of entrepreneurship education in business schools can create barriers to institute-wide offer and take-up' (HEInnovate, 2014, p.6), and that the success of the entrepreneurial university hinges on the popularisation of 'beyond-business concepts of entrepreneurship, innovation and institutional change' (HEInnovate, 2014, p.2) and created of 'entrepreneurial cultures'(Clark, 1998) which integrate departments, academics, and learners from disciplines which have traditionally resisted enterprise because of its strong business and market-related connotations.

The idea of the ‘entrepreneurial academic’ is generally considered to have been popularised in HE discourse by Henry Etzkowitz and his writings on the relationship between ‘entrepreneurial science’ and the so-called ‘second academic revolution’, which he referred to as the ‘spread of relations with industry throughout the U.S academic system, and world-wide’ (Etzkowitz, 2001, p.28 ; Henry Etzkowitz, 2002). Here, Etzkowitz described an extension of the university’s traditional teaching and research missions to include a commitment to ‘fostering research which can be developed into marketable products and technologies, thereby advancing the public good and economic wealth’ (Boehm, 2008, p.1).

Critically, for Etzkowitz this ‘revolution’ came about not as a result of government or management fiat, but because of the organic ‘evolution of the social norms of science, from disinterested to entrepreneurial science’ (Etzkowitz and Zhou, 2017). Elsewhere, Etzkowitz has described these ‘norms’ as entailing the ‘capitalization’ of knowledge for ‘economic and social development’, a recognition of ‘interdependence’ between universities, industry and government, the development of ‘independent’ universities which are not ‘a dependent creature of another institutional sphere’, ‘hybridization’ of organisational forms arising out of the interface and interactions between universities and industry, and ‘reflexivity’ about the ‘internal structure of the university’ and its external missions (Etzkowitz, 2008, p.41). Clark’s perspective on the entrepreneurial orientations of academics and universities has much in common with Etzkowitz’s, but is distinguished by a deliberate effort to unmoor ‘entrepreneurship’ from associations with traditional commercialisation and technology transfer by developing inclusive definitions of the ‘entrepreneurial academic’ and ‘entrepreneurial collegiality’ which emphasise what Norman Fairclough has referred to as the ‘activity’ and ‘quality’ senses in enterprise discourse (Fairclough, 1991). Here, then, ‘entrepreneurial’ academics are not merely scientists who can convert their research outputs into valuable patents and spin-out companies but are instead professionals – in any discipline –who are positively oriented towards change, and towards seeking out opportunities, in a ‘self-steering’ way, to engage in external collaboration, while – if possible – generating third-stream income. This more expansive definition of ‘entrepreneurialism’-

which is reflective of the idea of enterprise as an ‘ethic of personhood’ outlined in chapter two – addresses the ‘decidedly negative semantic aura’ (Mautner, 2005, p.112) that sometimes attaches to signifier ‘entrepreneurship’ in HE, lending it a more inclusive ‘meaning potential’ (Fairclough, 1991) that, arguably, would assist in Clark’s aim of making entrepreneurship reach ‘across old boundaries’ into ‘traditional academic disciplines in the humanities and social sciences’ in the ‘stimulated academic heartland’ (Clark, 2002, p.331).

Among those interviewed were lecturers, senior lecturers, readers, and professors in the fields of education, political science, English literature, international studies, the social sciences, history, creative and performance arts, visual cultures, journalism, policy studies, and creative writing. While the majority of participants were career academics, some – such as ‘Louie’, ‘Patrick’, ‘Debby’, and ‘Quinn’ - had entered higher education after establishing professional careers in fields such as journalism, theatre, writing, and human resource management. Additionally, a number of participants occupied, or had previously occupied, management or administrative positions within their universities. A table of participants’ attributes can be found below.

<b>List of Participants</b>					
<b>Pseudonym</b>	<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Service</b>
‘Arthur’	Education	1.	M	Lecturer.	30 Years
‘Bernadette’	Education	1.	F	Lecturer.	Approx. 10 years
‘Clark’	Political Science	2.	M	Professor.	Approx. 10 years
‘Debby’	Linguistics, Education	3.	F	Professor.	25 – 30 years
‘Elaine’	English & English Lit.	4.	F	Professor.	25 – 30 years
‘Fergus’	Politics, International Studies, Environment.	4.	M	Reader.	20 + years
‘Grainne’	Social Sciences.	3.	F	Lecturer.	20 – 30 years
‘Hope’	History, Policy.	5.	F	Lecturer.	< 5 years *
‘Iris’	History.	6.	F	Professor.	30 Years
‘Janet’	Arts, Visual Culture, Photography	1.	F	Professor.	> 30 Years
‘Kieran’	Humanities, History.	5.	M	Professor.	20 – 30 years *
‘Louie’	Journalism	2.	M	Lecturer.	<10 years **
‘Matt’	Humanities, History.	6.	M	Professor.	> 30 Years
‘Norah’	Performance Studies, Performing Arts.	1.	F	Professor.	20 years approx.
‘Owen’	Politics, Public Policy.	4.	M	Senior Lecturer.	10 – 15 years.
‘Patrick’	Arts, Theatre.	4.	M	Senior Lecturer.	Approx. 10 years **
‘Quinn’	Writing, Creative Writing.	2.	F	Lecturer, Chair.	< 5 years **

**Table 2: A Table of Attributes for Research Participants**

\* ‘Hope’ divided her role between academic work and a policy position, meaning that she was closely involved with the development and promotion of the entrepreneurial paradigm within her university. ‘Kieran’, who worked at the same university, but had enjoyed a more of a traditional academic career, was also given an ‘explicit brief’ for promoting enterprise within his institution. In this regard, both participants represent outliers relative to the rest of the sample.

\*\* ‘Louie’, ‘Patrick’, and ‘Quinn’ had each been recruited into their current universities on the basis of established careers in their respective professional fields (i.e. Journalism, Theatre, and Writing).

#### **4.4.2. Access, Ethics and Informed Consent**

Initially, a study introduction letter was sent to the administrators of non-STEM schools, departments, and faculties within the six chosen universities. Further to this, due to limited early success in securing research participants, the same letter was sent to individual academics by email, their details having been procured from university staff pages available publicly online. Provisional arrangements were made to interview in excess of twenty participants, however due to scheduling conflicts only seventeen were eventually carried out, alongside one pilot interview which was conducted at the researcher’s own university and not included in the study. The purpose of this pilot was to refine the interview schedule and coding strategy.

Maintaining high ethical standards is an important aspect of any kind of research involving people, particularly when they are being asked for their perspectives on potentially sensitive matters related to their workplace and vocation. This study conformed with the University of Plymouth’s ethical guidelines and received ethical approval from its University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) before any empirical data collection was carried out. The Social Research Association’s ethical guidelines were also consulted during the pre-empirical phase of the project’s development, with the researcher taking particular account of their recommendation that social researchers ‘must strive to protect subjects from undue harm arising as a consequence of their participation in research’ (SRA, 2013, p.14).

Participants were each issued with a consent form detailing the research aims, data collection methods, and measures taken to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. This form also outlined their rights with

respect to withdrawing from the study, requesting that segments of their interview be omitted, and gaining access – if required – to the findings of the project before any aspect of it was published.

#### **4.4.3 Anonymity and Confidentiality**

As participants were expected to share potentially sensitive information pertaining to their professional practice, place of work, and attitude towards their managers and colleagues, it was vital to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of their data and identities. To this end, interviewees were initially referred to by the file name generated by the researcher's digital audio recorder (e.g. 'WS560004' or 'VN870015'), after which a Microsoft Excel (Microsoft, 2013) spreadsheet detailing participants' attributes – such as their title (e.g. 'senior lecturer', 'professor'), their employing institution, their gender, and their approximate years of service – was prepared. Within this spreadsheet, participants were initially referred to alphabetically (e.g. 'a', 'b', 'c') before being given first-letter corresponding pseudonyms such as 'Arthur', 'Bernadette', and 'Clark'. Special consideration was also given to redacting any information from interview transcripts that could be used to identify a participant, such as the name of their university, a description of its locality, or any other details, such as a description of a colleague or a publication, that could be used to triangulate their identity.

At no time was any information about participants shared with the supervisory team, other than their pseudonyms and generic attributes. It was also decided not to reveal the names of the universities included in this study as it was felt – by the researcher – that including this information could potentially make it easier for participants' identities to be determined. As such, universities were given numerical pseudonyms (e.g. 'university 1', 'university 2') and included in an attribution table that can be found in this methodology chapter and the appendices (Section 4.3.1.). With respect to maintaining confidentiality of records, a data management policy was adhered to which ensured that all research data – including recordings - were kept privately on a password-protected drive – and backup drive – in the possession of the researcher. Recordings were also deleted permanently from any audio-recording

equipment and kept separate from any of the researcher's cloud storage services. The researcher was also cognisant of the legal requirements related to the storage and use of personal data set out in the Data Protection Act (1998), particularly with respect to the safe and secure storage of data, and its use for 'limited, specifically stated purposes' (Office of Public Sector Information, 1998).

#### **4.5. The Interview Schedule**

In the original research proposal, one-on-one interviews were described as a way of gathering 'unique narratives of experience and academic identity development' from participants, in the hope that the 'conversational flexibility' and interactive nature of the research interview would elucidate something of the participants' attitudes, values, and 'self-perceptions as academics'. It was also decided that these interviews would follow a 'two-step' structure, in which a lightly structured exploration of academic work identity would be followed by a more structured component – including a series of sensitising questions - which would guide participants to address the central concepts underpinning the research project - including the 'entrepreneurial university', the 'entrepreneurial academic', and the subject of 'culture' within universities – while taking care to minimise researcher influence. A copy of the interview schedule has been included in the appendices.

#### **4.5.1. Schedule Part A - Biographies, Values, and Professional Self-Constructs.**

One of the central aims of this research was to explore how non-STEM academics conceive of their role in relation to notions of enterprise and entrepreneurship. However, it was also decided that - before introducing the concept of the entrepreneurial 'academic' into discussion – participants would be invited to provide their own perspectives on what it 'means' to be an academic, for them. As such, the first section of the schedule - 'part A' – utilised a combination of the biographic-narrative interview method (BNIM) (Wengraf, 2004) and semi-structured questions about academic values and role-perception, in order to elicit responses from participants about their own sense-making practices as professional academics, and the discursive repertoires that they used in discussions of academic work.

Inspired by the 'biographic-narrative-interpretative' method of research interviewing developed by Tom Wengraf and Prue Chamberlayne (Chamberlayne, Bornat and Wengraf, 2000; Wengraf, 2004), this segment of the schedule was limited to a few open-ended 'story-eliciting' questions, beyond which researcher intervention was kept, purposively, to a minimum. As much as was practical, the researcher avoided 'directional supporting' of participants' responses so as to encourage what Wengraf has described as their 'gestalt' to emerge (Wengraf, 2004, p.113). Wengraf adapted the psychological concept of 'gestalt' in his research methodology so as to develop an interview strategy that 'that minimizes (for as long as possible) the interviewer's concerns (system of values and significance) to allow the fullest possible expression of the concerns, the systems of value and significance, the life-world, of the interviewee' (Wengraf, 2004, p.69). Elsewhere, this approach has been described as a matter of seeking to draw out the interviewee's 'frame of reference' rather than the 'interviewer's agenda' (Jones and Rupp, 2007, p.277). As previously outlined, the interest here was in the 'discursive construction of "self" and identity in interview settings' (Mann, 2016, p.51), with participants' accounts being treated as 'specimens' of interpretive practice rather than as reliable 'statements about or reflections of an external reality' which is not directly observable (Paul ten Have, 2004, p.73).

Rather than fully embracing the whole, systematic, multi-session BNIM approach, the schedule made use – in the first section – of what Wengraf has described as the 'single question aimed at inducing

narrative' (SQUIN) method, in which the researcher is confined to a single, initial 'life-story' eliciting question, in this case 'can you tell me about how you got to where you are today professionally?' (Wengraf, 2004, p.122). To support this SQUIN approach, the researcher made a point of communicating to participants that they should take as long as they like to provide their account, and that they should not feel discouraged by the researcher's silence. In some cases, however – such as when participants provided abbreviated accounts- it was necessary to encourage them - without providing much 'framing, preface or interruption' (Brannen *et al.*, 2007, p.19), to elaborate. Typically, in such cases, the researcher would invite them to tell 'their whole story'.

The idea underpinning this approach is that interviewees are encouraged 'to explore, reconstruct and relive experiences within his or her own frame of reference' with a view to observing how they 'legitimise' and 'rationalise' their activities (Chamberlayne *cited in* Macdonald, 2009, p.97), and the discursive resources they draw on in doing so. For the purpose of this research, the rationale for commencing each interview using the SQUIN approach was to draw out accounts from participants about their own professional self-constructs and biographies that were framed by a discursive repertoire which they had freely chosen, and one which might reasonably approximate the manner in which they accounted for these outside of the interview setting. Here, a 'discursive repertoire' denotes a set of socially-shaped linguistic resources which individuals use to construct accounts and interpretations of various aspects of their social realities, such as their understanding of what it means to be an 'academic', or their beliefs about the proper mission of universities. The concept of 'discursive repertoires' points to a relatively circumscribed range of 'regularities and patterns' (Alexius, Furusten and Löwenberg, 2013, p.5) in the speech of participants, but in opting to describe these as 'repertoires', emphasises the agency that speakers have to combine the stock of 'discourses' that they typically use in inventive and unpredictable ways, or as Jørgensen and Phillips have suggested, 'discourses are drawn on in social interaction as flexible resources' (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002, p.105). Elsewhere, discursive repertoires have been described as denoting the 'simultaneous flexibility, individuality, and yet clearly sociohistorically limited and constrained' (Frankenberg, 1996, p.76) characteristics of the ways in which social subjects use language in their day-to-day lives.

The Data derived from this biographic-narrative approach, it was hoped, could provide a snapshot of the ways in which participants framed their practice as academics *themselves*, which might then later be contrasted with how they conceive of their role in relation to notions of enterprise and entrepreneurship. In basic terms, then, the objective of utilising a method styled on the BNIM and SQUIN approach was not to derive empirically reliable data about participants' real-life sense-making practices, but rather to generate a set of interview-contingent perspectives on what it 'means' to be an academic which were not influenced by the theoretical and substantive concerns of the researcher. And although one of the main aims of the SQUIN approach is to induce 'theorizing about the self' (Wengraf, 2004, p.111) in the form of an uninterrupted narrative, it was assumed that accounts provided by participants were relatively contingent upon the interview as a 'constructed speech event' (Labov, 1982, p.232) or 'specific mode of interaction' (Brinkmann, 2013, p.5), rather than reliable reflections of an 'underlying generalized reality' (Liddicoat, 2011).

Following this initial narrative-inducing query, a series of more conventional semi-structured questions about academic values, motivations, professional self-descriptions, stakeholders, and institutional culture were asked. These more explicit queries were intended to draw out participant's professional self-constructs and strategies of self-presentation, or at least a situated specimen of the kinds of discourses they might typically use to frame their beliefs about their own practice, and their understanding(s) of what it meant to be an academic working in a contemporary UK university. Again, in keeping with the study's approach to the content of interviews as situated 'linguistic performances' (Wengraf, 2004, p.7), rather than reliable indicators of participants' 'authentic intentions, experiences, meanings, or behaviours' (Talja, 1999, p.11), the responses provided by speakers were treated as contingent 'specimens' of their professional discursive repertoires, the value of which lay not in their empirical validity, but in the possibility that they might produce a complementary set of discourses that could be fruitfully compared to the data derived from their responses to the more explicit questions asked about the entrepreneurial academic and university concepts in the second part of the interview. In simple terms, the aim of this section was to explore the professional self-constructs of participants so as to elicit answers that were *less* influenced by the interviewer or the major themes of the research. While in later sections, an interactive approach was developed in which the meanings of questions and

answers could be ‘negotiated between participants’ (Wengraf, 2004, p.39), the purpose of this less co-operative first section was to allow participants to ‘speak for themselves’.

In addition to the preliminary biographical SQUIN query, a number of more conventional semi-structured questions were asked about the ‘values’ that participants saw as ‘underpinning their work’, in addition to a number of further narrative-orientated questions such as ‘what factors influence you to choose this career?’, ‘how would you typically describe your work to others?’, ‘How is your work important?’, ‘who does your work benefit?’, and ‘What purposes does it serve?’. The overall aim of this interviewing strategy was to use a combination of research question types to elicit as much data as possible about participants’ perspectives on academic work and professionalism, their legitimising narratives, and their professional self-constructs, so that these could then be compared to their responses to questions about the ‘entrepreneurial university’, ‘entrepreneurial academic’, and ‘enterprise culture’ from the second half of the schedule. In this initial section, participants were also asked for their perspectives on their university’s ‘institutional culture’ and its influence on their work with a view to comparing their responses to later discussions about the entrepreneurial university and ‘culture change’.

#### **4.5.2. Schedule Part B - The Enterprise Paradigm and University Culture.**

In the second half of the interview – ‘Part B’ - participants were invited to reflect on what they thought that it meant for a university or academic to be ‘entrepreneurial’, and whether or not these concepts were familiar to them or had any salience for them professionally. Further to this they were asked if there was any expectation of them, within their university, to ‘be entrepreneurial’, and if so, how they were required to demonstrate this. Additionally, interviewees were asked if any of their work was ever ‘interpreted’ by their university as ‘entrepreneurial’, and if so, if this was a description which they could align themselves with. Initially, the interviewer provided no information about the concepts of the entrepreneurial academic or university as they are generally articulated in the extant literature, for the purpose of inviting interviewees to provide an account of what *they* thought these meant.

Following this, the researcher asked a question about university culture which was accompanied by a statement about the ‘emphasis’ placed by ‘advocates’ for the entrepreneurial model on universities to transform their institutional cultures. Here, the researcher set out specifically to introduce participants to one of the orthodoxies of the literature on enterprise universities, namely that it was a necessity for them to create an ‘integrated entrepreneurial culture’ or at least to develop ‘a work culture that embraces change’ (Clark, 1998). Interviewees were firstly asked what they thought that this expectation of universities to change their cultures ‘meant’, and whether or not any explicit priority had been given to culture change at their institution in recent years. Lastly, they were questioned about the forms of communication the university typically employed to convey its corporate culture to employees.

A final series of shorter questions were then asked, grouped under the headings of ‘Management and Leadership’, ‘Knowledge Sharing’, and ‘Teaching’. In the first of these segments, participants were asked about governance structures, leadership styles, and about the scope that academic staff had to influence their university’s strategic decision making. These questions were motivated by a desire to ascertain whether or not – at least from interviewee’s perspectives – their respective universities appeared to fit the mould of either an ‘entrepreneurially’, ‘bureaucratically’, or ‘collegially’ governed institution. Further to this, based on the premise that entrepreneurial academics exhibit an outward-facing orientation, and are committed to identifying opportunities to produce and share knowledge in ways which generate value for communities inside and outside of the university, participants were asked if their university had developed any expectation of them to ‘share’ their ‘knowledge or expertise’ in new ways, to find new practical uses or applications for it, or to identify new avenues for adding public value to their work. Lastly, they were asked if - through their teaching – they had been given any responsibility for cultivating or developing entrepreneurial thinking or skill-sets in their students, and if so, how they interpreted this.

#### **4.6. Pilot Interviews and Methodological Modification**

During the pre-empirical phase of the research, a small pilot study was carried out on the basis of three interviews undertaken with colleagues in the researcher's home institution. The purpose of this pilot was to test out the interview schedule, assess the efficacy of individual questions, and determine the extent to which the 'two-step' BNIM *and* semi-structured design of the interview could furnish the researcher with the kind of data required for analysis. The most significant outcomes of the pilot related to the researcher's growing realisation about the difficulty associated with asking participants to answer questions about 'culture', whether at the departmental or university level, and the tendency for participants to exhibit a high degree of variability - and even contradiction - in their accounts of their own values and identities, and representations of experience. For this reason, it became clear that the researcher would have to develop an approach to interviewing which was both sensitive to the complexity, and in some case ambiguities, of the concepts of 'culture' and 'enterprise discourse', and which could account for high degrees of variability and inconsistency in the interview data. The steps taken to address these issues are outlined in the following sections (4.7 and 4.8).

#### **4.7. The Complexity of Culture**

Culture, which typically denotes the symbolic aspects and 'human side' (McGregor and Joel Cutcher Gershenfeld, 2006) of an organisation, is often described as playing a critical role in norm formation and in determining 'the way we do things around here' (Deal and Kennedy, 1982). Organisational cultures are also typically regarded as representing the 'communicatively constructed' shared 'social and symbolic reality' of a specific institution, and though these cultures can be relatively unified or fragmented, the 'consensus view' of organisational culture regards 'organizational members (as) having highly similar, or integrated, meanings for cultural elements' (Keyton, 2011, p.75). Researchers who adopt a 'traditional, objectivist and functionalist' view of culture typically regard it as an organisational

‘variable’, made up of ‘values, norms, rituals, ceremonies and verbal expression’ (Alvesson, 2002, p.21) which affect the behaviours of organisational members and can, crucially, be ‘managed’ or reshaped in order to ‘create new principles to guide affect, behaviours, and cognitions that will then become normative within the organizational system’ (Kwantes and Glazer, 2017, p.55). This perspective is often associated with a ‘structural realist’ ontology (Ashkanasy, Wilderom and Peterson, 2000, p.10; Westwood and Clegg, 2003, p.8) in which organisations are viewed as ‘structures that have a variety of properties (...) including culture’ (Ashkanasy, Wilderom and Peterson, 2000, p.7).

Linda Smircich, however, has described organisational culture as a ‘root metaphor’ for conceptualising organisations, rather than an internal variable which can be exploited ‘to mould and shape internal culture in particular ways’ so as to ‘change culture, consistent with managerial purposes’ (Smircich, 1983, p.346). For Smircich, discussions about organisational culture entail a number of assumptions about ‘the ontological status of social reality’ as well as a ‘range of assumptions about human nature’ (Smircich, 1983, p.340), namely that organisational cultures can be easily isolated as empirical phenomena, and that their management will lead to desired changes in the values, cognitions, and behaviours of employees. By describing culture as ‘root metaphor’ for conceptualising organisations, Smircich’s point is to emphasise that culture is not necessarily ‘something an organization *has*’ but is, rather, ‘something an organization *is*’ (Smircich, 1983, p.347). Here, then, culture becomes what Smircich describes as an ‘epistemological device for framing the study of organization as a social phenomenon’ (Smircich, 1983, p.353).

From this perspective, organisational culture is given a much less ‘concrete status’ and is framed as something which is not assumed to have a ‘objective, independent existence’ outside of the ways in which it is conceptualised and communicated about. Culture is also conceived then, not as a ‘cultural artefact’, but as a ‘generative process’ (Smircich, 1983a). This perspective does not suggest that - as a collection of symbols, discourses, and other signifying practices – organisation cultures are not subjectively experienced as ‘real’ phenomena, but instead proposes that as dimensions of social reality, organisational cultures are an outcome of the intersubjective negotiation of meaning’ and are shared ‘only to varying degrees’ by organisational members (Smircich, 1983b, p.64). By extension, when

organisational researchers set out their perspectives on culture they can be viewed themselves, not as discussing an objective, tangible, or measurable phenomenon, but advancing their own social construction or metaphoric conceptualisation of the organisational form.

This research proceeds from the perspective of organisational ‘culture’ as both a metaphor and an emergent and contested aspect of the social and symbolic construction of reality. As such, while the entrepreneurial paradigm influenced by the work of Burton R. Clark is based, at least in part, on an acknowledgement that universities are complex and ‘ambiguity-prone’ (Jarzabkowski, Sillince and Shaw, 2010) organisations characterised by diverse and contested ‘ideas’ about what universities *are*, Clark’s suggestion that an ‘integrated entrepreneurial culture’ be embedded within universities so as to reconcile ‘enterprise’ and ‘academic’ values (Clark, 1998) appears to be reminiscent of the ‘traditional, objectivist and functionalist’ view (Alvesson, 2002) which holds that a ‘unified culture’ can be created in pluralistic organisations as a precondition for a strategic consensus to occur’ (Carney, 2016, p.108). And though Clark’s model is based on a broad conception of ‘enterprise’ which can accommodate diverse interpretations it still betrays some of the qualities of the ‘integration perspective’ on organisational culture which holds that ‘a “strong” or “desirable” culture is characterized by consistency, organization-wide consensus, and clarity’ (Frost *et al.*, 1991, p.11).

In anticipation of participants offering diverse perspective on matters of ‘culture’, the schedule was developed to address the extent to which they identified more fully with either a ‘whole university’, departmental, or disciplinary ‘culture’. However, in the initial interviews it quickly became clear that, when asked about the ‘culture’ of their universities, participants tended to question the extent to which such a thing could be said to meaningfully exist. As such, the schedule was modified to accommodate the fact that ‘organisational culture’ was conceptualised and subjectively experienced in considerably different ways by individual participants, and that – in many cases – they were deeply sceptical about the extent to which a ‘whole university culture’ had any empirical reality. To this end, when asked about the ‘culture’ at their institutions, follow-up questions were provided which invited participants to distinguish between the ‘official’ culture of their university, as it is communicated, and ‘culture’ as it is subjectively experienced. Also, when individual interviewees began to problematise the very idea of

‘culture’, the researcher would encourage them to develop this point and to reflect on the meaning of ‘culture’ as it pertains to universities as organisations, sometimes engaging in dialogue with participants in a ‘discursive co-construction’ (Potter and Wetherell, 1987) of culture as an ambiguous concept.

As an interpretive study which utilises social constructionist discourse theory, and thereby regards language – the medium through which interviews are carried out – as a resource which speakers can use interactively to construct different versions of ‘reality’ within the interview setting, inviting participants to problematise the concept of ‘culture’, sometimes in dialogue with the researcher, was not viewed as a threat to the validity of the research but rather as an opportunity for developing a richer understanding of participants’ perspectives on the subject. Under a traditional ‘factist’ approach (Alasuutari, 1995) – as an exploration of participants’ perspectives on their university’s ‘culture’, and the extent to which they felt that its entrepreneurial positioning had affected this culture – the interview data might have been treated as an epiphenomenon, of interest only to the extent that it could illuminate something reliable about the underlying, empirical reality of their respective university ‘cultures’. However, as this research proceeds from assumption that language and other signifying systems are the primary medium through which organisational cultures – as well as professional subjectivities – are constructed and transmitted, participants’ problematisation of the very concept of university ‘culture’ serves only to highlight the extent to which ‘culture’, in general, is conceptually indeterminate, intangible, and ‘notoriously difficult to define’ (Gesler and Kearns, 2002, p.12).

#### **4.8 Variability and ‘Discursive Repertoires’**

One of the ‘analytical shortcomings’ often associated with discourse analysis is the tendency for it to lead researchers into the ‘circular’ process of ‘identification’ (Antaki *et al.*, 2003) wherein discourses, despite being relatively vaguely defined both as analytical units and socio-linguistic phenomena – are identified by the researcher within their data, provided with a label, and then assumed to have an ‘independent existence’. In this vein, it is easy to employ a restrictive analytical approach in which the

researcher isolates recurring patterns within their data and presents these as being ‘manifestations of a shared pattern of talking’ (Antaki *et al.*, 2003, p.7) with generalisable social and ideological significance.

Similarly, it can be easy to cite ‘prior identification’ by another scholar as sufficient warrant for the putative ‘existence’ of a particular discourse, and then to merely scan one’s data for evidence of its presence (Widdicombe, 1995). ‘Enterprise discourse’ represents a particular case in point, as though an expansive literature attests to its significance and existence as a feature of contemporary life (Mautner, 2005; McCabe, 2008; Nayak and Beckett, 2008; Parkinson and Howorth, 2008), it is often very difficult to pin down, with Norman Fairclough writing that ‘enterprise discourse’ does not represent a discrete, bounded and easily isolatable phenomenon- or a ‘well-defined code’ - but rather is best thought of as ‘a rather diffuse set of tendencies affecting the ‘order of discourse’ of contemporary British society as (...) as part of wider tendencies of cultural change’ (Fairclough, 1991, p.112).

In this sense, Fairclough regards ‘enterprise discourse’ as ‘a field of potential meaning’ in which a number of complex vocabularies are used, according to a range of shifting, unstable, and context-dependent strategies, to communicate a variety of different messages. In his analysis of what we might ‘mean’ when we refer to ‘enterprise discourse’, he identifies in a small sample of political speeches three distinct semantics ‘senses’ which are invoked in the use of the term ‘enterprise’, referring respectively to ‘quality’, ‘activity’, and ‘business’ senses. Further to this, he observes that these distinct senses are often used in combination and in different configurations with hierarchical degrees of ‘salience’ depending on the communicative context (Fairclough, 1991, p.114). What this means, in effect, is that the term ‘enterprise’, wherever it is used, is open to being interpreted in a multiplicity of different, or combinations of ways, which presents significant problems for any effort to identify a ‘well-defined code’ which could be described as *an* ‘enterprise discourse’.

As this research is oriented both towards identifying the types of ‘discourses’ that participants use when accounting for their professional practice, and inviting them discuss their perspectives on particular manifestations of ‘enterprise discourse’ as it pertains to contemporary higher education, it is necessary to take account of the hazards involved, firstly, in adopting an analytical ‘strategy of restriction’ (Potter

& Wetherell, 1987, p.39) which refines participants' accounting practices into a limited set of discrete and well-defined 'discourses' which are presumed to be reflective of their 'authentic' attitudes, experiences, and beliefs, and secondly, adopting a perspective on 'enterprise discourse' which eschews its intrinsic ambiguity as an object of research.

The use of the term 'repertoire' as modifier of 'discourse' is intended to highlight the fact that language use in everyday life – including research interviews' - is 'flexible and dynamic' (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002, p.107) and to avoid succumbing to a deterministic perspective which undervalues subjects' 'discursive agency', which refers to their capacity to flexibly reword and reinterpret cultural narratives and redefine the subject positions made available to them by discourse. Although this research adopts a social constructionist perspective on discourse as constitutive of social reality and subjectivity, overlooking the way in which speakers assemble their utterances in the manner of a kind of *bricoleur* or as a kind of 'sculptor at work, fashioning a product out of the material and with the tools available to him or her' (Bhaskar, 1989, p.266) would be to a kind of 'discourse determinism' (Walkerdine, 1987) in which subjects are viewed as always confined to socially available discourses, rather than as purposive agents who are able to deviate from and creatively recombine them.

In practical terms, this suggests that, within any given interview, participants may construct 'very different, and often irreconcilable, positions and lines of argument regarding a single topic' (Berg 2003, p. 119) and draw on a 'repertoire' of diverse, and sometimes contradictory 'discourses' – understood as 'regulated ways of speaking' (Barker and Jane, 2011) about phenomena which 'encode different representations of experience' (Fowler, *cited in* Mills, 2004, p.6). In analytical terms, then, this necessitates an approach which allows - rather than restricts - the diversity of participants' accounting practices' (Potter and Wetherell, 1987) on the basis that 'consistency' does not indicate 'descriptive validity' (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 34) but is often 'an achievement of the researcher rather than a feature of the participant's discourse' (Talja, 1999, p. 4). In simple terms, based on an understanding of language use as fundamentally improvisational, an analytical approach which accommodates 'variability' accepts that speakers may frame topics in different ways, and even express contradictory points of view within and across sections of interview talk. And though this does not preclude

identifying features that participants' responses have in common, this 'repertoire' based approach - by accommodating seeming inconsistencies and contradictions in interview data – has the potential to provide a more accurate snapshot of the 'full range of accounting resources people use when constructing meaning of their social world'(Potter and Wetherell, 1987).

#### **4.9 Analytical Coding**

The interviews were first transcribed, before being coded using NVivo 10 (QSR, 2012), a qualitative data analysis programme developed by QSR International. Initially, transcripts were coded using an 'open' strategy which allows the analyst to identify and develop thematic categories inductively from the interviews, rather than using 'a top-down deductive approach to code the data and check them against current theories' (Riazi, 2016, p.37). An inductive, 'open' approach requires the researcher to analyse the transcripts inclusively, and to create low-inference *in vivo* codes that can be refined at a later stage. This preliminary approach was deemed appropriate because of the interpretive paradigm within which the research was being conducted. As interpretive research is oriented towards analysing how participants *themselves* interpret aspects of their experiences and social realities, it represents what Patrick Jackson has, in a discussion of Anthony Giddens's 'double hermeneutic', referred to as a form of 'making sense of making sense' (Jackson, 2006, p.264). This open approach to coding was particularly important for the initial BNIM segment of the interview, as it was intended to draw out participants' own perspectives on academic work and universities, and the discursive resources they used to describe them, in a manner which was not influenced by the researcher's 'project-defined theoretical and practical concerns'(Wengraf, 2004, p.144).

Further to this, a set of *a priori* codes were developed which addressed the substantive and theoretical concerns of the research. In particular, as the research was oriented towards exploring how participants interpret and negotiate the concepts of the entrepreneurial academic and university, and their perceptions of the impact of their university's positioning as 'entrepreneurial' on their academic work-

life, it was deemed necessary to develop ‘*a priori* codes that had been deducted from theory’ as well as ‘*a posteriori* codes that were induced from the interview transcripts’ (Moll and de Leede, 2017, p.104). As such, a list of *a priori* codes were generated from ‘the wider research and theoretical debates’ related to the research topic (Churchill and Sanders, 2007, p.65), which in this case meant the manner in which the related concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic are constructed in the research and policy literature. As a result, a hierarchy of *a priori* ‘main’ and ‘sub’ codes was developed for use in NVivo (QSR, 2012) which was modified and refined inductively as the analysis progressed.

Once each of the interview transcripts had been coded, the results were subjected to several stages of ‘axial’ and ‘selective’ coding for the purpose of code refinement and data reduction. Axial coding refers to a process in which the typically large quantity of relatively unstructured ‘low inference’ codes (Punch, 2009, p.184) developed in preliminary analysis are refined by the researcher, who ‘examines relationships’ between existing codes in order ‘to understand more in-depth what the data are revealing with regards to theory building’ (Hays and Singh, 2012, p.345). Lastly, the researcher engaged in a form of ‘selective coding’, which refers to a process of further refining the axial codes for the purpose of developing a manageable data set, comprising of a limited number of ‘high-level concepts’ (Birks and Mills, 2011, p.95), that could form the foundation of a cohesive set of findings, presented in chapter five.

## 4.10 Summary

This chapter outlined the key research question and guiding sub-questions for this study, as well as the qualitative and interpretive paradigm within which it has been carried out. As an interpretive study, this research is centrally concerned with exploring how participants themselves understand and negotiate the concepts of the entrepreneurial academic and university, conceive of their role in relation to notions of enterprise and entrepreneurship, and interpret the impact of their university's positioning as 'entrepreneurial'.

As a study which makes use of discourse analysis as a methodology, and is underpinned by a social-constructionist epistemology, it has been necessary to treat language - the medium through which research interviews are carried out – not as a transparent vehicle of communication, but as *the* medium 'through which social reality is constructed' (Elder-Vass, 2012, p.77) and through which knowledge about the world 'out there' is mediated and becomes institutionalised. This perspective on language as a tool with which human beings make sense of their world and articulate their identities has important implications for the use of research interviews as instruments for empirical data collection, and engenders an epistemological scepticism about the extent to which interviews can, in fact, furnish researchers with reliable knowledge about any 'underlying generalized reality' (Liddicoat, 2011).

This sceptical perspective on interviews invites researchers to abandon traditional 'factist' approaches which 'make a clear-cut division between the world or reality 'out there', on the one hand, and the claims made about it, on the other' (Alasuutari, 1995), privileging the former, and valuing the latter only to the extent that it can furnish reliable information about 'extra-interview realities' (Wengraf, 2004). Adopting an epistemologically sceptical approach entails treating the interview itself as the 'empirical reality' being studied and approaching them with a view to interrogating what participants' accounts 'do', instead of what they tell us about the outside world. In this regard, participants' contributions were treated as 'specimens of interpretive practices' (Talja, 1999, p.13), rather than as a 'neutral record of secondary phenomena'(Potter and Wetherell, 1987) in the world 'out there', or as

permitting ‘entrance to the “real” experiences, attitudes, opinions, and emotions of the interviewee’ (Berg et al. 2003, p.4).

This epistemological perspective on the nature of interviews is consistent with the interpretivist paradigm in which the research was carried out, as the study is oriented towards exploring how participants *themselves* interpret aspects of their experiences and social realities. However, it is necessary to balance epistemological doubt and methodological caution (Hammersley and Gromm, 2008, p.94) with the aim of being able to infer something of generalisable significance from the interview data. As such, having identified the tensions that exist between the ‘radical critique’ of interviews presented above (Hammersley and Gromm, 2008) and the assumptions, underpinning discourse theory, that ‘discourses’ are both constitutive of ‘social reality’, and represent the linguistic expressions of ‘knowledge formations which organize institutional practices and societal reality on a large scale’ (Talja, p. 2), the research has proceeded from the position that the ‘discursive repertoires’ deployed by participants in the interview setting are, despite individual subjects’ ‘discursive agency’ (Butler, 1997), relatively shaped – that is, constrained *and* enabled - by the discourses made available to them as members of society and of specific ‘interpretive communities’ in the field of higher education.

## 5. CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH FINDINGS

### 5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the ways in which academics in non-STEM disciplines reported on their experiences with – and understandings of – the concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic, and to ascertain the extent to which they had observed the ‘entrepreneurial paradigm’ materialise in the ‘culture’ of their respective institutions. The researcher’s interest in the relationship between enterprise discourse and the organisational ‘culture’ of universities stemmed from the apparent consensus within the scholarly and policy literature about the need for universities to develop an integrated ‘entrepreneurial culture’ (Clark, 1998, p.7)(Gibb, 2006b, p.2)(Rae, Gee and Moon, 2009) by pursuing a policy of ‘organisational culture change’, with culture here denoting ‘the realm of ideas, beliefs, and asserted values’ (Kwiek, 2008, p.115) which inhere within institutions. In addition, then, to enquiring into how participants interpreted the concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic, the interviews were also oriented towards interrogating the ways in which participants felt that ‘enterprise culture’ had been mediated and ‘embedded’ in their institutions, if at all.

A key theme that emerged from the literature, and the empirical data collection and analysis, was that ‘discourse’ and ‘culture’, both as concepts and empirical phenomena, were inherently difficult to define and isolate. Further to this, ‘organisational culture’ was itself differently interpreted according to a number of contradictory discourses as a theoretical concept, as well as being conceptualised and subjectively experienced in considerably different ways by participants in their respective universities. To this end, an interview schedule was developed that took account of the ambiguities that pertain to questions of ‘culture’, ‘discourse’, and ‘enterprise’, and gave participants opportunities both to outline their own understandings of the phenomena in question, and to respond to a number of *a priori* ‘sensitising concepts’ and statements drawn from the literature on entrepreneurial universities, ‘enterprise culture’, and entrepreneurial academics. Based on the premise that qualitative research interviews are not just empirical data-collection instruments which allow researchers to gain ‘entrance

to the “real” experiences, attitudes, opinions, and emotions of the interviewee’ (Berg, Wetherell, & Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2003, p.4) or construct a ‘neutral record of secondary phenomena’ (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p.145) but rather represent the jointly constructed interpretive ‘artefact’ or ‘accomplishment of interviewer and respondent’ (Dingwall, 1997, p.56), the researcher’s active interventions were not viewed as a problem of influence or ‘reactivity’. As such, in some instances, where participants expressed doubts about the existence of whole-university ‘cultures’, the researcher would intervene to try to guide participants towards exploring their perspectives on ‘culture’ as an ontological entity.

However, in the first part of the interview – where the researcher utilised a Biographic-Narrative Interpretive Method (BNIM) (Chamberlayne, Bornat and Wengraf, 2000; Wengraf, 2004) to elicit uninterrupted narratives of personal experience from participants, researcher interventions were kept to a minimum so as to allow ‘the fullest possible expression of the concerns, the systems of value and significance, the life-world, of the interviewee’ (Wengraf, 2004, p.69) at least insofar as they were discursively constructed within the sociolinguistic context of the interview setting. The purpose of this section of the schedule was to elicit responses from participants about their own sense-making practices as professional academics, and their discourses of academic work. This involved a combination of a ‘single question aimed at inducing narrative’ (SQUIN) (Wengraf, 2004) aimed at encouraging participants to tell their ‘biographical’ stories, and a series of more conventional questions about their academic identity and values. Critically, these questions were asked before the concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic were introduced into conversation, so as to derive data that was not influenced by the theoretical and substantive concerns of the researcher. The rationale underpinning this strategy was to produce data – on participants’ own perspectives on academic work and universities – that could be compared and contrasted to later discussions about the meaning and significance of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic.

Further to this, attention was paid analytically to moments within the interviews where both parties problematised aspects of the interview schedule or engaged dialogically in a ‘discursive co-construction’, understood here as the joint creation by the interviewer and participant of a particular

patterned way of describing or interpreting a subject of conversation. For example, in a significant number of the interviews, both parties spent time discussing the idea of ‘culture’ as it pertained to universities, and exchanged views about the complexity of the term, the dimensions of organisational life that could be considered ‘cultural’, and the relationship between a university’s whole ‘culture’ and that of its various departments, faculties, or units.

## **5.2. Findings - Biographies, Professional Self-Constructs, and Values.**

The findings outlined in this section relate to the first segment of the interview schedule – ‘Part A’ – which utilised a lightly-structured design combining the ‘Single Question SQUIN method with an additional series of questions concerning academic values, professional role-perception, and institutional cultures. The purpose of this section, which has been labelled ‘Biographies, Professional self-constructs, and values’, was to elicit – with minimal researcher intervention - data on the discursive repertoires that participants used to account for their professional self-concepts and values, and their understanding of the ‘culture’ of their respective universities.

In the first part of the schedule, participants were asked a series of questions about their professional biographies, motivations, and the ‘values’ that they saw as ‘underpinning their work’. Further to this, the researcher enquired into how they typically described their work ‘to others’, what their day-to-day work-life entailed, what made it ‘important’, and who it ‘benefited’. Lastly, they were invited to reflect on their university’s institutional ‘culture’ and the extent to which its values had any ‘influence’ on their work. This section began, however, with a ‘single question aimed at inducing narrative’ SQUIN which invited participants to reconstruct their professional biographies for the purpose of eliciting ‘storied’ accounts that might illuminate their own professional self-understandings or ‘self-constructs’, or in more simple terms, how it is that they ‘saw themselves’ as academics. Though the research, for reasons of practicality, did not make use of the multi-session structure of Wengraf’s narrative interviewing method, the first part of the schedule was modelled on his recommendation for inducing storied

accounts from participants through restricting interviewer interventions ‘to a single initial question’ (Wengraf, 2004, p.111), namely ‘can you tell me how you got to where you are today professionally?’. This approach has been described by Wengraf as a method for ‘inducing theorizing about the self, a self-theory’ (Wengraf, 2004, p.111) in the form of an uninterrupted biographical narrative. As such, researcher intervention was severely restricted, except where participants offered concise responses, in which case it was intimated that the purpose of the question was to elicit a narrative, of some sort, regarding all or part of their professional experience.

The purpose of this approach was to invite participants to tell their professional ‘story’, not for the aim of gathering ‘authentic’ narratives of experience and using the resulting ‘data as evidence to support assertions about extra-interview realities’ (Wengraf, 2004, p.1) but to explore the ‘discursive repertoire’ that participants employ, at least within the context of the interview, when speaking about their careers and professional self-concept. The term ‘discursive repertoires’ is used here to denote the ‘simultaneous flexibility, individuality, and yet clearly sociohistorically limited and constrained’ (Frankenberg, 1996, p.76) ways in which social subjects recount and account for their professional careers and lifeworlds. One of the benefits of this kind of approach, it is often suggested, is that narratives are selectively constructed, and so - through what they explicitly articulate and excise – provide an expression of participants’ ideologies, strategies of self-presentation, and ‘tacit and unconscious assumptions’ (Wengraf, 2004, p.115). Following this initial narrative-inducing query, a series of more conventional questions about academic values, motivations, professional self-descriptions, stakeholders, and institutional culture were asked.

These more explicit questions were intended to draw out participant’s professional self-constructs, or at least a situated specimen of the kinds of discourses they might use to frame their beliefs about their own practice, and their understanding(s) of what it meant to be an academic working in a contemporary UK university. Again, in keeping with the study’s approach to the content of interviews as situated ‘linguistic performances’ (Wengraf, 2004, p.7), rather than reliable indicators of participants’ ‘authentic intentions, experiences, meanings, or behaviours’ (Talja, 1999, p.11), the responses provided by speakers were treated as contingent ‘specimens’ of the their professional discursive repertoires, the

value of which lay not in their empirical validity, but in the possibility that they might produce a complementary set of discourses that could be fruitfully compared to the data derived from their responses to the more explicit questions asked about the entrepreneurial academic and university concepts in the second part of the interview. In essence, this approach was intended as a way of addressing the issue of reactivity by eliciting answers that were liable to be *less* influenced by the interviewer or the major themes of the research. While in later sections, an interactive approach was developed in which the meanings of questions and answers could be ‘negotiated between participants’ (Wengraf, 2004, p.39), the purpose of this less co-operative first section was to allow participants to ‘speak for themselves’.

Firstly, the researcher sought to identify the professional value discourses and self-constructs which participants articulated in their biographic narrative accounts. These were then collated with references to values that participants made in response to the explicit query: ‘what values do you see as underpinning your work?’ and its subordinate semi-structured follow-on questions (see appendix C). The aim here was to arrive at a fuller picture of the repertoire of values discourses and legitimising narratives deployed by participants by identifying the implicit *and* stated values alluded to in both their narrative accounts, and in their responses to more traditional semi-structured interview questions. To elicit further narrative data, participants were also asked questions such as ‘what factors influenced you to choose this career?’, ‘how would you typically describe your work to others?’, ‘How is your work important?’, ‘who does your work benefit?’, and ‘What purposes does it serve?’, the overriding aim being to combine different types of interview questions to elicit as much data as possible about participants’ perspectives on academic work and professionalism, their legitimising narratives, and their views on the ‘cultures’ of their respective universities.

Taken together, participants provided accounts of their professional values and self-constructs that were coded according to the following themes:

- Liberal Education Discourses, the Social Good, and Political Ideologies
- The Self-Conscious Bracketing of Traditional Academic Identity Discourses
- Student Stakeholders and Pedagogical Values
- Academic Stakeholders, Scholarship, and Disciplinarily Progress
- External Stakeholders, Social and Professional Communities

### **5.2.1. Liberal Education Discourses, the Social Good, and Political Ideologies.**

#### **‘Liberal’ Perspectives**

A majority of those interviewed described their own practice, the purposes that it served, and their professional motivations, in terms that could broadly be defined as consistent with a ‘liberal’ model of HE, in that they primarily spoke about the value of their work in relation to its contribution to knowledge and scholarship, its transformative effects on learners, its cultivation of an empowered, critical, and in some cases, ‘cultured’ citizenry, and its service of the broader ‘public’ or ‘social’ good. The ‘wider good’, however, was not always framed as a secondary outcome of the disinterested liberal education model, but as a matter of the responsibility for academics, who were employed as ‘public’ or ‘civil’ servants in a state-funded university system, to ensure that a broader public return accrued from their work. While the majority of participants acknowledged the significance of universities’ contributions to local and national economies, the imperative for academics to secure external research funding, and the importance of adopting a more ‘reflexive’ and ‘outward-facing’ approach to issues such as community engagement and student employability, they were also – for the most part - collectively keen to stress that their work was non-utilitarian in character, and to reassert the values of liberal

education and disinterested scholarship in the face of the perceived prevalence of an ethos of economism in the contemporary UK university.

The term 'liberal', however, was not always explicitly referenced by participants, with some preferring to use terms such as 'social', 'cultural', 'principled', or 'people-centred' to account for their own personal professional philosophies. Regardless of the vocabulary used, however, the import appeared to be the same for most of the interviewees, namely, that their work represented a kind of moral enterprise which was motivated by an interest in serving society through disinterested scholarship, and the creation of an 'empowered', 'critical', and 'independently-minded' citizenry through their teaching. Further to this, a number of those interviewed synthesised a broader 'liberal' perspective on their work with three other strands of 'ethical' discourse, one relating to the aforementioned invocation of a 'public service' ethos, another drawn from critical pedagogy discourses which centre on the imperative to rethink the relationship between university education, research, knowledge production, the university as an institution, and the wider community or society, and a third framed in terms of the relationship between participants' personal politics - whether 'left-wing', 'feminist', or 'activist' – and their practice as academics.

'They are incredibly liberal, my values, they revolve around the kind of intrinsic value of education, they- my values are that (0.6) that people need support in order to succeed and reach their goals' (Norah).

A number of those surveyed, such as Norah, a professor of performance studies at a regional 'post-92' university, and Elaine, a professor of English literature at a regional 'Red Brick' research university, described their values as explicitly 'liberal', and referred respectively to 'making a difference', promoting things that 'do not have monetary value', and rejecting the 'utilitarian' (Norah), valuing education and scholarship for their 'intrinsic value', and 'transforming' lives through the cultivation of 'independent' and 'critical' students (Elaine). Iris, a history professor at an 'Ancient' collegiate research university, also explicitly referenced taking a traditional 'liberal education' view of her work, arguing that it was not the content, but the 'process' of a humanities education which prepared students to be 'reflective, self-critical, or, you know, self-disciplined human beings'. Fergus, a reader in politics at the

same 'red brick' university, attested to having 'an absolutely naïve beating-heart liberal view' of HE being oriented towards developing 'critical citizens', serving society, and 'mak(ing) the world a better place', describing academic values as 'antithetical' to those of 'the market' and professing a commitment to the 'robust exchange (.) of ideas' in public life, and equipping students, above all else, with 'a critical knowledge of the society they're living in'. This required academics to be 'critical (...) free-thinkers', who were not 'quiescent' and refused to 'collude with the status-quo' but 'critically interrogated it'. Fergus, however, articulated this 'liberal' perspective alongside a vision of academics as 'privileged knowledge workers' with an obligation to 'give back', which he undertook by engaging in forms of 'radical' and 'critical' pedagogy with learners outside the university as 'co-producers of knowledge', and through his political activism.

Arthur, a lecturer in education in a 'Post-92' regional university, described his professional approach as being underpinned by a 'cultural', 'social', or 'principled' model, which he contrasted with 'purely economic', 'functional', and 'utilitarian' approaches to education. As a specialist in English, he also articulated a kind of literary humanist discourse, alluding to the value of preserving culture by integrating students into 'literate society', which for him was 'one of the deepest roots of our culture'. English literature was also described as a tool that could be used to foster criticality in students, concerning cultural practices', 'society', 'communication' and 'economics'. This view was echoed by Elaine, Iris, Owen, Norah, Fergus, and Patrick, for whom a humanities education was most valued for the critical tools that it equipped students with, as good members of society. Bernadette, who was an education lecturer in the same university, spoke of having a 'humanistic' professional ethos, and of 'theorising (and) developing knowledge in a more ethical, moral way', which she compared to a prevailing 'highly pragmatic' and 'managerialist' culture at her institution.

'There is a kind of commitment to (.) education as a sort of public good, emm, so a public-sector ethos is very, very strong in everything that drives me' (Elaine).

'I think of myself as a civil servant, I'm paid by the public, and although you don't want to go down that road of "I am their- they are our masters", I am a public servant, and all academics have a responsibility to, in a sense, justify why they should be paid from taxpayer's money' (Kieran).

A significant number of those interviewed offered a synthesis of traditional ‘liberal’ and ‘public sector’ or ‘civil servant’ discourses on the duties and responsibilities of academics. Elaine, Fergus, and Kieran all described themselves as public or civil ‘servants’ and related that public service was a key professional value, consistently contrasting this with the values of the ‘market’. Elaine, for example, described her work as being imbued with a particular ‘public service’ ethos, adding that she did not regard entering the academic vocation as akin to ‘g(h)oing int(h)o the pri(h)est hoo(h)d’, but rather as involving a ‘kind of commitment to (.) education as a sort of public good’.

### **The ‘Social Good’**

‘Your primary objective is the common good, to leave this world a better place because of the activities you’ve done’ (Fergus).

A strong theme that emerged from the first section of most interviews was that participants described their practice as being motivated in some way by a commitment to ensuring the ‘public’ or ‘social’ good, sometimes articulated as a promoting or preserving ‘culture’ for its intrinsic social benefit. In some cases, this was framed in terms of the traditional idea of the indirect ‘multiplier effects’ of a liberal education, while in others, participants were able to cite specific concrete practices which they engaged in to extend the value of their work to communities outside the university.

‘I’m very realistic about the impact of my research (...) the good social purpose of my work in inheres primarily in teaching’ (Owen).

Owen, a senior lecturer in history at a regional ‘red brick’ research university, reported often feeling conflicted about the ‘good’ that he was doing in his work, adding that while he was sceptical about the impact of his research, ‘in terms of the good that I’m doing’ he could cite his teaching as through this he was ‘helping shape minds’, ‘educating generations’, and doing something with ‘good social purpose’. Norah, for whom teaching was also described as both an ‘intrinsic’ and ‘social’ good, reported to feeling ‘like you’re making a real difference, with people, all the time’. Arthur also placed a high

value on feeling that he was ‘doing a good thing’ from which ‘social’ and ‘cultural’ benefits were derived, and commented that both through his own teaching, and his training of future teachers, he was helping to ‘raise achievement’ and spread ‘good’ and ‘ethical’ practice. As a lecturer in education, he also drew a strong connection between his disciplinary, pedagogical values and his ethical commitment to the public good

Bernadette commented that ‘issues of social justice’ and ‘equity’ were things that ‘permeated’ and ‘underpinned’ her work, both in the context of teaching and research, as part of a broader ‘humanistic’ approach in which ‘people matter first’. For her, it was important that every aspect of her practice had ‘some element of ethics, morality and justice related to them’, not as specific objects of research or teaching, but as a kind of professional ethos which animated her work. Fergus also reported a commitment to ‘making the world a better place’, and creating a more ‘equal’, ‘just’ and ‘sustainable’ society, adding that this was something he tried to accomplish both through his teaching and through ‘outreach’ and ‘activism’. For Clark, a political science professor in a ‘plate glass’ research university, it was vital that his policy research, in particular, had some ‘social utility’, adding that he had ‘quite a strong sense of- of- of what I hope my work is about’ which was, ultimately, to ‘do something about ameliorating living conditions for people’. Similarly, Gráinne connected her research with her personal politics and commitment to advocating for a large white minority ethnic group to which she had a direct familial connection.

Elsewhere, participants who worked as academics in fields such as the visual arts, theatre, performance studies, and English literature, alluded to the social good of their work coming from its contribution towards the promotion and preservation of culture as a social good, either through providing a ‘critical education in English literature’ and researching historical literature (Elaine), promoting the ‘intrinsic’ and ‘non-monetary’ value of culture as a way of ‘making a difference’ (Norah), or curating the arts as a means of developing culture, advocacy for women artists, or promoting community engagement (Janet). Patrick, a theatre and performance lecturer, also referred to using ‘applied theatre’ as a pedagogical technique for promoting theatre as a social good.

## Political Ideologies

A number of participants drew an explicit connection between their personal politics or political ideologies and their practice as academics. For example, Fergus and Elaine, who both spoke of a ‘very strong working-class (.) identity’ (Fergus) and a ‘class element’ shaping their work (Elaine), outlined a commitment to supporting working-class and other non-traditional learners, with Fergus referring to a need to ‘enthuse other working-class eh w- you know- men and women to go on to university’ as a way of ‘repaying’ his ‘community and society’. Louie, a journalism lecturer who was recruited into his current ‘plate-glass’ research university on the basis of an established career in the field, also recounted his ‘working class background’ making him ‘quite political’ and underpinning both his educational and journalistic work, motivating him to commit to a lifetime of promoting ‘great, highly ethical journalism’, critiquing the ‘corrupting influence’ of commercial ownership on the press, and protect(ing) the underdog’. Owen, meanwhile, referred to higher education as ‘the way towards creating a future’, which he added was important ‘for somebody like me who’s got pretty strong left-wing values’, though he was careful never to turn the lecture hall into a ‘vehicle for expressing my own values’. Both Owen and Fergus, in fact, described their politics and their educational practice as being interwoven, and as often placing them at odds with the culture of the university where they both worked. Norah also referred to her values as ‘left-wing’, and ‘feminist’, adding that ‘I believe we live ideologically (...) and part of it is about how we choose to negotiate ideological systems’.

Several participants, including Gráinne and Norah, referred to their experience working as academics being ‘highly gendered’, and – in common with Janet and Bernadette – stated that, alongside their core academic missions, they were committed to a feminist ethos, and to advancing the cause of women both inside and outside of the university. Elsewhere, Janet described developing a specialism in visual cultures as a way of synthesising her interest in the arts with the ‘political orientation’ which had attracted her to sociology in the nineteen seventies. Iris, similarly, alluded to choosing academia as an ‘anti-career’, having come of age during a period of great social change – the late 1960s – and receiving her education against the backdrop of ‘a kind of climate of experimentation and student initiative’.

## **The Self-Conscious Bracketing of Traditional Academic Identity Discourses**

One of the more interesting observations made about the manner in which participants accounted for their own values, and professional legitimising narratives was to be found in the tendency for them to self-consciously ‘bracket’ their use of more traditional, or idealised, constructions of academic work or universities by offering disclaimers about the extent to which they were unrealistic, anachronistic, or overly romanticised. Consequently, although most of those interviewed adopted more traditional ‘liberal’, ‘humanistic’, ‘ethical’, or ‘political’ perspectives on the values of their research and teaching, and on the ‘idea’ of the university, there was a tendency to underscore self-consciously the instances in which they drew on more traditional academic discourses by emphasising their obsolescence, or the extent to which some of the more ‘high-minded’ aspirations associated with academic work – to use a description offered by Iris – had ever been measurable, or even achievable.

Hope, for example, placed a high value on the ‘mutually supportive’ and ‘tight-knit web of obligations’ that characterised the ‘collegial’ culture within her department, adding that it created a ‘genuine sense of being in it together’ which was part of what it ‘means to be an academic’. However, she very swiftly questioned whether or not the phrase ‘being in it together’ was something ‘we can use anymore’, intimating perhaps that her description was somewhat unrealistic. Iris, while she advanced one of the more traditionally liberal perspectives on the value of her work and on HE generally, also remarked that she often questioned some of the more idealised ways of ‘characterising’ and ‘accounting’ for academic work, describing them as ‘high-minded’ and exaggerated, particularly when they were framed in terms of ‘public responsibility’, ultimately commenting that – as a historian - ‘I wouldn’t make very elevated claims for the benefit of the content of the work I do’.

Clark, similarly, characterised some of his own more idealised beliefs about the value and purpose of his work as being ‘lofty’ or ‘high-faluting’, adding that in reality, it was often very difficult to ascertain the extent to which one accomplished one’s ‘higher’ pedagogical or scholarly ideals. To this end, he also

compared an intervention about his values to a ‘pratfall question’, before adding that ‘you have these lofty values, and how, how do you get them translated into practice? emm (0.5) I don’t know’. This kind of refrain was quite common amongst participants, such as when Bernadette remarked that despite viewing her work as promoting ‘social equity’ and the social good, these were ‘abstract and general’ ideas which - though it was her ‘intention’ – she could never be sure of actually embedding in her day-to-day practice. She was also critical of ‘idealising’ traditional models of the university and academic work, as these tend to obscure the ‘problematic’ ways in which ‘power and knowledge intersect in more traditional concepts of Universities’. Elsewhere, Owen reported to having to be ‘very realistic’ about the impact of his work, despite the feeling amongst some of his disciplinary colleagues that their research might ‘change the world’. Some participants were also self-conscious, and in some cases critical, of ideas such as the ‘lone scholar’, which Arthur labelled as a ‘flawed notion’, and ‘academic freedom’, which it was felt was either unrealistic, or something that had never truly characterised academic work-life anyway. Kieran, while he placed a high value on ‘freedom and autonomy’, remarked that academics who just pursued their own disinterested research, ‘did their own teaching’, and were paid sixty-thousand pounds a year just to, eh, you know, just suit your own ego’ were guilty of having ‘an obnoxious sense of privilege’. Despite this, he referred to teaching as being at ‘the core of any university’ and though it ‘often comes off very trite’, he was committed to ‘broadening a generation’s horizons’.

### **5.2.2. Stakeholders**

In addition to eliciting ‘storied accounts’ of academic identity from participants and asking them to reflect on the values that ‘underpinned’ their work and how they ‘typically described it to others’, a semi-structured question invited them to reflect on what made their work ‘important’, who it ‘benefited’, and the ‘purposes’ that it served. The rationale behind this question was to ascertain who participants saw as their primary and secondary ‘stakeholder’ groups, so that this could be compared and contrasted to the manner in which the literature on entrepreneurial academics and universities constructs issues of public accountability, new ‘modes’ of collaborative knowledge production, and what Clark has described as the contemporary university’s ‘demand-response imbalance’ (Clark, 1998). The findings of this section of the schedule have been separated under the two headings ‘Academic Stakeholders, Scholarship, and Disciplinarily Progress’ and ‘External Stakeholders, Social and Professional Communities’.

#### **Academic Stakeholders, Scholarship, and Disciplinarily Progress**

##### **Learner Stakeholders**

Participants responded unanimously that the most important beneficiaries of, or ‘stakeholders’ in, their work were students, although some were explicitly critical of the term ‘stakeholders’ on the occasions where it entered into conversation. Though a significant number of those interviewed felt that their universities’ increasingly outward-facing orientation, and overriding focus on generating research income, had resulted in a neglect of the traditional teaching mission, they consistently cited undergraduate and postgraduate learners – and in some cases, learners within the community - as the key beneficiaries of their work. Some participants, like Janet, spoke of a commitment to developing pedagogy in their discipline on the whole, such as through developing undergraduate textbooks. Arthur, as an education lecturer, referred to serving not only his students, but an ‘outer ring’ of students in non-

tertiary education who would benefit from his commitment to spreading ‘good professional knowledge’ and ‘improv(ing) teaching’ practice, which he lined with his discipline’s strong, ‘communitaire’ ethos that was oriented, pedagogically, to ‘bringing people forward in society in all sorts of ways’

There was a consistent tendency to link teaching with ‘transformation’, criticality, citizenship, ‘thinking differently about things’, ‘broadening a generation’s horizons’, and the intrinsic value of education, with several participants commenting that a humanities or arts education could bring about a ‘general empowerment’ and prepare students for work ‘all sorts of other spheres’, though they were reluctant to adopt ‘a language of transferable skills’ (Iris). Elaine, for example, commented that one of the main aims motivating her work was the creation of ‘critical’ and ‘independently-thinking’ graduates and an ‘educated citizenry’. A number also professed, such as Debby, Gráinne, and Fergus, to being ‘deeply passionate about teaching non-traditional entrants’ (Gráinne), while Louie and Janet referred to an overriding commitment to preparing students to work in their respective fields of journalism and the visual arts, alongside cultivating criticality and ‘reflexivity’ (Louie). In a similar vein, Matt proffered that, outside his own research, his responsibility was to ‘training the next generation of academic historians, while Quinn, a lecturer and chair of creative writing, spoke of her responsibility to students, both with respect to broadening their minds, and developing their craft so that they could navigate the world of publishing and professional writing.

In summary, when asked about who stood to ‘benefit’ from their work or what ‘purposes it served’, the majority of participants focussed primarily on students – both undergraduate, postgraduate, and in some cases external – as their core stakeholder groups, with interviewees consistently advancing a discourse on the value of HE which could be described as ‘liberal’ in that it emphasised criticality, personal development, learning, empowerment, and the fostering of certain civic virtues as desirable learning outcomes. In some instances – such as in the case of Louie, a journalism lecturer – a vocational perspective was advanced, but one which prioritised professional values such as criticality, integrity, and ‘truth-seeking’ over utilitarianism, while Janet and Patrick, a professor and senior lecturer in the creative arts respectively, spoke of the need to prepare students to develop a portfolio working model in preparation for the precarious world of work as an independent arts practitioner. A significant number

of participants - including Arthur, Janet, Elaine, and Fergus – expressed a discomfort with the effects of a perceived contractualisation of the lecturer-learner relationship, arising out of a broader cultural shift typically related to the ‘marketisation’ or ‘commercialisation’ of undergraduate learning and a growing ‘consumer culture’, with Gráinne referring to the lecturer-learning dynamic becoming progressively a ‘very crude exchange’.

### **Academic Stakeholders.**

After students, the second most cited stakeholder group were academic communities and disciplines as beneficiaries of participants’ scholarship and research, with several - such as Clark and Matt – emphasising that it was from doing research that they derived their ‘core satisfaction’ (Clark). In total, around three quarters of those interviewed described their discipline or academic community as one of the primary groups that their work served. In some cases, participants spoke of a commitment to merely advancing knowledge within their discipline as an intrinsically positive goal, such as when Elaine referred to ‘contributing to ongoing scholarship’ as a primary goal and a ‘good in itself’. Elsewhere, networks of researchers and collaborators within particular disciplinary fields were highlighted as key stakeholders, with several participants also highlighting the importance of pursuing blue skies thinking’, and ‘basic research’ (Clark). Elsewhere, Arthur commented on the importance, for him, of being ‘at the cutting edge of one’s area and to be within ‘a community’ with shared ‘research’ and ‘knowledge’ interests, while Matt referred to having a ‘European academic audience’, and his overriding commitment, beyond his students, being to groups who are interested, both in the academic and non-academic worlds, in history and historical debates.

A number of participants, who ranked research and scholarship as their second-most important activity as academics, were also committed to a more integrated approach to teaching and research. For example, Bernadette, as a lecturer in education, spoke of the necessity for her – and her colleagues – to integrate scholarship and teaching for the purpose of ‘developing more theoretically informed, richer,

more equitable practices' in their field, while Fergus referred to a commitment to engaging, through his research, in the 'co-production' of knowledge with learners inside and outside of the university. And though a significant number of those interviewed identified strongly as academic researchers, there was also a consistent tendency to inveigh against a growing research performance culture driven by metrics and pressures to secure funding.

## **Lay Readerships**

In discussions of their stakeholder groups, a smaller, but significant number of those interviewed attested to the importance of disseminating their work outside of the university, particularly through the creation of accessible works for lay readerships. Clark, for example, for whom 'social utility' was an important principle, felt that reaching 'non-academic audiences' was critical for contemporary academics, and alluded to instances of receiving 'nice feedback' from 'laypersons' who had made use of his policy studies, to which he added that it was incumbent upon academics to try 'to popularise your research'. Elsewhere, Kieran talked about serving the wider community' and supporting 'the impact agenda', as well as the importance of 'writing accessible work' arguing that 'it's quite important that knowledge is disseminated'. Matt also referred to having a strong commitment to developing 'a non-academic audience' for his historical research owing to its general value to 'society'.

## **External Stakeholders, Social and Professional Communities.**

### **Social and Community Stakeholders**

In addition to citing students, academic communities, and lay readerships as key beneficiaries of their work, a significant number of those interviewed looked beyond to ‘society’, communities, and external professional groupings as having an interest in, or standing to benefit from, their work as academics. Around three quarters of participants framed their work as contributing, either in specific or more abstract ways, to what was variously described as ‘society’, ‘the public’, ‘taxpayers’, ‘civil society’, ‘the wider good’, or ‘culture’, while approximately half highlighted the value of their work to various professional, third sector, or policy groups, with the same number again referring to specific ways in which local communities represented one of their key audiences.

‘Why do I do this, what do I hope my- my goal is to make the world a better place’ (Norah).

In keeping with the liberal idea of education as an intrinsic *and* social good advanced by participants, a number of those interviewed described wider society – sometimes in a relatively abstract way – as beneficiary of their work. Clark, for example, attached a strong moral discourse of social utility to his research practice in the area of policy studies, commenting that he was motivated by a desire to use his research to ensure a ‘broader social return’ and ‘ameliorate the way that people live’, primarily through ‘equipping’ them with a ‘richer’ and more ‘critical’ understanding of the political and policy ‘realities’ in which they lived, while others spoke of their work benefiting society through their contributions to ‘culture’, to creating ‘a store of knowledge’, and to developing an ‘educated citizenry’. A number of participants – such as Janet, Patrick, and Norah, also highlighted their work in the arts as a way of pursuing community engagement and contributing to social and cultural development in the locality and region.

In the case of Arthur and Bernadette, education lecturers in a regional ‘Post-92’ university, the social good derived from their work was not conceived abstractly but stemmed from their work in training

professional teachers and advising local schools and government, such that both could attest to observing the outputs of their practice in terms of tangible social benefits for educators, students, and communities. Fergus, who saw his work as assisting in the creation of a ‘less unequal, less unjust, and more sustainable world’, framed this quite abstractly, but also more concretely in terms of the specific initiatives he engaged in to ‘bring the knowledge that we produce in the academy’ into the community. He also referred to his research practice and ‘civil society activism’ as vehicles for him to ‘give back’ to communities in the locality and the region. His university, he added, did not seem serious about engagement and outreach in the city, region, or with specific communities unless it could produce commercially exploitable patents, ‘spin-off companies’ or ‘knowledge transfers’, while for him disinterested outreach was a core academic value. Gráinne, meanwhile, felt that the main value of her work lay in the research she carried out into minority ethnic communities, which had specific tangible social benefits in terms of her work with policy and advocacy groups.

### **Professional Communities**

After students, disciplinary communities, and the public at large, approximately half of the participants group spoke of their commitment to serving the various professional groupings which stood to benefit in some way from their practice. Louie, for example, regarded himself as an ‘academic practitioner’ and so, in addition to training the next generation of ‘reflexive’ and ‘critical’ professional journalists, he felt that his research, which benefited from his position at the intersection of professional journalism and academic research, could provide unique perspectives which were of use to both groups as professional communities. Elsewhere, Janet referred to having ‘a congregation of rather different sorts of stakeholders’ which included not only students and academics, but also art practitioners and galleries, while Hope described a commitment to bringing insights from within the university and academia to educational policy networks, and *vice versa*.

Additionally, Debby, Arthur and Bernadette referred to the value of their work in collaborating with other professional groups in the field of education, at tertiary and non-tertiary levels. Such as when Arthur spoke of his responsibility for spreading ‘good professional knowledge’ and ‘improv(ing) teaching practice’ in

his region, and Bernadette, similarly, utilised a discourse of professional development that emphasised a disinterested and collegial commitment to working with trainee teachers and other external stakeholders to in the pursuit of various broad educational goals. Elsewhere, Debby described her research as being of use to educators ‘who (0.3) need to learn how to (0.2) manage in a (0.3) professional or HE environment’, particularly with respect to teaching ‘communication skills’ and ‘writing English for academic purposes’.

In summary, then, participants were most likely to describe the beneficiaries of – or ‘stakeholders’ in – their work as students, academic disciplines, and ‘society’ or ‘civil society’ more broadly. In most cases, the obligations of academics and universities were framed in terms of values such as the ‘benefit to society’ and the imperative to empower students, as both citizens and learners, with a liberal and critical education. Further to this, a significant number of those interviewed professed to having a commitment to making a contribution to their discipline and to the general store of knowledge, citing other academics, and networks of researchers as groupings that their work ‘served’. Some accompanied this ‘liberal perspective’ with a kind of ‘public service’ repertoire, in which academic work was discussed in terms of ‘public responsibility’, the expectations of the ‘tax payer’, a ‘public service’ ethos, and the requirement for academics to ‘give back’ to ‘community and society’. It is interesting to note that none of those interviewed cited businesses or employers as key stakeholders, though some did allude to a commitment, in more general terms, to contributing towards local and regional social and economic development.

### 5.2.3. Institutional Cultures

Before proceeding to the second stage of the interview schedule, in which participants were asked explicit questions about the concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ academic and university, the interviewer posed the question ‘how does the institutional culture of your university and its values influence your work?’. The purpose of this question was to solicit responses about how participants conceived of their university’s ‘culture’, and their relationship with it. ‘Culture’ is often regarded as a ‘variable’ of organisations, made up of its characteristic shared norms, beliefs, values, symbols, and world-views, which ‘develops in interaction between individual and organization’(Witte and Muijen, 1999, p.585). In this vein ‘shared values and culture’, and not ‘formal control systems’ (Coyle *et al.*, 2013, p.16), are often held up as *the* essential prerequisite for developing entrepreneurial universities. Universities, however, have been described as ‘ambiguity-prone’ organizations made up of ‘multiple constituencies’ of ‘autonomous professional workers’ (Jarzabkowski, Sillince and Shaw, 2010, p.220) with significant ‘internal differences in terms of values, beliefs and symbolism’ (Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2008, p.46). In this respect, this component of the interview schedule was oriented towards exploring participants’ perspectives on the ‘ontology’ of university culture’, but before the concepts of the entrepreneurial university and academic had been introduced into discussion.

Some of the key themes which emerged from these discussions were:

- The difficulty of imagining a whole university ‘culture’
- Growing bureaucracy and administrative workloads
- Centralised ‘managerialist’ and hierarchical cultures, and the devaluation of academic values.
- ‘Marketisation’ and funding.
- Audit, ‘Performance’ Cultures, and Exogenous Factors.

## **The difficulty of Imagining a Whole University ‘culture’**

When asked about the ‘culture’ of their institution, a significant number of participants responded that this was in fact difficult for them to conceptualise, arguing instead that universities were complex, often fragmented, institutions without ‘cohesive’ unitary cultures. Several of the participants also remarked that there was a clear difference between the ‘culture’ of their university – if indeed this could be said to exist – and that of their respective schools, departments, or faculties, which they were more likely to identify with. As this problem became apparent very early on in the data collection period, a follow up question had been prepared, which asked interviewees to consider distinguishing between their university’s ‘official culture’, which was often articulated in its ‘espoused values’ and strategic ‘visions’, and what participants saw as the ‘cultures’ both of the whole university, if this was conceivable, and of their own department. As a consequence, in almost all cases, questions about ‘culture’ tended to be accompanied, by the researcher, with follow-on questions or disclaimers which sought to sensitise the schedule to the emergent theme of the complexity of culture as a phenomenon. In many cases, participants reported identifying, not only with departmental cultures, but with networked assemblages of actors that extended across and between universities, and across national and international contexts, the most frequent example offered being disciplinary communities.

Asked about the relationship between his own role and the ‘culture’ of his university, Arthur recalled his time working in secondary education, and claimed that schools had more ‘cohesive’ cultures than universities because of the narrowly defined outputs’ and relatively ‘homogenous (...) ambitions’ that professional actors in a school setting were able to align themselves around. This cohesive culture allowed teachers to identify with their school and channel their ‘interests, knowledge, and identity’ fully into the collective mission of the school. In using this example, the interviewee associated strong organisational cultures with a mission which is narrow in scope and clearly defined, which he felt was absent in universities, describing them as being more complex, ‘inchoate’ and ‘fragmentary’, made up of professionals with sometimes radically ‘conflicting intentions’ and ‘quite different agendas’. He also suggested that academics were more likely to be driven by the ‘corporate principles’ of their own

disciplines, rather than those espoused by their employing institution, reinforcing a theme that emerged in most of the interviews analysed here – namely that individual academics were more likely to derive their ‘cultural’ values from their disciplinary community and their specific vocation, than from their university.

Debby echoed this view when she commented that she did not feel ‘particularly allied’ with the institutional culture at her university but did with that of her department. With respect to institutional culture, though Quinn had only worked at one university, she imagined that ‘it depends very much on the part of the university you’re in’, adding that it was difficult to conceive of the university as a ‘whole thing’. On the subject of the culture projected by her university, she commented that while she had been ‘slightly involved’ in the writing of its most recent mission statement, these kinds of documents were largely speculative, adding that their central message was typically ‘wouldn’t it be nice if?’. Despite Clark’s view that academics were influenced by the priorities and values that percolated or ‘cascaded’ down from the institution’s ‘funding priorities and strategic priorities’, he also subscribed to the view that academics were more likely to be influenced by the ‘culture’ of their disciplines, than that of their university. To this end, he alluded to the fact that within his discipline there was ‘still, a significant, em, culture of lone scholar (.) research’, which he believed would ‘always be the case’, and although he spoke of emerging pressures on academics to pursue research strategically, he stated that one of the key ways in which he typically got projects ‘off the ground’ was to partner with ‘colleagues elsewhere’ such that ‘institutional priorities have less of an impact’.

Elaine reported that, within her department at least, there was a culture defined not by ideological alignment or shared values *per se*, but by all kinds ‘differences of opinion’, and while there was a minimal ‘shared common ground’ within her faculty, she described this as being ‘at odds’ with that of the values of the ‘central university culture’, to the point where she referred to this dynamic as characterised by ‘directly antagonistic cultures’ and ‘poor relations’. She also reported that meetings between her department and central management often had a very ‘unpleasant atmosphere’ which she found ‘demoralising’. When asked if she felt that there was a ‘interest in finding common ground’ on the part of university management, she responded ‘no’, and that the culture had become very ‘polarised’,

to which she added that even academics who had been recruited into managerial positions were viewed amongst the faculty as ‘taking a line on either side’. Similarly, Fergus, while describing his university’s official culture as being increasingly ‘corporatised’, business-like, and fixated on league-tables and the commercialisation of knowledge, also attested to ‘the local culture not just in my own school but across the faculty certainly (being) resistant to it’, though to express this kind of ‘dissent’ in public was akin to ‘career suicide’.

Bernadette argued that culture was a ‘complex’ subject and questioned whether ‘culture’ was really a matter of ‘organisations’ or if it pertained to ‘a more individualistic level’ and was constituted out of ‘relationships between people’ both within the university and within ‘networks of people’ which exceeded its limits. As with several other participants, she suggested that ‘culture’ was more of a micro-social, rather than institutional, phenomenon, and that there was a kind of schism between culture conceived at the organisational, or at the individual or network level. Part of academic work, she claimed, involved negotiating this division, and she reported that some of her colleagues ‘managed that division extraordinarily well’ by ‘finding the right sorts of networks of people’ both within and beyond their institutions. Culture then, was theorised here as a matter of assemblages that could exist within individual institutions, but which was not bound by them. Her firm belief was that, although university culture was a kind of ‘social construct’, such that it had no ‘essential’ existence, it still had the potential to be treated as ‘real’ and to influence peoples’ perceptions, even if, upon reflection, we were aware of its constructedness.

Owen reported, with respect to the ‘official culture’, that there was ‘a massive gap between their vision statements (...) and the reality on the ground’, describing an idealised image presented by university managers of a ‘hospitable place for academics and students’ which, in his experience, the ‘real culture’ was not. Instead, he commented that there was a low value placed on teaching, and that his university had ‘a Taylorist approach to managerialism’ which entailed ‘total control over what people do, increasing bureaucratisation, increasing (.) auditing regimes which impact d- dramatically upon, emmm (.) both the real-world quality, the objective quality of peoples’ work, and their subjective experience of their work’.

In some cases, participants argued that the decentralised or collegiate structure of their university actively worked against the possibility of it having a cohesive institutional culture. Iris, who had previously been 'heavily involved in university administration', reported that her university, a large 'ancient' institution, was, as many tended to expect, much 'less managerial as most universities are now' and more 'decentralised', such that it was difficult to speak of an 'institutional culture'. For her, the 'most important reference point' culturally was that of her own faculty, which had changed 'completely' in her thirty years' employment, most recently as a result of the faculty having to 'become (.) much more cohesive and strategic in order to negotiate external pressures in a way that just wasn't necessary in say, the early eighties'. Elsewhere, Owen also reported to being able to identify positively with the culture of his department, stating that 'there is a sense of camaraderie here between people, and I derive a lot of satisfaction from that', because that means that 'I'm willing to stay here', 'it just makes it a bit more tolerable'.

Hope was an outlier in that she described a positive and coherent institutional culture, particularly as she played an active role – in her policy position – in helping her university to 'crystallise' its 'culture' and 'ethos' and present it publicly to policy makers and government. However, she also alluded to a distinctive departmental culture which she was exposed to as a result of her work in academic history. Here, she reported experiencing an 'academic culture' characterised by 'a more tightly-knit web of obligations and, sort of mutual support'. She further stated that she did not believe that 'cultures are always homogenous' but that 'generally', she had found, there was a 'kind of energy' at her university that 'they might not be able to put their finger on'. Kieran was positive about the 'close-knit' and 'collegial' character of his own department, describing it as 'a very good environment- working environment' with a 'very stable core' of academic staff members, and less turnover than seemed to be the norm, but noted that his faculty had faced challenges in adapting to his university's 'business-facing' brand. Ultimately, this was resolved by an effort by managers within his faculty to reinterpret the institutions cultural message in terms that were more acceptable within the humanities, implying a process of 'negotiated translation'.

In addition to the complexity of university 'culture' as a phenomenon, participants did report, when asked about their respective institutions' cultures, a number of more tangible changes that they had observed in recent years. These were coded and gradually refined into three broad headings, including 'Growing bureaucracy and administrative workloads', 'Centralised 'managerialist' and hierarchical cultures', 'Marketisation and funding', and 'Audit, "performance" Cultures, and Exogenous Factors'.

### **Growing Bureaucracy and Administrative Workloads.**

A considerable number of those interviewed reported that they had growing or unsustainable workloads, particularly with respect to the administrative burden placed on academics by university management. This was also frequently contrasted with perceived popular misconceptions about the realities of academic work, such as when Clark reported that he often had to emphasise to outsiders how little time was spent engaged in what people perceive to be the 'core business' of his profession, namely 'teaching' and 'research'.

'I find that there's again this big lack of understanding in terms of- of how your daily life actually is (...) I would usually say that you know it's actually mostly about, em, things such as, as administration, management, em, and much less about teaching and research than you might imagine' (Clark).

One of the key ways in which the culture of institutions did impact on the nature and meaning of academic work-life, for the majority of those interviewed, was through the gradual bureaucratisation of universities. This, most participants agreed, had increased the administrative burden on academics, displacing other core activities – such as teaching, research, and scholarship.

'The more of the admin that is invested in the academics, the less benefit the university is getting from the - the highly trained and highly skilled academic potential of the academic staff, and I personally think that's, emmm, a misuse of resources, you know?' (Janet).

For Janet, disproportionate administrative workloads, with individual tasks which sometimes took ‘several whole days’ to complete, were not merely an unwelcome intrusion into the academic cloister, but were, in fact, tremendously wasteful. Where this was most acutely felt, she claimed, was in the area of scholarship, adding that academics barely had the time to ‘keep up with the latest, at minimum keep up with the latest scholarship in the field’, which was what ‘enabled you’ to keep your teaching up-to-date. Janet painted a picture of an institutional culture in which academic role complexity and a pushing out of administrative workloads from the centre was impacting on the core teaching and research mission of the university.

Owen also pointed to increasing bureaucracy with ‘increasing audit regimes’ and ‘new forms’ and ‘procedures’ which exercise ‘ever more control over what I can do, over what my students can do’, stating:

‘Subjectively, it leads to an increasing sense of isolation from the institution, when I joined to be honest with you I thought (university name), it’s a well-respected university (.) emm, corporate identification for me is gone’ (Owen).

Patrick also described his university as ‘hierarchical’ and ‘obsessed with controlling everything’, though often bureaucratic initiatives would fail, because of the ‘law of unintended consequences’, as there was typically ‘too much of a distance between what they set and what happens on the ground’. Though, to some extent, Patrick’s university typically allowed him to ‘just get on and do our own things’, he was critical of the bureaucracy of the institution and the various ‘forms to be filled’ and work and time ‘allocation summaries’ that he needed to complete, questioning the value of these statistics as, for the most part, ‘you just make up the figures as you go along’. ‘This part’ of the job, he added, he had ‘little short of contempt for’.

## **‘Centralised ‘managerialist’ and Hierarchical cultures.**

In addition to reporting a tendency towards ‘bureaucratisation’, a significant number of participants described their universities as having become more ‘centralised’ and ‘managerialist’, with several referring to a growing schism between ‘academic’ and ‘management’ cultures, and some more specifically to a devaluing of the cultural values of non-STEM disciplines.

In this regard, Bernadette described her institution as having developed a ‘highly pragmatic’ and ‘managerialist’ orientation, which she contrasted with her more ‘ethical’ and ‘humanistic’ approach to teaching. Debby also referred to her university as having developed a top-heavy and ‘antagonistic’ managerial culture with which her faculty was regularly at odds, while Owen described his university management style as entailing ‘increasing bureaucratisation, auditing regimes’, and growing ‘control’ on the part of central management.

This had also resulted, he claimed, in a kind of ‘surveillance culture’ in which the university used auditing an accountability structures to exercise ‘ever more control’ over what he could do as an academic.

‘the sea-change that’s come over universities in the last thirty-five, thirty years is- is, a shift from a kind of (.) flat system (0.1) where people were, by and large, just allowed to get on with their jobs, to a much more hierarchical system’ (Matt).

Matt, who was employed at a relatively decentralised collegiate university, reported feeling that a more ‘hierarchical’ management culture had evolved in recent years, despite the ‘federal’ college structure affording a ‘degree more of protection’ meaning that ‘to some extent’ things ‘move forward by consensus rather than by (.) diktats’. In some cases, participants reported that the more centralised cultures that had developed in their university had replaced ‘academic’ with ‘managerial’ values, resulting in a kind of cultural ‘polarisation’ (Elaine) between the university’s centre and its peripheries. Elaine, in particular, described this polarisation as indicative of a tendency for non-STEM values to be

underrepresented at management level, despite her humanities faculty performing well ‘by all of the sort of key performance indicators and targets’.

### **‘Marketisation’ and Funding.**

A significant number of participants reported that their universities, partly in response to changes in the HE funding landscape, had come to prioritise income generation above all else, whether with respect to research or other third-stream activities. For Debby, this had been damaging to the university’s traditional missions, particularly with respect to teaching. Fergus was also critical of what he perceived as a growing ‘marketisation’ within his university, which he described as involving ‘the (.) commercialisation (.) of- of knowledge (.) and the co-option of the University as an adjunct to (.) the market effectively’. This had resulted in an institution with an ‘official culture’ which he interpreted as sending out a message that the university was a ‘business’ with a ‘corporate’ and ‘brand’-driven orientation. Such was his university’s emphasis on research funding income and brand capital that it had taken on the aspiration of becoming ‘a research led university of international excellence’, which for him was a homogenous brand that had severed the institution’s ‘obligations to our local community’.

Gráinne reported that, despite initially being excited about her university’s strategic decision to adopt a more ‘outward-facing’ posture, after an ‘initial flurry of change and transformation’ the university’s strategy had devolved into an overarching imperative for academics to ‘bring in money’ at all costs. She added that the ‘default position’ of her university, today, appeared to be that ‘all academics are lazy’ and that they need to be pressurised into attracting funding and being ‘seen to be doing stuff outside the institution’. Academics were also increasingly pressurised to be competitive with other institutions, ‘rather than maybe the collegial (.) sort of (.) networks that you would have had in the past’.

A number of participants were also critical of the extent to which the marketisation of student funding, and an emergent student ‘consumer’ culture was affecting their universities’ attitudes towards learning and teaching, particularly with respect to the ‘skills’ and ‘employability’ agendas. Elaine noted that, whilst she acknowledged the need to ensure that students were being equipped to leverage their

education in an increasingly competitive labour market, she was critical of what she perceived as the potential for both the 'skills agenda' and her university's 'highly pragmatic, managerialist' culture to make 'private sector' values dominant in universities. Debby felt that 'the notion of students as customers' appeared to 'drive everything' for senior management, which had alienated her from the institution, and compelled her to think 'I don't recognise this place, do I actually work here?' Kieran also pointed to what he perceived as a growing consumerist culture, driven by changing student expectations, and though he believed that the student population was 'diverse', he was concerned 'that increasingly a significant section of the study body' had come to view the university as 'a bit like a sausage factory' where knowledge was a commodity and degrees were treated as 'pieces of paper' which students pursued for 'an edge in the job market'.

'On the whole I think the university- the university's values are the right ones for a big business, however I don't think that those values, uhhh, universally play themselves out in the same way across the university' (Norah).

Norah confessed to feeling 'ambivalent' about her university's culture, based on the idea that while she understood that the 'university is a big business' and 'in order to allow me to do the things that I need to do the university has to ma(h)ke mone(h)y', she was, on another level, 'very uncomfortable with a lot of the things that this university – that are the university's mission statements'. She added that while she understood 'what the government framework' was and was 'not naïve' about the practical challenges of the university sector, the strategic positioning and identity of her university, on the whole, left her slightly uncomfortable, particularly with regards to its emphasis on 'generating income'.

Patrick was also critical of a tendency for the university to prioritise research above all else and recounted a 'newly appointed professor' in his faculty who, because he had secured a 'prestigious research reward', had 'bought himself' out not only of teaching, but of seemingly any institutional responsibilities, adding that he found this 'very notion antithetical to anything (that) brought me into university'. He described an encounter in which he and his colleagues were told that they would not 'be seeing' said professor 'for three years' and feeling at the time that the individual would likely take a job elsewhere when his research project was completed. He remarked that the university seemed 'delighted

about this’ and that that taught him a lot about ‘the things that the institution values’ above all else – namely, research funding and prestige’.

### **Audit, ‘Performance’ Cultures, and Exogenous Factors.**

Closely related to both ‘bureaucratisation’ and funding focus, participants also pointed to an all-consuming trend towards universities elaborating new forms of accountability and technocratic methodologies for measuring the performance and quality of academic work as part of a broader ‘audit culture’, though in many cases participants attributed these developments to pressured coming from outside of the university, such as in relation to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and the creation of a quasi-market in student tuition.

Despite the relatively decentralised and *laissez faire* management of her university, Iris reported that the ‘pressures of, you know, measurement and evaluation’ had grown during her time as an academic, and become increasingly prevalent in recent years, though she attributed this both to changes in the university’s management, and to developments in the external ‘environment’. Elsewhere, Matt – who was employed by the same university – complained about a changing culture of management ‘wanting you to do things, fill in forms, report back, look for external funding, *etcetera, etcetera*’, which sometimes made him feel like a micro-managed ‘industrial worker’. Elsewhere, Janet described the prevailing research culture, which had in recent years become a priority focus in her already bureaucratised and performance-driven university, as a matter of ‘translating something that should be about something qualitative into something that can be measured quantitatively and alluded to a ‘heavy-handed’ culture of ‘audit’ and ‘research performance’, as well as a ‘heavy stress on accountability’. However, she attributed much of this to a broader sectoral audit and performance culture within which research had come increasingly ‘to be measured and valued by funding generated and PhD students attracted’ and not by ‘the context within which intellectual debates that are productive and creative take place.’ For her, the research environment was too performance-driven, and insufficiently scholarly, driven primarily by the priorities

of funders. Elaine also argued that research performance measures such as citation indices that typically tend to be driven by, and more applicable to, STEM research, had gradually become hegemonic – despite resistance from academics in the humanities and related disciplines.

In teaching too, Janet noted that university efforts to track and audit student feedback were having the effect of contractualising lecturer-student relationships and were driven more by performance measurement than by a real ‘concern for learning’. However, she also remarked that this was partly because of university governance at the local level, and partly due to exogenous factors such as the national student survey (NSS). This idea, that the pressures shaping academic and universities’ ‘cultures’ were, in many respects, coming ‘from outside’, was something that recurred throughout the interviews, with participants regularly citing the research excellence framework (REF), the NSS, university league-tables, and the increase in university tuition fees as forces which had altered the character of universities more than any Vice Chancellor or managerialist intervention.

In this respect, Clark theorised that a university’s ‘culture’ was typically a matter of the strategic focus of its managers, which in turn were conditioned by a desire to ‘take advantage of opportunities’ and ‘minimise risks’ in response to shifting external policy and funding landscapes, which was something that was affecting UK universities acutely. Similarly, Fergus observed that his university’s culture was being shaped by its development of a reputation as ‘a research-led university of international excellence’ and its fixation on ‘matrices’, ‘league tables’, and ‘impact factors’, while Owen felt that his institution’s ‘pipe dream’ of becoming a research-led international university was undermining its existing reputation as a ‘good regional university’. This emphasis on league tables and research performance was something echoed by Patrick, who worked at the same institution as Fergus and Owen and remarked that academics were under increasing pressures from a culture in which research was ‘given much more emphasis than anything else’, and the National Student Survey and university league tables featured prominently in university governance.

Elsewhere, Iris commented that within her ‘ancient’ collegiate institution, her *faculty* itself had adopted a more strategic outward-facing posture in response to the need to ‘negotiate external pressures in a way that just wasn’t necessary in say, the early eighties’, particularly in relation to research funding. Matt, who

was employed by the same university, felt that the pressures of the RAE and REF had encouraged a culture of needing to 'churn out' research and funding applications, as well as new forms of accountability undermining academic autonomy. He alluded on several occasions to the necessity to 'preserve academic values' in the face of the mounting demands of the contemporary research culture, remarking that as long as 'most academics remain true to their goal which is the progress of (0.2) science and research, emmm, and regard the whole impact agenda with emm, slightly ironically', then he would be more optimistic about the threat of these new pressures to traditional academic missions.

### 5.3 Findings - The Entrepreneurial University

Part B1 of the interview commenced with the researcher relating to participants that their university had ‘positioned itself publicly as being entrepreneurial’, before asking them what they thought that this ‘means’. Responses to this question, and commentary on the idea of the entrepreneurial university drawn from across each interview, have been summarised here under the following headings:

- The Entrepreneurial University as an Economic Concept, including:
  - a) The Entrepreneurial University and Values Conflict
- Broad Conceptions of the Entrepreneurial University, including:
  - a) Community Engagement and the Social Mission
  - b) Responses to External Factors, including Research Funding and Brand Identity

#### **The Entrepreneurial University as an Economic Concept**

‘But let me get to the real nub of this, there’s no such thing as an entrepreneurial university, there’s entrepreneurial businesses, ok, there’s entrepreneurs, but not an entrepreneurial university (...) I think it’s doing that because it now sees itself primarily as a business, it has ceased to see itself truly as a university, emm (0.1) as an institution of education’ (Owen).

Although a number of participants were able to elaborate or countenance a broader ‘activity’ or ‘quality’ sense of the entrepreneurial university, the majority associated it with the values of ‘business’ or the ‘markets and were sceptical about the extent to which universities were articulating an inclusive model of ‘enterprise’ in their communications, regardless of the rhetoric deployed by university leaders. Some felt quite strongly that the idea of the entrepreneurial university had no broader meaning and was merely a matter of universities coming increasingly to see themselves as ‘businesses’ or ‘large corporations’, with Owen stating that ‘I’ve nothing against the private sector, you know, I think relationships with the private sector are absolutely appropriate, and right, but we shouldn’t turn ourselves into a business,

‘cause we’re not a business, and we can’t even compete with businesses, we just don’t have the, we ought not to have that kind of culture’.

Arthur viewed the entrepreneurial university as a manifestation of the ‘cultural values’ of what he called ‘the business agenda’, viewing it as an ideological imposition from outside the university system. Elaine, a Professor of education, described the entrepreneurial university as evidence that they, as institutions, were succumbing ‘to the language and the values of the market’, increasingly adopting a ‘business ethos’ and regarding students as ‘customers’. Both Clark and Fergus alluded to being cognisant of the broad meaning potential of ‘entrepreneurialism’, but both felt that, in the United Kingdom at least, it tended to be ‘corralled into a very narrow perspective’ that focussed on income generation, ‘spin off companies’, and ‘proper entrepreneurship’ (Fergus). Elsewhere, Debby, when asked for her own definition of the entrepreneurial university, responded that it signified an institution which had added external income generation to its traditional missions of teaching and research, while Iris speculated that it referred to an institution being, in a sense, a ‘business organisation which has to think about how to bring in the income that will allow it to be the kind of university it wants to be’.

For Arthur, the danger of this entrepreneurial paradigm was that it naturalised the idea that universities were a ‘kind of production business’ and that they would over time become ‘more visible as a business entity, rather than a purely cultural and socially beneficial entity’. This notion, that the entrepreneurial model represented a normalisation of the idea that universities were primarily ‘economic’ entities was taken up by Bernadette, for whom the entrepreneurial university seemed to signify most clearly ‘that economic relationships matter’. Elsewhere, participants related that this expressed itself in the increasing tendency for ‘economic viability’ to take precedence over all other criteria in the evaluation of proposed programmes and projects, which were expected to be ‘revenue generating’, if not ‘cost neutral’ (Clark).

‘The entrepreneurial University is itself acting as a business in a global market, competing for students, for research funding, for top-rated academics, in a way that businesses would operate, in terms of increasing their market share’ (Fergus).

Arthur also suggested that the enterprise university meant moving from a more 'social' or 'cultural' mode to a more 'economic mode' primarily driven by an imperative to be 'either maintaining current income or increasing it', or 'gaining a bit of market share which could put a university at an advantage compared with other institutions'. Clark also noted that the entrepreneurial university, in the parlance of UK HE policy at least, was difficult to untangle from what he called the commercialisation agenda', which he associated with 'economics', 'income generation', industry-linkages, and 'generating as much money from' research commercialisation as one could.

'I think this culture shift is much more about, em (0.5) pretty much about money-making and about trying to reposition Universities as, eh, institutions which can (0.2) if not become self-supporting in all cases (0.3) move towards being profit-making and get as close to that as they can.' (Clark).

In some cases, the entrepreneurial model was described as a form of 'privatisation', such as when Clark commented that it was part of a gradual shift from universities being 'state-funded to being (.) either, you know privately funded' or 'looking to become profit-making institutions on some basis or other', and suggested that this was not a case of university's responding strategically to external changes in their environment, but a deliberate, long-term effort by successive governments to privatise universities through the slow marketisation of their operating environments. Though Norah, a professor of performance studies, accepted that her regional 'post-92' university's 'strong' enterprise 'positioning' was a pragmatic response to the 'political and economic circumstances' of UK HE, she professed a 'deep ambivalence' about the entrepreneurial mission, describing herself as uncomfortable with the emphasis on 'making money'. To this end, she also referred to her 'fear' that particular disciplines and schools which were less amenable to, or capable of, raising money would eventually be 'left behind' by the entrepreneurial university.

'Parts have to work together, and there will always be parts that make money, and parts that don't, so my fear with that is that there will be people who are left behind because not every one of the university's mission's needs— everybody needs to be forward thinking, but not everyone needs to make money' (Norah).

In some instances, participants made reference to the traditional 'business sense' of enterprise as something which had always been a feature of their university's identity, rather than an extrinsic imposition or a fashionable 're-branding' exercise. This was particularly true of institutions three, a regional 'post-92' public research university and former polytechnic, and two, a 'plate-glass' public research university and former technical school. In each case, participants cited an established tradition of industry-linkage, primarily through work placement, consultancy, and applied research, giving their university a distinctly 'entrepreneurial' ethos which had been present throughout its history. For example, Debby reported that although she had no experience of her university communicating an explicitly 'entrepreneurial' mission, she felt that it had 'always been an entrepreneurial university' because it had historically established links with local industries through its programme design, and the appointment of industry figures to managerial roles.

Similarly, Louie, from a 'plate-glass' university, which had started its institutional life as a technical college, alluded to it having always had an 'external positioning' as a result of it historically being 'very closely related to the workplace because of its core activities', and having 'always had close relationships with industry'. Elsewhere, Owen and Patrick both alluded to their university's historical successes 'working with private firms' (Owen), with Owen positing that the entrepreneurial mission was about 'rolling that out as a model for the whole university', which he found 'deeply problematic'. Here, though, participants like Louie and Debby still associated the entrepreneurial model primarily with industry-linkage and commercialisable research, they proffered that this was not a new development for their respective institutions, regardless of change in the rhetoric used by university managers. Similarly, Patrick and Owen suggested that this orientation was part of the heritage of individual faculties and schools which had traditionally had a culture of producing commercialisable outputs, which was now being promoted throughout the university under the guise of 'entrepreneurialism'.

## The Entrepreneurial University and Values Conflict

‘In the first couple of years it actually alienated me from the university, it made me feel angry about working here, emmm, I felt that I didn’t share its values, I felt that I was being preached to, emmm, and it made me unhappy, I can honestly say that enterprise at the university- the enterprise university made me unhappy to the point where I did think about leaving’ (Norah).

A significant number of the study’s participants alluded to the idea of the entrepreneurial university as an indicator of a general colonisation of HE by values drawn from other domains of practice, generally at the expense of what were variously described as traditional ‘academic’, ‘public sector’ or ‘collegial’ values. Norah, for example, referred to the entrepreneurial university as a kind of ‘business’ or ‘capitalist model’ which threatened the traditional ‘overarching values of the university to educate, to lead, (and) to provide opportunity’.

For Clark, the development of this model was symptomatic of a tendency for people from ‘outside’ to enter HE and change what ‘universities are’ who were ‘never really that conscious of it anyway, what HE is supposed to be for’. Similarly, Owen’s reported view was that his university had embraced the entrepreneurial mission and ‘a much broader culture of commercialisation’ because it was being led by ‘key decision makers (who) are not people who are genuine academics, they come from a managerial culture’. In this regard, Owen suggested that the entrepreneurial posture was not a necessary response to prevailing external circumstances, but instead an expression of a ‘broader culture of commercialisation’ which universities were ‘happily embracing’ because of the values of their central leaderships. In his own university, Owen reported, the most powerful member of central management was ‘an accountant’ who he described as being fundamentally out of touch with academic values and imperatives and the idea that a ‘good university’ was, essentially, an ‘institution of education’ and not a ‘corporation’.

Elaine expressed that view that the entrepreneurial model was an expression of universities succumbing to ‘the language and the values of the market’, which for academics, was an issue of ‘personal morale’, while also an indication of universities, which she thought ‘embodied all of the best qualities of the

public sector', becoming captured by 'private sector' which recast universities as businesses and students as 'customers', a development which she described as 'invidious' and as 'decimating the key values' of universities. Fergus argued that such were the pervasiveness of market values in his university, that they had completely overwhelmed considerations of 'inequality', 'democracy', and 'ethics' in its efforts to 'expand into new markets' in territories with problematic human rights records, speculating that there was unlikely to be any references to 'producing critical citizens' in their memorandums of understanding.

Many of the participants, though they were committed to student employability, felt that this agenda had resulted in a 'cultural' shift within universities in which employability was entangled with the entrepreneurial mission in a way which was fundamentally at odds their own discipline's pedagogical traditions. Here, participants advanced traditional humanist and liberal pedagogical discourses which were typically framed as being threatened by the emergence a student consumer culture and an associated performative regime which evaluated teaching on the basis of quantitative indicators of quality including student feedback. Though this learning culture was often associated with external forces such as the marketisation of student tuition fees, or pressure from the NSS, many participants suggested that these developments were linked in some way to the entrepreneurial university. For example, Elaine, discussing the entrepreneurial mission at her 'Red Brick' regional research university, stated that one of its manifestations was a single-minded focus with which her university seemed to be seeking to embed employability across programmes and syllabi, adding that her teaching 'had not changed' despite these expectations, and that humanities graduate employability was distinct from that of other, more vocationally oriented, programmes. Elaine summarised this development as a shift towards a model of money, and balance sheets rather than about 'delivering quality education'.

Matt also associated the entrepreneurial university with a growing culture of treating 'the student as a consumer', which he remarked, 'fills most of us with horror', representing a threat to the traditional pedagogical relationship between lecturer and student, and exemplifying the growing commodification of universities. Owen, who professed to feeling 'very strongly' about his university's entrepreneurial culture, suggested that it was symptomatic of an institution that saw 'itself primarily as a business,' and

not as an 'institution of education. He was highly critical of his university's appointment of 'entrepreneurial' educators and 'entrepreneurs in residence', arguing that they had no place in higher education. For him, entrepreneurialism was something that one learned 'through practice' in the domain of private business, and he found it 'bizarre' that universities were now promoting the idea that it could be 'taught'.

Elsewhere, Fergus, discussing the relationship between the entrepreneurial university 'brand' and the cultural salience of the myth of the entrepreneur, embodied in figures such as 'Richard Branson' and 'Gordon Gecko', and the popularity of reality TV formats such as 'The Dragon's Den', argued that the values which these phenomena epitomised were 'particularly corrosive' and 'absolutely antithetical' to the values of universities and HE. He also suggested that the entrepreneurial model was more likely to gain 'traction' in the 'natural sciences' and with 'engineers' but was inconsistent with the 'critical' values of the 'arts, humanities, and social sciences'. Elsewhere, a participant expressed disapproval of forms of 'entrepreneurial' education and training that seemed oriented towards turning students into 'these Dragon's Den type head-cases', which he felt was inappropriate for the university, and certainly had no place in his discipline or school. Though he had no issue with universities training people 'to go into the private sector', he found this kind of 'behavioural' entrepreneurial teaching model to be contrary to the pedagogical values of the university.

Many of the study's participants suggested that, though they had developed strategies to adapt to the entrepreneurial paradigm or had witnessed very little concrete change in their working lives, they were concerned about what the entrepreneurial university model might mean for the future of their disciplines. Clark, a political scientist related that disciplines such as his own were 'less likely (.) to be able to fit with that kind of, of, emm of emphasis' on the basis that it was less amenable to commercialisation.

The majority of those interviewed felt that the entrepreneurial university was a less problematic proposition for STEM disciplines, who were better placed to engaged in activities such as knowledge transfer and exploitation, research commercialisation, and external consultancy. In this respect, Fergus argued that the idea had 'more traction on the natural sciences and engineers' but in the 'arts, humanities

and social Sciences' it was generally resisted both because of the difficulty they faced in commercialising their research, and the incompatibility of the entrepreneurial model with their 'critical', 'questioning', and non-utilitarian disciplinary values. Norah, though she expressed a pragmatic acceptance of the entrepreneurial university model and its need for 'making money' to sustain itself, also professed to feeling a 'deep ambivalence' and discomfort about the overriding emphasis on income generation, and though she was not opposed to the idea that academics and their departments be 'forward thinking', adding that this was better than being in a 'stuck institution' that was resistant to change', for her 'making money' was core to the entrepreneurial mission, and she believed that this was not something that could become an all-university capacity, adding that she 'feared' that some parts of the university would 'be left behind'.

### **Broad Conceptions of the Entrepreneurial University.**

Although the majority of those interviewed showed a tendency to associate the entrepreneurial university with what Norman Fairclough has called its 'business' sense, linking it with 'market values', 'commercialisation', and universities being operated 'like businesses', a number of participants did refer to being cognisant of some of the more inclusive ways in which universities and academics were sometimes conceptualised as 'entrepreneurial'.

### **Community Engagement and the Social Mission.**

Several of the participants reported to having an understanding of the way in which the 'entrepreneurial university' was sometimes used to signify an institution that adopted a broad 'outward-facing' orientation towards working more closely with, and to the benefit of, local communities and non-academic audiences. Arthur described this as the 'social sense' of the entrepreneurial university, in which it 'tries to be part of the local community', develops a 'regional identity', and engages in work that has a 'local resonance'. In his own institution, he reported that this had been articulated as part of

the entrepreneurial mission but that, in his view – it was subordinated to the idea of enterprise as chiefly involving ‘income generation’

Clark, similarly pointed to an alternative ‘social’ model of the entrepreneurial university as an institution that was responsive to regional social and economic needs, worked to identify opportunities to bridge the gap between the academic and non-academic worlds and create public value, though he considered that this model was not a feature of the HE landscape in Britain, but a continental European phenomenon. Elsewhere, Fergus alluded to an understanding of this broad ‘outward-facing’ model of the entrepreneurial university, but remarked that, in his experience, his university’s rhetoric and actions tended to speak in a ‘fairly minimal’ way about its ‘connections’ and ‘obligations’ to the city and region, which had a long history of post-industrial decline and deprivation. Patrick, who was employed by the same institution, shared this view, and stated that, despite its broad entrepreneurial rhetoric, he found himself ‘continuously at odds with the prevailing culture of the university’, particularly with respect to how it had come to neglect its historical position as *the* institution looked to as the region’s main centre of education and training in favour becoming a ‘global’ university.

Bernadette claimed that her university’s articulation of the concept had originally been overwhelmingly ‘economic’, but they had later come to adopt the ‘social enterprise’ model as a means to ‘readdress’ staff misgivings. It was in this space – where enterprise represented a ‘social’ phenomenon, that she felt her discipline, education, was ‘intended to operate’. Ultimately, however, Bernadette felt that though her university’s management had ‘made a huge effort in order to make us aware of this agenda and to try and embed it within the practices that we use’, they had not been successful in ‘shifting hearts and minds’. Fergus also reported that within his own university, there had been a drive for students to engage in ‘social enterprise’ as part of the broader ‘official University push for entrepreneurship’, though he felt that this was primarily viewed not as a good in itself, but as an ‘as anteroom to proper entrepreneurship’ and argued that the model of the entrepreneur typically promoted by his university was of ‘the individual, lone, romantic, heroic capitalist’, rather than a model of making ‘the world a better place by working together collectively’.

Two participants, Kieran and Hope, who worked at a ‘post-92’ research university, and had both had a specific remit for promoting their university’s entrepreneurial mission in their respective associate head of school and policy roles, advanced a positive discourse on the entrepreneurial university which was broadly in line with the ‘social’ and ‘outward facing’ institution that other participants had described as a conception that they were aware of, but which was typically subordinated to the ‘economic’ or ‘business’ entrepreneurial archetype. For Kieran, ‘entrepreneurialism’ or ‘cultural entrepreneurialism’ was a model that he was happy to ‘espouse’, and he recounted that his humanities school had actively developed an ‘entrepreneurial’ identity – in the inclusive sense of the term- as a negotiated response to what was then his university’s ‘business-facing’ brand, which he and his colleagues had found ‘problematic’.

### **Responses to External Factors, including Research Funding and Brand Identity.**

‘I think what it means is that the university wants to be able to compete in a global economy, that it understands that in order to fulfil all of its missions it must be able to sustain itself, emmm, therefore in order to sustain itself it needs to be forward-looking, it needs to make money to do it, it needs to be innovative’ (Norah).

The majority of those interviewed expressed that, even where they had reservations about the idea of the entrepreneurial university, and associated it negatively with commercialisation or privatisation, they appreciated that it was, in some sense, a necessary strategic response to the economic and political challenges of the environments in which their institutions now operated. The external ‘environments’ or ‘climates’ alluded to by participants typically took four forms. The first of these, and the most significant, was a general uncertainty about state funding of the university system, and the second a concomitant increase in the pressure on universities to broaden their funding base through the pursuit of income generation from research, consultancy, commercialisation and third-stream activities. Iris, for example, commented that the pressures place on academics today to ‘perform’ and be more

‘strategic’ were not necessarily because ‘the university tries to create (.) a highly competitive environment so much as that's just the way the world is changing’.

Thirdly, participants pointed to a marketised consumer culture which was putting pressure on universities to compete for their share of domestic and international tuition income, with some participants further alluding to the expansion of a performative audit culture associated with phenomena such as university league tables and the REF. Norah, a professor in a regional, ‘post-92’ university with a strong entrepreneurial branding, associated this orientation with a strategic response to the ‘current political and economic circumstances’ of HE.

‘E- every post-1992 university now (0.2) is thinking about what makes them distinctive (0.1) with the (.) new fees regime that comes in, it is more and more going to be a question of “why I should go to that university”’ (Kieran).

Arthur regarded the entrepreneurial model as an expression of marketisation and the ‘cultural values’ of the ‘business agenda’, but also accepted that as a consequence of reduced state funding, and increased competition for students, it represented, in part, an imperative for universities to become more ‘cost-conscious’ and derive financial benefit from ‘whatever source’ possible. Many respondents (including Arthur, Fergus, Janet, Quinn and Owen), whilst critical of the entrepreneurial university as an expression of marketisation, acknowledged the pressures on universities to preserve their current funding base, or to compete within the quasi-markets in students, funding, and research grants that have, in recent decades, come to shape the HE landscape. Owen, though he felt ‘deeply, deeply, deeply troubled’ by the entrepreneurial university model, also remarked that it was, at least in part, a reaction to ‘the state not being willing to put money into education, and the universities having to look elsewhere for funding’ through either ‘raising fees’ or ‘through private sector entanglements’.

Janet described the university’s entrepreneurial positioning as a ‘response to, eh, the fees hike’ and the imperative be ‘attractive’ to students by bringing to the fore aspects of existing course provision – such as placement and industry- and repackaging them as a distinct, marketable education offering that promised better vocational outcomes. Kieran, similarly, while promoting a positive discourse of ‘cultural entrepreneurialism’ as an operating model for humanities disciplines, also proposed that for the university,

‘entrepreneurialism’ as a strategic response to changes in the market for students had ‘to be seen in terms of recruitment’. Quinn, noted however, that although entrepreneurialism can represent a response to increasing student fees and competition, the irony is that ‘people spend (0.2) less time teaching and more time doing kind of strange endeavours (0.3) emmm, to try to earn money’, resulting in students getting ‘a worse deal’. Ultimately, however, on the university positioning itself as ‘entrepreneurial’ she commented that ‘I don’t think it has any option’.

This idea, that a kind of competitive and marketised logic which necessitated an ‘entrepreneurial’ response was being driven, not by university leaders, but by exogenous factors such as government divestment, the REF, national and international league tables, and to some extent, the NSS, was consistently articulated by participants. Arthur labelled this the ‘competitive context’, adding that it was not a new phenomenon for UK universities, before speculating that the entrepreneurial university model might be an expression of this broad ‘cultural shift’ in which ‘economic considerations’ had come further and further to the fore in all matters related to UK HE. Matt attested to a growing strategic orientation towards performative measures of quality and excellence in the form of university ranking and league tables, adding that his ancient’ university was increasingly coming to view itself and other universities as antagonists in a competitive market, and as such was becoming more strategic and bureaucratic in nature, which was ‘a long way from the university world where I started’.

Typically, participants would describe the idea of the entrepreneurial university as a strategic response to the demands of a changing external environment in terms which suggested that they saw this development not as an expression of institutional dynamism and innovation, but as a pragmatic or unavoidable response to prevailing circumstances. Elaine, for example, felt that though she considered her university ‘declaring itself’ an ‘entrepreneurial’ institution as ‘part of that (.) wider culture’ of ‘money-making’, ‘rationalisation’, and ‘employability’, she also suspected that this orientation was not ‘entirely of its own choosing’, being ‘partly driven by government decisions and so on’.

Ultimately, while a number of participants struck a tone of pragmatic acceptance in their discussions of the entrepreneurial university as a strategic response to external challenges, they typically expressed an unwillingness to identify with the entrepreneurial model and were critical of the values that it embodied,

such as when Norah stated that while she could ‘accept that the university needs to be this way’, she herself did not have to identify with it, and in her day-to-day practice tried to ‘ignore’ it because of the way in which it conflicted with her own professional ethos.

### **The Research Landscape.**

The external challenge most frequently cited by participants was the growing ‘emphasis on universities bringing in outside funding which basically means research funding’ (Matt), with a significant number of participants suggesting that the outward-facing entrepreneurial posture of their universities was mostly clearly articulated in their prioritisation of research excellence, research funding, and the need to meet the expectations of societal impact driven by the REF. In this context, ‘entrepreneurialism’ was typically used to denote both a greater emphasis on income generation, particularly from research, and the vicissitudes of a growing ‘performative’ or ‘audit’ based research excellence culture. Matt, who suggested that his ‘ancient’ university’s decentralised collegiate structures had made individual faculties and schools relatively immune from the ‘top-down world of mission statements and strategy-strategic plans and models’, also reported that academics were still being admonished to ‘increasingly spend time writing research proposals for external funding, in order to keep the s- emmm, machine on the road’, sometimes to the detriment of their traditional duties.

Clark also commented that ‘entrepreneurialism’, in his experience, tended to be conflated with the ‘research commercialisation’ and ‘research excellence’ agendas which also pertained to his work, stating that, as he had been initiated into academic life during the nineteen-nineties when the ‘zeitgeist’ determined that academics ought not only to be research active, but to produce research that in ‘some sense’ could be ‘practically useful’, the current entrepreneurial paradigm, ‘if not totally predictable’, was not ‘a million miles away’, with the two vocabularies often implicating one another.

## Strategic Rebranding

‘I don’t think that really (the university) moving to entrepreneurship is anything more than a line on the website to be honest’ (Patrick).

For Clark, though the entrepreneurial university - in its ‘narrow’ economic ‘interpretation’ – could be an expression of the need for institutions to respond strategically to a changing student and research funding environment, it also represented, on a more cosmetic level, a kind of marketing exercise geared towards increasing a university’s ‘profile’ by adopting a culturally salient discourse that appealed to a diverse range of stakeholders. Elsewhere, Elaine likened the phenomenon to a ‘presentation strategy’ designed to communicate to the outside world that the university had adopted a kind of ‘business ethos’, and as a matter of you know, selling yourself’, ‘selling a product’, and ‘market(ing) yourself’. She added that this was particularly relevant in the competitive context of the quasi-market in student tuition engendered by the introduction of ‘full fees’ and the influence of league tables, both of which compelled universities to have to think strategically about developing their ‘brand’ in order to attract student interest. Fergus, a reader in politics at a regional ‘red brick’ university, associated this brand identity with the cultural salience of the myth of the entrepreneur, which he linked with ‘Richard Branson, Dragon’s Den-style, that Alan Sugar eh what you might- (call) corporate porn’, and Gordon Gecko, American you know entrepreneurial vim and vigour and so on’. Further to this, he described the university’s recent receipt of a national award for being ‘entrepreneurial’ as something which served only to shore up its corporate-driven (.) eh- branding exercise’ which was ‘so much bullshit’.

Gráinne, a social sciences lecturer in a regional, ‘post-92’ research university, invoked the enterprise management concept of the entrepreneurial firm by proffering that a ‘really entrepreneurial’ university was likely one characterised by speed of response to the external environment’, ‘stripping out of layers of bureaucracy’, ‘quick decision making’, and ‘just having the courage to go with wwww- with ideas that might seem a bit off the wall’, though in the context of her own university she argued that the entrepreneurial label was primarily a branding exercise and ‘useful marketing tool’, which had very little impact on the ‘lived reality for most academics at my institution’.

Although Iris did not believe that her ‘Ancient’ collegiate university had a unified ‘entrepreneurial’ mission, or at least had not encountered it from the vantage point of her humanities department, she did point to a growing tendency for the university to seize upon what ‘people are doing ‘within the university to ‘project’ a particular ‘impression’ outwards, though she could not confirm that this promotional imperative was ever articulated in ‘entrepreneurial’ terms. This was consistent with the other participant interviewed at her university - ‘Matt’ – with both suggesting that the ‘collegiate’ or ‘federated’ structure of their institution frustrated any efforts by central management to construct a unified brand identity or official whole-university ‘culture’. Janet, an arts Professor in a regional ‘post-92’ institution, also referred to her university’s entrepreneurial mission as being a matter of branding, which was reflected in its promotional literature, and visual brand identity. She was also critical of the over-use of ‘buzzwords’ such as ‘creative industries’ in her own faculty and saw these as a discursive manifestation of her university’s entrepreneurial re-branding. Further to this, she consistently remarked that the university had a tendency to reinterpret many of the activities that had been taking place in her department ‘for years’ as confirmation of the institutions entrepreneurial character, and to frame these within their promotional materials as such.

Janet also proposed that her own university’s embrace of ‘entrepreneurialism’ was driven by a desire to establish a distinct brand identity in the context of a region in which the only other major provider was a public research university with a stronger international reputation and membership of a prestigious ‘research intensive group of universities’. Here then, she proffered that her university’s leadership had sought to ‘latch’ onto the idea of its host city as being, historically, ‘a city of discovery and exploration’ which had once been a notable hub for global trade, exploration, and the movement of people throughout Britain’s colonies. In this sense, she regarded her university’s ‘entrepreneurial’ orientation as more of an imaginative exercise in taking a prevailing normative discourse about universities and giving it a distinctive, regional articulation. Her university, she claimed, had an identity problem, and when faced with ‘the interesting question of what to be’, set about ‘identifying a way of being university that transcends being somehow simply the provider that looks to the region, whilst the other university in the region looks to the international stage’. This, she suspected, was at the root of its particularly robust

rebranding as ‘entrepreneurial’, though the problem with this, she added, was that ‘it’s not quite clear what it means’.

‘Pardon my French, but it’s total bollox, the guy who has been driving this is not really kind of supported in terms of actual resources, emmm, you know (...) it’s window dressing I think’ (Patrick).

Patrick supported his view that the entrepreneurial posture of his university was mere ‘branding’ and ‘window dressing’ by highlighting that, despite identifying publicly as *the* entrepreneurial university, its management had in fact actively worked to thwart the efforts of the individual - who he labelled ‘Mr. Entrepreneurship’ – who had been ‘driving it all’. He suggested that his university’s entrepreneurial mission was ‘very ad-hoc and haphazard’, lacked ‘coherence’, and was regularly contradicted by the actions and communications of central management. He attributed this, in part, to his university’s leaders having ‘worked their way through a conventional career path, without ‘mak(ing) their own opportunities’, and as such, had ‘no capacity for entrepreneurship or ‘personal capacity for risk-taking’. Ultimately, Patrick remarked that the university’s entrepreneurial positioning was a matter of rhetoric and publicity, arguing that ‘I don’t think that really (the university) moving to entrepreneurship is anything more than a line on the website to be honest’.

For his ‘post-92’ university, Kieran stated that the entrepreneurial agenda was a matter of institutions having to reflect on what made them distinctive, particularly in light of new pressures arising out of changes in HE funding and student expectations. This was particularly the case, he added, for modern ‘post-92’ universities such as his, on the basis that they were less well-placed to respond strategically to changes in the external environment than their more established ‘ancient’, ‘civic’, and ‘plate-glass’ counterparts. Universities like his, which tended to serve regional and ‘local’ communities, had had a more difficult time attracting students nationally and internationally, and so had ‘to come up with their own unique selling points, emmm (0.2) to different- to differentiate themselves from - and obviously that’s exact- that’s exactly what the entrepreneurial (.) mission, is all about’.

Kieran, however, unlike the majority of participants, reported that his university’s entrepreneurial rebranding had been accompanied by a substantive effort to institute meaningful and positive change in

the university's culture, with him commenting that any university can 'jump on the bandwagon and say they're also entrepreneurial', but actually doing it meant more than 'Vice Chancellor's meetings or Times Higher Awards'. In this sense, he considered that universities positioning themselves as 'entrepreneurial' could either be a superficial rebranding according to a popular discourse, or something much more substantial which required institutions to think very seriously about their strategy and market position, particularly in relation to students, and to make meaningful changes geared towards promoting a culture of external engagement, 'collaboration', 'exchange', 'dialogue', and 'building up' partnership. He further remarked that although he was an advocate for enterprise – broadly conceived – he was conscious of the extent to which it is often deployed as a relatively skin-deep rhetoric. He acknowledged that, where his own school was concerned, entrepreneurialism was, in some respects, a 'tag' that had been used to 'repackage' and 'reinterpret' practices that 'we were already doing', but that because of its inclusiveness, this was a label that the humanities could more readily adopt, compared to the idea of being 'business-facing'. It should be noted that Kieran was one of the few participants who could positively identify with the prevailing inclusive conception of 'entrepreneurialism' favoured by advocates for the entrepreneurial university, rather than speculating, as many other participants had, that this label *could* apply to their work, and their institution, but that it was not something they could align themselves with.

#### **5.4. Findings – The Entrepreneurial Academic**

One of the main aims of this research was to explore how academics in non-STEM disciplines conceive of their role in relation to notions of enterprise and entrepreneurship. As such, in part B2 of the interview schedule, participants were asked what they thought that it 'meant' for an academic to be 'entrepreneurial', and if this was a concept that they could align themselves with. Further to this they were asked if there was any expectation of them, within their university, to 'be entrepreneurial', and if so, how they were required to demonstrate this. Additionally, participants were asked if any of their work was ever 'interpreted' by their university as 'entrepreneurial'. Initially, the interviewer provided no information about the concept of the entrepreneurial academic as it occurs in the extant literature,

for the purpose of inviting interviewees to provide an account of what *they* thought that it meant. However, as the conversation progressed the interviewer stated that in an entrepreneurial culture, academics were ‘encouraged always to be open to new ways of thinking about their work’ in an effort to invite participants to link the concept of the entrepreneurial academic to notions such as change, responsiveness, and reflexivity.

Participants’ responses to questions about the concept of the entrepreneurial academic are presented below, and organised according to the following headings:

- Values Conflict and the Entrepreneurial Academic and the Entrepreneurial Academic as an ‘Economic’ Concept.
- Non-STEM engagement in Academic Entrepreneurship.
- Entrepreneurialism and Academic Role-Complexity.
- Broad Definitions of the Entrepreneurial Academic.

### **Values Conflict and the Entrepreneurial Academic as an Economic Concept**

In addition to regarding academic ‘entrepreneurialism’ as a primarily economic concept, and as a matter of rhetoric which had very little substantive meaning for their practice, a significant number of those interviewed also described this paradigm as expressing a set of values that were in conflict with, or directly antithetical to, those that were central to their practice as academics, attesting perhaps to what Rinne and Koivula have described as a ‘clash of values’ between ‘academic’ and ‘market’ values in the contemporary European university (Rinne and Koivula, 2005). In the majority of cases, participants advanced a more-or-less forceful critique of the entrepreneurial model as being incompatible with their existing value-systems, whether these were framed in terms of their discipline, traditional university values, or a ‘public sector’ ethos.

Much of the discussion on values conflict appeared to hinge on the matter of the participants’ perspectives on the function of income generation, or ‘attitude towards money’ (Debby), with many of

those interviewed relating that while they understood the funding challenges faced by contemporary universities, they saw income generation ‘for its own sake’ as contrary to the spirit of their work and their disciplinary values. For example, while Debby was positively disposed towards ‘bringing in’ money to support her research work, financial considerations were not for her the ‘overriding thing’, adding that the values of the ‘entrepreneurial agenda’ were ‘foreign’ and ‘alien’ to her work, insofar as they pertained to ‘creating businesses’ and ‘generating income’. Elaine also remarked that the concept of the ‘entrepreneurial’ academic was unclear to her and that it did not ‘speak to what I do’ as it was very likely linked with ‘making a profit’, the university ‘being a business’, and with ‘private sector’ imperatives which ‘decimated’ the ‘values’ she associated with universities as ‘public sector institutions’. For Fergus, the idea of the entrepreneurial academic was founded on a ‘depoliticised’ model of the entrepreneur myth, which he felt university managers supported because they lacked critical perspective.

The primary ‘conflict’, then, articulated by participants related to a perceived discord that existed between values associated with markets, commercialisation, and income generation, and those which they derived from their disciplines, and their normative perspectives on both academic practices and the idea of the university.

‘To me it’s a nonsense, and academics aren’t entrepreneurs, I mean I- an entrepreneur is there to make a profit (0.2) you know by definition universities are charitable organisations, they’re not there to make a profit, they do need money, but they’re not (.) there to make a profit’ (Matt).

The dominant perspective on the concept of the entrepreneurial academic which emerged from the interviews was that it was indicative, primarily, of the growing importance of commercialisation, income generation, and other external, for-profit activities to the contemporary university. And while a number of those interviewed reported being aware of some of the broader and more inclusive ways in which academic entrepreneurialism was sometimes articulated, they typically resorted to reaffirming their stated belief that this model of academic identity and practice was primarily ‘economic’. In most cases participants remarked that being ‘entrepreneurial’ was effectively about ‘making money’, though some alluded to it also signifying the generation of other, non-financial, reputational forms of capital.

Arthur, for example, commented that he had a difficult time engaging with the idea of entrepreneurial academic work because his practice was ‘not really associated with (...) income generation’, adding that at his own university - where entrepreneurialism was a ubiquitous motif in both internal and external communications –it had tended to be framed ‘more in economic than in cultural terms’ and, as such, had made a ‘strong impression’ on him. Elsewhere, he suggested that ‘entrepreneurialism’ was antithetical to his own ‘cultural’ approach to his work and could bring about ‘potentially a diminution’ of it.

‘I think most are- think that it has to do with making more money, getting more students in, getting higher grants, running night-classes, doing whatever it is to make money’ (Norah).

Asked about the concept of the entrepreneurial academic, Norah - who worked at the same institution- commented that it appeared to suggest that individuals needed to be ‘outward-facing’, to be ‘going out into the world’, and to be engaged in collaboration, but added that this was something which appeared already to have been captured by the ‘impact agenda’, further to which she remarked that, in her university, entrepreneurialism appeared to mean ‘making money’. Elsewhere, Bernadette, though she spoke briefly of the possibility of interpreting some aspects of her work according to a ‘social’ model of entrepreneurship, stated that for her entrepreneurialism was an expression of ‘primarily economic’ values, and that it did not fit with her ‘humanistic’ pedagogical approach and commitment to ‘issues of social justice’ and ‘equity’. To this end, she commented that ‘to be entrepreneurial is judged by money’, and as such she had no desire to see her practice characterised as ‘entrepreneurial’. If she had wanted to, she added ‘I’d have a business, I wouldn’t be in a university’.

Clark reported being aware of a broader, more ‘social’ model of enterprise, but that this more expansive definition of enterprise did not have much salience in UK universities, where enterprise seemed to denote the imperative to generate ‘income’, ‘commercialise research findings’, and enhance the ‘profile’ of the institution. After remarking that he ‘could go into all sorts of- of, eh (0.2) guff about being a self-starter and all that kind of stuff’, and that entrepreneurialism could also denote ‘bringing in new ideas’, considering ‘how you might do things better’, and ‘setting up new forms of teaching emm

(.) outreach work of other kinds', he reiterated that this was not the 'message' that was emanating from his, and other, universities in the UK, which were 'basically saying you need to be raising money.' As there were limited possibilities to generate, 'cash from the research' in his discipline, and because making his research proprietary would undermine its utility, he felt that the concept of the entrepreneurial academic had very little salience for him. When asked what he thought it meant to be an entrepreneurial academic, Matt, similarly declared 'I've got no idea', adding that he found the idea to be a 'nonsense' as entrepreneurs were, categorically, interested in the pursuit of profit, and universities, while they require funding, were not in the business of 'mak(ing) a profit'.

'If people want to talk about entrepreneurship, we can talk about entrepreneurship on our website, but I'm not an entrepreneur, if I wanted to become an entrepreneur I would have gone into business' (Matt).

Matt suggested that there was a categorical difference between entrepreneurs - as 'business' figures - and academics, asking: 'My history books sell, but does that make me an entrepreneur, or a good historian?'

'I expect that the key thrust of this entrepreneurial culture is to- for us to convert our research into something which is marketable, I can bring in loads of cash, we can make money off it' (Owen).

Owen also proffered that the hegemonic definition of the 'academic entrepreneurialism', in his experience at least, was primarily a matter of commercialising research and 'making money', adding that an inability, or reluctance, to do this would become 'a negative mark against you' in terms of career progression. In his own research practice, he stated that all he needed was 'a good library and time', so that he was not 'a person who would bring in a lot of money', adding 'it's immoral for me to bring in money if I don't need it, because money is a scarce resource'.

When questioned about what it ‘meant’ for an academic to be entrepreneurial, Debby proffered that it likely meant:

‘Considering your job as not just to educate and to conduct research which is what traditionally people thought (.) em but also sees it as part- is to (.) develop capacity within the university and develop hh em hh links with (0.4) i- industry while- sort of money-making i- identify ways of making money which are not (.) dependent on (.) HEFCE funding’ (Debby).

Although she considered that a broad definition of academic entrepreneurialism would ‘quite suit her’, when asked if she would describe her work as ‘entrepreneurial’, Debby remarked that she would not because she didn’t ‘feel very close to people in the business school’, and to do so ‘would seem to imply that I had the same attitude towards (.) money as they do’. Asked for clarification on this statement, Debby responded that ‘it’s not that I don’t like them or anything’ but ‘I think there is a big divide between what we do’. She added that while she was not opposed to ‘finding new ways of making money’, she only wished to do so to support the traditional missions of the university.

Fergus conceded that many of the qualities signified by the model of the entrepreneur were also shared by the academic, who he described, in a ‘generic way’, as being committed to ‘challeng(ing) yourself’ and going ‘outside your comfort zone’, as well as being ‘critical’, ‘analytical’, ‘self-starting, passionate, (and) dynamic’. However, he rejected the idea that one could ‘suddenly come along and say ‘oh well that’s being entrepreneurial’, arguing that this term was intimately bound up with the expectations of academics ‘to produce commercially exploitable knowledge’. He added that the vision of the entrepreneur projected by his university was of the ‘orthodox sense’ of somebody setting out to ‘start up their own businesses’ or ‘the individual, lone, romantic, heroic capitalist’ who is ‘motivated by making loads of money’.

Janet suggested that what it meant for an academic to be ‘entrepreneurial’, in her experience, was often ‘unclear’, and sometimes contradictory, adding that there was very little consistency in the types of activities that her own university considered to be entrepreneurial in nature. And though she acknowledged some of the more inclusive definitions of enterprise in circulation in UK universities, it seemed to her, for the most part, to suggest ‘adopting a more evidently business model’ which was about

making ‘profit for the university’ or pursuing a research idea ‘that has commercial potential’, rather than because it is intellectually stimulating. For Patrick, the biggest problem’ with the concept of academic entrepreneurialism was that the majority of academics ‘are not entrepreneurial’, and though this label could be applied to some of his practices, such as ‘taking on consultancies’ and ‘generating graduate income’, in his university, while staff were ‘encouraged to exploit our skills in the wider community’ he never felt ‘there was encouragement of academics to be entrepreneurial *per se*’.

### **Non-STEM engagement in academic entrepreneurship**

In addition to regarding academic entrepreneurialism as a matter of ‘market’ or ‘economic’ values coming to influence ‘managerialist’ perspectives on the nature and value of academic work, a number of those interviewed suggested that STEM disciplines were more amenable to this paradigm, and that, conversely, those in non-STEM disciplines were less likely to be able to adopt the mantle of the ‘entrepreneurial’ academic. Clark, for example, remarked that academics in his discipline – compared to ‘engineering or other natural sciences’ - were much less likely ‘to be generating multi-million-pound winning eh patents or what-have-you’, especially if ‘entrepreneurial increasingly means generating cash’. This, for him was problematic’ for academics in ‘social sciences, arts and humanities subjects’, and potentially undermined their capacity to remain ‘research active’ as funding decisions come increasingly to ‘be heavily shaped by (.) em, the ability to generate that kind of income’. Elaine, who associated entrepreneurialism with ‘making a profit’ and ‘private sector’ values also remarked that this was difficult for non-STEM academics, while Owen felt that being an entrepreneurial academic was about ‘working with private firms’ and research commercialisation, which some faculties in his university, such as ‘engineering’, had been successful in. For him, it was ‘deep – deeply problematic’ that central management appeared to be ‘rolling that out as a model for the whole university’. Fergus, who worked at the same university, also considered that academic entrepreneurialism would have ‘more traction in the natural sciences, and (.) engineers’ but in the ‘Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences’

would be resisted because of a tendency within these disciplines to be more ‘critical’ and ‘questioning’ of the university running itself ‘like a business’.

Fergus also commented that his university’s ‘fixation on metrics’, ‘the measurable’, and ‘the economic’ was indicative of the fact that university management systems’ were dominated not by ‘sociologists (.) or by political theorists (.) or in fact anyone from arts or humanities or social science’, but by ‘chemists, engineers, physicists eh- medical practitioners and so on’ who because of their ‘disciplinary cultures’ and willingness to ‘work with the corporations in an uncritical manner’ were less troubled by the enterprise paradigm and its connection with the ‘formal market system’.

### **Entrepreneurialism and Academic Role-Complexity**

A considerable number of those interviewed regarded ‘entrepreneurialism’ either as a new set of responsibilities added to their already complex workloads, or as indicative of an emergent ‘performance’ or ritualistic ‘audit’ culture. While this development was often associated with the pressures of the Research Excellence Framework (REF), several participants suggested that this agenda was sometimes articulated in the form of an expectation of academics to be ‘entrepreneurial’. Arthur, for example, remarked that the REF had precipitated a shift away from more traditional approaches to research and publication ‘for the sake of the subject’, towards a more targeted and competitive set of dynamics, while also suggesting that there was some degree of overlap between the ‘impact’ and ‘entrepreneurial’ agendas, to which he added that the former might have been ‘lassoed’, ‘hijacked’, or ‘adopted’ by the latter, at least in the context of his institution, which had a particularly strong entrepreneurial brand. Elaine linked the increase in performance management and metrics to growing expectations on individual academics resulting in a more competitive environment which rewarded those who were ‘lucky’, ‘very good at filling in the interminable forms’ and generating income, or competent ‘self-promoters’, but who were not necessarily producing superior quality research. Bernadette also commented that the pressure to behave ‘entrepreneurially’ was most acutely felt in her

university in the rhetoric attached to research performance and income generation, and that there had been a blurring of 'enterprise' and 'research', to the point where there was 'no distinguishing line'. Adopting a narrow economic perspective on enterprise, she also questioned how 'bringing in money' for research could be viewed as 'entrepreneurial', as it did not generate any profit.

Janet felt that as academic responsibilities were already so complex, varied, and intensive, it was difficult for her to imagine any working academic adding 'entrepreneurialism' to their portfolio. She recalled reading about 'Scott's account of trying to fundraise for his, ehh, journey to the Antarctic', and more recently, an example of an individual who, in her region, had almost single-handedly seen through the development of a nationally significant conservation project, remarking that while academics shared the ability of these types of figures 'to tap straight into funding networks and, you know, you make, emmm, make things happen', true entrepreneurialism, of this sort, was itself a full-time job which required a certain 'single-mindedness' that was 'difficult' to achieve 'in the university context (.) because you're also, you know, teaching, you're also doing your research, and you also are (.) chairing committees and you're also running a research group and so on.' With regards to expectations of academics within her own university to be entrepreneurial, she was of the view that there was a mismatch between what it's possible actually for individuals to achieve in and around, or on top of all their other (.) responsibilities', unless they worked in a dedicated research or enterprise role.

For Debby, the entrepreneurial agenda', in conjunction with the pressures of the REF, were potentially damaging to the quality of academic work, as their emphasis on performance and metrics could encroach on the 'unproductive ways of thinking' you 'often need to go down', and the 'failures and impasses' that were often entailed in developing 'breakthroughs in thinking' through basic research. Judging academics purely by performance measures and income generation, she suggested, would lead to a 'foreclosure' of the kinds of open-ended exploration that were essential for research to 'yield anything of value'. Ironically, she felt that this threatened what was already 'entrepreneurial' about academic work, as scholarship is all about being open and being aware of changes and new work', about having a 'commitment to be abreast of, you know, this word "cutting edge", you want- if you're going to be, the highest achieving scholar, you are on top of contemporary work'.

Clark also proffered that the ‘increasing relevance’ of the economic calculus of entrepreneurialism had the potential to determine the ‘kind of people’ that academics would have to become in order to secure funding for their projects, with Fergus stating that the practice of academics looking outside the university to ‘get money’ from ‘external sources’ used to be encouraged and incentivised, but was now mandatory and was reshaping the nature of academic work, even though sufficient allowances were not always integrated into their workloads. And though Fergus acknowledged that funding was ‘instrumental’ to carrying out research, it had now ‘got to the stage that even if your research doesn’t demand funding you’ve got to be seen to be applying for it and getting it.

Many of those interviewed related that expectations of them to behave ‘entrepreneurially’ had not been accounted for by any change in their existing workloads, with Gráinne, a social sciences lecturer in a ‘post-92’ public research university, describing the ‘entrepreneurial’ mission as a case of expecting ‘more and more for less and less’, with the new expectations is brought representing ‘quite a- a burden on top of your teaching and research’, particularly as one was now compelled to be thinking ‘in business terms’, constantly ‘scanning the boundaries’, looking at ‘what’s going on externally’ and asking ‘can I get money from here or there?’. In this sense, the expectation of academics to engage in ‘entrepreneurial’ activities, over and above their existing responsibilities, could be described as a matter of universities seeking to extract excess surplus value from academics. Norah, who reported that the entrepreneurial mission was quite conspicuous within her university, had tried to reconcile herself with it, but ultimately reasoned that ‘it just makes me think that there are not enough hours in the day, I could if I wanted to, but what am I going to give up?’. While elsewhere, Gráinne also suggested that her university had a tendency to incentivise entrepreneurial behaviour through guarantees related to ‘accelerated awards’, ‘development and performance review’ – if individuals ‘exceeded’ their ‘objectives’ - but that this was rarely honoured.

## Broad Definitions of Academic Entrepreneurship

‘I hadn’t really thought about that very much, but I do think that good researchers have the same sort of, not only a spirit of enquiry, but a spirit of, emmm, project development and problem-solving that (0.5) has some kinship with whatever a more managerialist sort of notion of entrepreneurialism is’ (Janet).

A number of those interviewed remarked that the term ‘entrepreneurial’ could, in theory, be applied to their practice, but generally rejected this label as either ‘managerial’ speak, or as superficial rhetoric which added little explanatory power to conceptions of academic work. Janet for example, could see how it might be applied to some aspects of her practice – such as ‘thinking outside of the box, thinking laterally, eh, making connections, problem-solving and so on’ - but associated it with ‘managerialism’ and commented that ‘I don’t think it’s a particularly useful label either’. Adding that these activities were ‘sort of, what we do anyway as academics isn’t it?’

Matt, when asked if he could conceive of a broader definition of the academic entrepreneur, replied:

‘I mean if ‘entrepreneurial’ means hard-working, research-active, emm being good teachers (0.1) well I’m all- I’m all- I’m more than happy with that, I mean I want to be a good teacher, and be a- a good researcher (0.2) but I don’t see that as being an entrepreneur’ (Matt).

Elsewhere, Arthur described being familiar with the ‘social’ sense in which ‘entrepreneurialism’ had come to denote universities and academics who were responsive to changes in their environment and committed to the idea of public engagement, arguing that his work fell under this definition, but that this was because outreach and engagement were norms within his discipline and had always been carried out in a ‘self-directed’ way. He did report a ‘tacit eh demand to be entrepreneurial’ at his institution but felt that it was not ‘terribly precise’, having something to do with being ‘an agent of promoting the position of the university’ and ‘drawing on’ external relationships for the benefit of the institution and its profile, though his feeling was that this was primarily an ‘economic’ imperative, rather than a ‘social’ or ‘cultural’ one.

Similarly, though Bernadette and Fergus both acknowledged that it might be possible to reconcile their academic values with a broad notion of entrepreneurialism, neither identified with the designation and both felt that the financial element was dominant in university discourse, while Clark, who was aware of a more expansive definition of ‘entrepreneurialism’ often used in his discipline to talk about people who can create opportunities, who can you know seize a moment eh and (0.2) secure an objective’ and ‘bring in new ideas’, remarked that this ‘social’ model was not what was promoted within his university. When asked about the idea of the entrepreneurial academic, Owen responded ‘What does it mean? ‘I’ve no idea’, before adding that for him, at least, an ‘entrepreneurial’ academic, which he preferred to call an ‘active academic’ was somebody ‘who en- emmm, engages with other academics, emmm, who, emm, eng- engages in a sense of having conversations, discussions, arranging events, emmm, so that people can come together and exchange ideas’ instead of merely fulfilling the obligations of their contract. In his experience, however, he suggested that ‘entrepreneurialism’, in the context of academia, appeared to signify converting research into something ‘marketable’ and ‘bring(ing) in loads of cash’.

Though keen to stress that she had no interest in ‘money for its own sake’, Debby stated that she could positively identify with a broader definition of the entrepreneurial academic, which she added ‘quite suits me really’. She linked this to her active research profile, her record in securing research income, and her work with publishers in collecting material for them that could also be used in her research ‘in practical ways’. However, when asked if she described her work as ‘entrepreneurial’, she responded that she had ‘never thought of (her)self’, nor ‘described (her)self’ in this way. She did profess to being an advocate for the impact agenda, and for making research more meaningful and useful to external stakeholders but did not associate with any form of ‘entrepreneurialism’, figuring it instead as a kind of ethical imperative for academics who are publicly funded, and a means of avoiding the trap of becoming too ‘inward-looking’ and cloistered within one’s own ‘little discourse community’.

Gráinne remarked that being ‘entrepreneurial’ could denote a capacity for ‘networking’, ‘making outside contacts’ and ‘exploiting opportunities’, and that these were things which she valued and excelled at. However, she ultimately remarked that, for her, ‘entrepreneurialism was essentially about individualised financial targets’. She also cited her engagement with local communities and ‘sitting on

the local enterprise panel' as potentially 'entrepreneurial' behaviours, but considered that, as it's not bringing in any money', she was not sure if this would fit her university's definition. Later, she reported witnessing someone who 'had been very bad at their job' becoming 'untouchable' on account of having 'landed massive' grants, even where 'prior to that there had been questions about this individual's performance', arguing that this was indicative of her university's attitude towards academic entrepreneurialism.

For Quinn, 'entrepreneurialism' could be a matter of seeing and seizing on 'opportunities' that would benefit students, and to this end she recounted an industry linkage which she had developed with an advertising firm that provided student placements. This was something that 'did not exist before', and so in a sense, she suggested that this might be considered 'entrepreneurial', though she also remarked that this was not motivated by the 'pursuit of money' but because it was 'useful for students', 'scholarship', and 'spreading the energies, sort of out- outside into the outer world'. These kinds of opportunities were presented to her, however, as she had worked a writer for many decades, and so had 'a great many contacts she could use', and not because she had the 'temperament' of an entrepreneur, adding that 'I mean really I don't know if I go to enough parties you se(h)e' to engage in it fully. She also questioned the extent to which career academics would be able to pursue create these opportunities, having not had a previous career and network of professional contacts to draw on.

Iris, who confessed to having not encountered the idea of the entrepreneurial academic in her 'ancient' university, speculated that it could denote a narrow 'commercial' ethos, or something much 'broader', involving non-financially-oriented networking, opportunity seeking, and outreach. In this latter 'context', she pointed to the fact that today, unlike in the 1980's, there were opportunities for academics to seek out different sources of funding, network and pursue collaboration externally, and disseminate work in new ways, but that this had nothing to do with 'making money' for her at least, and she had never used the term 'entrepreneurial' to describe it. She added that she was 'constantly on the lookout for (.) ummm, financial and other opportunities', but that again, this was not something she had conceptualised as a form of 'entrepreneurship'.

In cases where participants demonstrated familiarity with broader conceptions of academic entrepreneurialism, or where they suggested that the term *could*, theoretically, be used to describe some aspects of their work, there was a related tendency to suggested, in most cases, that very often this represented a case of applying a new rhetoric to existing practices, such as when Debby remarked that, even if this vocabulary was used to evaluate her work, ‘I think I would be doing the same thing anyway’, or when Fergus rejected the idea that the university could suddenly come along and say “oh well that’s being entrepreneurial” and that this would have any significance for him or his practice. In this sense, then, participants seemed, though they had no substantive investment in it, or categorically rejected it, to regard ‘entrepreneurial’ as a rhetorical label that *could* be applied to their professional practice or activities. A number of interviewees also alluded to ‘managerialist’, ‘social’, and ‘broader’ conceptions of academic entrepreneurialism, associated with being opportunity-seeking, problem-solving, change-responsive, reflexive, outward-facing, gateway-solving, and experimental, though a consensus emerged that these were attributes which academics traditionally possessed, with Janet remarking ‘that’s actually just, emmm, how academics have probably always practiced’.

In some instances, participants also referred to academic entrepreneurialism as a matter of their universities reinterpreting the activities of academics to fit a strategic form of institutional or re-branding, or as a matter of promoting the achievements of the university in the outside world, with a number of interviewees associated entrepreneurialism with being ‘an agent of promoting the position of the university’, or being adept at ‘self-promotion’ and ‘selling’ oneself both inside and outside of the university. Similarly, Janet commented that within her university to ‘there’s much more emphasis on (.) not only doing what you’re doing but demonstrating (.) having done it’. For Elaine, this relationship between self and university promotion drove a kind of feedback loop of entrepreneurially-inflected publicity that benefited both the individual and the university. Fergus, similarly, commented that being entrepreneurial, in addition to ‘bringing in lots of research money’, meant being ‘somebody who is themselves an exemplar of a go-getter (.) typically you know someone who’s in the media, developing an eh- a profile for themselves’ and being ‘on the radar of senior management’. Here, then, entrepreneurialism appeared to denote a kind of publicity form practiced by academics who could produce different forms of beneficial ‘capital’ for the university, including some that are not narrowly economic –

such as in relation to prestige and reputation. Norah also stated that she got the impression that ‘people who are very entrepreneurial are also very good at hyping themselves’ and that entrepreneurialism had something to do with being a good self-promoter and ‘how you perceive yourself to be valued (more) than anything else’. For her, ‘people who perceive themselves to be entrepreneurial are also very good PR people for themselves and tend to be fore-fronted in university materials as being entrepreneurial’, calling this process a ‘vicious cycle’ of self-promotion and university recognition.

‘I think it's (.) to be constantly looking for, sort of innovation and for looking for opportunity- it's the self-reflection thing (...) It's probably a way of expressing isn't it that- that spirit of reflection and change and innovation and that takes different disciplines in different directions’ (Hope).

Within the sample of seventeen participants, there were two who could be said – in their perspectives on what it meant to be an entrepreneurial academic – to be ‘outliers’. These were Hope, who divided her time between a policy role and her work as an academic historian, and Kieran, who was a historian and associate head of school at the same ‘post-92’ university. Both employed a positive and inclusive definition of academic entrepreneurialism which was broadly in line with that advanced in the policy and higher education research literature. Hope, for example, commented that academic entrepreneurialism was associated with establishing external ‘links’, ‘third -stream type thinking’, ‘community engagement’, taking on a ‘new mind-set’, ‘new methods’, and a certain ‘willingness’ to engage in ‘innovation’ and ‘reflection’ in terms of how one produces and disseminates knowledge. In particular, she described academic enterprise as being about ‘brokering connections’, ‘doing exciting things’, and being ‘up for exploring interesting connections’ with groups inside and outside of the university. Throughout her interview, she linked enterprise to a kind of spirit of exploration or experimentation, commenting that it entailed being ‘just kind of up for it and to see where that takes things’ and having a general ‘openness’ to new opportunities and practices. Ultimately, for her, it was through adopting this kind of disposition that ‘the arts and humanities’ could respond to the ‘entrepreneurial and impact agendas’.

The themes of exploration, discovery and collaboration were regularly invoked, such as when Hope commented that one of the more interesting aspects of entrepreneurial work related to ‘being taken into

places you wouldn't necessarily expect to go' and discovering 'intersections that you didn't know were there'. She also alluded to individuals who might consider their academic, disciplinary values to be incompatible with the entrepreneurial model as 'sort of diehards' or 'reactionaries', adding that she had come to recognise that enterprise was 'inherent in the spirit' of her 'discipline' in that academic historians were reflexive, and continuously innovated by 'pushing the boundaries' of the discipline's 'methodologies' and 'perspectives'. Elsewhere, she framed academic entrepreneurialism as a grassroots phenomenon, arguing that while academics were often subject to 'processes and controls and hierarchies to some extent', the truly entrepreneurial ones were those who were 'willing to grasp things and then, and take that on' by being 'quite proactive' in 'making those connections and seeing opportunities'. However, she was also keen to emphasise that entrepreneurialism could not be imposed and had to be 'interpreted' and practiced in ways which were appropriate to their own cultures, values, and practices, adding that it entailed 'finding where your place is in that, well on that spectrum'.

Both Hope and Kieran, a history professor and associate head of school from the same faculty and university, represent outliers within the participant group as they both had specific remits for promoting the enterprise mission within their university, though Kieran -who had followed a traditional academic career path - reported to having embraced entrepreneurialism, not because of this responsibility, but because it was an effective strategy for reconciling his humanities ethos with the 'business-facing' culture of his institution.

'It's about thinking about different audiences and not just thinking about an academic audience and that to me is, that's thinking entrepreneurially' (Kieran).

Kieran was one of the few participants who reported not only to having an understanding of the idea of the entrepreneurial academic as it is commonly expressed in advocacy rhetoric, but also a positive identification with it as an alternative to the imperative of being 'business-facing', which was the institutional 'identity' that his university had taken on before embracing the entrepreneurial mission. Although he alluded at several points to entrepreneurialism being a 'tag' and a matter of strategic rebranding driven primarily by the pressures of student recruitment, he also expressed a strong belief in academics' obligations to reflect on the public value of their work, and their engagement with non-

academic communities, arguing that, from his perspective, this was what the ‘entrepreneurial’ discourse was primarily about. Though he did not ‘like the message’ that research was only ‘valuable’ if it was disseminated in non-traditional ways, or had a wider value for the community, he was critical of academics who refused to take this aspect of the entrepreneurial mission seriously. Where academic work was concerned, then, Kieran aligned ‘entrepreneurialism’ quite firmly with the ‘impact agenda’, adding that it was ‘being a bit more entrepreneurial to think about how you could disseminate your work’ and ‘being taken away from your own little world and thinking differently’. ‘Entrepreneurialism’ then, represented for Kieran a kind of moral imperative for academics to think seriously about how their work might benefit the wider community, but only insofar as the pressure to do so was not externally imposed.

‘yeah, I consider myself to be entrepreneurial, it’s not a dirty word to be entrepreneurial in a- in- in cultural terms’ (Kieran).

Here, Kieran offered a defence of entrepreneurialism in the context of the humanities and challenged the idea that it was a pejorative term. In this sense, he advanced the concept of ‘cultural entrepreneurialism’ as something appropriate to the humanities and related disciplines, though it should be noted that ‘cultural enterprise’ was a specific motif featured in Kieran’s university and departmental literature. This concept appears to have emerged out of the allowance that his university made for his department to ‘be creative about other ways in which we can be entrepreneurial’.

He added to this that there was ‘an equation between something that’s an entrepreneurial activity and something which other people outside academic might be interested in’, before restating his belief that entrepreneurialism was about ‘doing more’, remarking that ‘I could sit back and be a professor and do my x amount of teaching, and go off and do my research and I could probably get away with it if I wanted to, but I don’t’. So, despite the nuances in Kieran’s discussion of entrepreneurialism as it pertains to academics, ultimately, he settled on it signifying the necessity for academics to take their accountability to the wider public more seriously, and to commit to finding ways to develop ‘wider reach and a wider interest’. Elsewhere, however, he associated entrepreneurialism, more conventionally, with

bringing in ‘lots of money from external grant revenue’, and securing ‘knowledge transfer partnership’, which, he remarked, were uncommon outside of the sciences. As such, he suggested that the term ‘entrepreneurialism’ and ‘enterprise’ were often replaced in his department with ‘slightly different titles’ such as ‘research’ and ‘community’, suggesting a number of subtle alterations that needed to be made to translate enterprise discourse into something more consistent with the values of his colleagues in the humanities.

### **5.5. Findings – Enterprise & University Culture**

The normative literature on transforming universities along ‘entrepreneurial’ lines tends to advocate not only for changes in their formal structures, but for the reform of organisations’ ‘cultures’, understood as the norms, values, behaviours, credos and ‘ways of doing things’ that constitute their distinct institutional identities. Organisational culture change has been described as a process of guiding, through management technologies, the ‘surface-level behavioural norms and artefacts’ of an institution, which ‘can occur with relative ease’, and seeking to influence ‘at the deepest levels of organizational culture’ its characteristic ‘assumptions, ideologies’ and behaviours’, which will naturally be more ‘time consuming’ (Witte and Muijen, 1999). One of the key ways in which it is theorised that culture change can be instigated within an organisation is through the transformation of discourse, with ‘organizational discourse’ described as ‘the languages and symbolic media we employ to describe, represent, interpret and theorise what we take to be the facticity of organizational life’ (Grant, Keenoy and Oswick, 1998).

Critically, this ‘facticity’ – or in other words, the empirical reality of organisational life – is something about which there exists a great deal of ontological scepticism (Hancock and Tyler, 2001; Westwood and Clegg, 2003), though the advocatory literature on entrepreneurial universities often adopts a ‘structural realist ontology’ in which organisational culture is considered both to have a fixed reality and to be a ‘variable’ which is amenable to transformation by management intervention (Ashkanasy, Wilderom and Peterson, 2000, p.7). To complicate matters further, universities are generally regarded

as ‘ambiguity-prone’ institutions whose complexity, size, diffuse power-structures, and ‘goal ambiguity’ present ‘particular problems for management, leadership and strategy processes’ designed to unite their diverse constituencies around collective courses of action (Jarzabkowski, Sillince and Shaw, 2010), such as those implicated in the idea of organisational ‘culture change’. A critical assumption of this research, then, is that universities are complex, ‘culturally differentiated’ (Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2008) organisations made up of groupings with diverse values, beliefs, professional discourses, and contested understandings of the nature of universities, teaching, and research. Additionally, the research - because of its interpretivist paradigm and discourse-based methodology – adopts a ‘social constructionist’ ontology in which organisational culture is not viewed ‘as an objective fact but a social construction’ (Krijnen, 2015) or as a ‘root metaphor for conceptualizing organization’(Smircich, 1983, p.342).

For this reason, interviews have not been treated as instruments for collecting reliable empirical data on secondary phenomena such as ‘organisational culture’, but as contingent communicative ‘events’ in which participants advance unique, situated accounts which are rooted in their own perspectives and experience, and, further to this, conditional on the research interview an institutionalised and goal-oriented practice. Crucially, it is not assumed that because a particular institution has, to a greater or lesser degree, positioned itself publicly as an ‘entrepreneurial’ university, that this has been directly felt or experienced in the professional lifeworld of the participant. On this basis, the interview schedule was designed such that where participants reported minimal experience of ‘enterprise’ as a feature of their university’s communications, governance, or ‘culture’, they were invited to reflect in more general terms on their sense of their university’s ‘culture’, and to report on any changes that they may have observed in their day-to-day work-lives, or the institution’s ‘identity’ in recent years.

Where participants felt that there was a link between changes in their university and its entrepreneurial mission, these points were explored, though the researcher was conscious not to create this correlation where it was not reported by an interviewee, and in a number of cases deliberately problematised the extent to which one might meaningfully account for a causal connection between a university’s centrally-defined ‘culture’ and the lived realities of academic life. In part B3 of the interview schedule,

the researcher specifically commented that advocates for the entrepreneurial university ‘place a strong emphasis on the imperative to transform ‘culture’ institutionally’, before asking participants ‘what do you think that this means?’.

The findings of this section of the interview schedule are outlined below, according to the following headings:

- University Culture and Culture Change
- The ‘Visibility’ of the Enterprise Culture
- Culture Change and University Governance

### **5.5.1 University Culture and Culture Change.**

As universities are highly complex, ‘ambiguity-prone’ (Jarzabkowski, Sillince and Shaw, 2010) organisations, which vary significantly in institutional form, and typically house a diverse number of professional communities, including discipline-based schools and faculties -with their own ‘cultures’ - one of the starting points for this research was that the concept of a whole university ‘culture’ was problematic, and that participants were likely to speak from their own perspectives and professional and disciplinary backgrounds. This perspective on culture within universities as plural and locally contingent was borne out by the responses of the study’s participants. One of the key themes that emerged both from this section of the schedule, and earlier discussions about institutional culture and academic values in Part A, related to the difficulty that many participants had in identifying with, or even conceiving of, a ‘whole university culture’, which made the question of organisational ‘culture change’ in universities relatively moot.

Bernadette, for example, when asked about her university’s ‘culture’, suggested that ‘culture’ was a difficult thing to define, and problematised the idea of a distinct ‘organisational culture’ by asserting that where the values and worldviews of academics were concerned, they were just as likely to identify with, or be influenced by, the broader ‘disciplinary’ culture in which they were situated, or perhaps the

local departmental or faculty 'culture' they experienced in their day-to-day work -lives. Further to this, she commented that 'when you try to unpick what culture means' you are likely to find very little coherence or 'commonality', and your endeavours are likely to 'fall to pieces'. This sentiment was echoed by Iris, for whom it was difficult to conceive of – let alone effect change in – a whole-organisational 'culture', particularly as the collegiate structure at her institution made it difficult to 'manage in a very top-down way'. Though Janet questioned the idea that one could regard a university as having a whole culture, she did consider the entrepreneurial mission at her university to be something that had been 'sort of, top-down', and that it had only won the acquiescence of an initially sceptical staff through 'familiarisation', and because it was part of a 'hegemonic process', her view however was the 'enterprise culture' embedded was mainly structural and communicational, and had not succeeded in changing peoples' values or identities. Quinn remarked that she also found it difficult to conceive of the university, in cultural terms, as a 'whole', and while she had been 'slightly involved' in the development of university mission statements, these documents largely articulated a vision that was speculative and very different from reality on the ground. Further to this, Arthur stated that because universities are large and 'very fragmentary' organisations, 'trying to read' what the 'agendas' can often be very difficult for those who are 'lower in the food-chain'. In this section of the schedule a large number of those interviewed reiterated the point that their discipline or department were their 'most important reference points' (Iris) in terms of culture which made questions about their relationship with the university's culture, let alone its efforts at 'culture change', difficult to answer.

Fergus stated that while he gave 'due deference' to the 'official, corporate culture' of his University, he was 'proud of the fact' that 'I certainly don't buy it and in fact a lot of my colleagues, again the local culture not just in my own school but across the faculty certainly would be resistant to it'. To this end, he added 'I act like the wise Ethiopian peasant, that means I bow down low and fart silently when the great lord passes by, outward signs of deference should not be ever, ever confused with acceptance of the regime of the day and so it doesn't really impact on (.) my work'.

## **‘Administratively Imposed Enterprise’.**

Where participants did report on their university seeking to engage in the embedding of enterprise culture within their institution, they tended to report it as a ‘top-down’ phenomenon, akin to what Paul du Gay has labelled ‘administratively imposed enterprise’, and generally referring to this as something which they either found alienating or could easily ignore.

Many participants alluded to their university’s enterprise mission as being something that was developed unilaterally and imposed on academics, without consultancy, such as when Norah commented:

‘I can honestly say that enterprise at the university- the enterprise university made me unhappy to the point where I did think about leaving’ (Norah).

Norah remarked that in the ‘first couple of years’ of her university’s entrepreneurial rebranding, it left her feeling ‘alienated’, ‘angry’ about working there, and ‘preached to’ as enterprise had been ‘forced on the university by central management’. In addition to regarding the enterprise mission as something which had obtruded into her life, she also expressed concern that it indicated that the university didn’t share her ‘values’, describing the enterprise paradigm as a ‘business model, which did not speak to what she valued most about the work done at universities, namely ‘research and teaching’.

‘I was also very angry because it just felt like we were being railroaded, every one of our other missions and core values was being steam-rolled over enterprise, and, emmm, I felt that that indicated that what I did wasn’t valued’ (Norah).

When the university announced its ‘entrepreneurial’ positioning, she reported that it was communicated in a very ‘top-down’ way and that the university declared ‘this is what we’re going to do, this is what we’re going to call it, we’re going to plaster it everywhere, we’re going to put the logo everywhere and you’re gonna follow it’. This left her feeling ‘that we had absolutely no say, nor could we express any dissent’, and though she reported that her position on the enterprise culture has softened somewhat as she had learned to navigate it and reinterpret its discourses in ways that worked for her, she suggested

that, even today, 'I think that we still can't express dissent'. Elsewhere, she described her university's adoption of an 'enterprise culture' as a matter of academics being 'bludgeoned into submission', adding that initially, this transition had been very demoralising.

'yeah, I do think that there was a decision that we were going to change the culture and this was going to be our cultural model, this was going to be our brand, and we were going to change absolutely everything' (Norah).

Norah also recalled thinking, during her university's adoption of the entrepreneurial model: 'I'm sure this is being done for the best, I hate the way it's being done, and I hated the way it was done, and I think it was done without style, I think it was done without respect'. And while she understood that effecting a culture change in a university was a 'momentous thing that takes time to do', she felt that her university's leaders had 'failed' in their approach which she found 'high-handed' and 'abhorrent'. Lastly, she commented that because of internal and external challenges to the university's 'entrepreneurial identity', this posture had begun to take 'a slight back-seat' in recent years, or at least became more 'nuanced', 'softened', or 'refined'.

Owen, who also reported observing significant changes in his university's communications and public positioning as a consequence of its development of an entrepreneurial 'brand', described this culture as having 'filtered down to basic, everyday discourse' because of university directives to treat students as 'consumers' and to embed specifically 'entrepreneurial' learning outcomes and 'entrepreneurial training' in academic programmes. For him, this style of effecting change was a kind of 'bureaucratised control', and he associated directives to develop entrepreneurial learning outcomes as linked to 'behavioural objectives model of education', which he rejected, and 'an objective sign of the expansion of entrepreneurial bullshit'. As such, Owen felt that culture change within his university had been about seeking to alter 'values and expectations' by modifying the strategic priorities, 'work practices' and 'vocabularies' of the institution, which he described as being undertaken in a 'top-down' and 'ham-fisted fashion', adding that 'everybody sees through it'.

## **Enterprise Culture and Discursive Change.**

A number of those interviewed also reported that while an ‘enterprise culture’ had become relatively common within their university, this was something that was a feature of the discursive practices of university management, and not a genuine shift in the attitudes, values, and orientations of the university’s academic communities. In this vein, several participants regarded enterprise as a matter of superficial discursive rebranding – which was relatively nebulous in character - and which had very little real impact on their day-to-day work-life. Janet, for example, commented that here university had adopted a strong enterprise orientation, and established a department responsible for promoting enterprise, but that despite her best efforts she could not divine explicitly what ‘enterprise’ meant, remarking further that ‘one hopes that they know what enterprise is, cause if not we’re all sunk’.

Arthur, who worked at the same institution, commented that the ‘enterprise agenda’ was omnipresent in its communications, but had failed to gain much traction on the ground. Bernadette, also of the same university - ‘Institution 1’ – proffered that ‘when you talk about transformation of culture and the ways that some of these managerialist practices do that, I think it’s at the superficial level’, adding that however culture change was pursued – whether through changes in ‘practices’ or ‘structures’, it was unlikely that university managers would be able to ‘win the hearts and minds’ or to ‘touch people emotionally and- and intellectually’. University ‘mission statements’, she felt, were rarely ever ‘embedded within social practice’, while she described ‘culture’ as ‘shared sets of values and beliefs’ that should be ‘derived’ or ‘defined’ through ‘academic knowledge development’, ‘discussion’, or ‘dialogue’, rather than by through ‘dissemination’ through ‘managerialist practices’. Debby, whose university’s ‘entrepreneurial’ mission was less explicit, and was often enveloped by its research funding focus, also remarked that university change initiatives, unless they were linked to tangible or structural phenomenon like ‘individualised funding targets’, were unlikely to affect ‘a huge change in attitudes’.

Elaine also reported observing referencing to enterprise and ‘enterprise culture’ in ‘languages and discourses’ emitting from central management but had not really been affected by any explicit calls to participate herself, while Fergus stated that he would sometimes report ‘in official speak’ that he taught

his students to 'entrepreneurial' but was never required to specify 'how' exactly because it was generally a 'box-ticking' exercise. Also, because he felt that entrepreneurialism could be 'as elastic as you want', it was very easy to negotiate the 'quasi-entrepreneurial type words' that had begun to permeated management discourses around the responsibilities of academics. Ultimately, he suggested that while he was open to 'reconstructing what entrepreneurship actually means' and developing alternative 'non-capitalist' models, he was sceptical that this was what his university's 'hierarchical missives' – which were easily ignored - had in mind.

Elsewhere, Norah described the idea of an 'entrepreneurial university' to be 'just ludicrous', albeit a 'brand' that she would have to live with, and as such she would have to find ways to make the culture of enterprise that 'was actually proposed' more amenable and 'palatable' to her and her colleagues. This was not, she remarked, a matter of changing values or culture, but of playing 'with language' and 'living within ideology', adding that enterprise had not 'affected my own value system'. To this end, she also suggested that entrepreneurialism in her university was more a matter 'of how you're expected to communicate than what you actually do' and described it as a kind of publicity which involved 'drawing attention to things, sort of excavating them from practices you're already doing' and presenting them in new ways. And while she was 'cynical' and 'ambivalent' about this process, she saw it as a necessary part of negotiating the 'languages' and 'ideologies' of the university.

Owen, who had previously reported that his university's efforts to embed an entrepreneurial culture had been 'top-down' and 'ham-fisted', described the phenomenon as a 'vocabulary' which embodied particular 'values' and a 'specific view of what the culture should be', which was in 'contest' with those which characterised the university's academic communities. Further to this, he remarked that he had to recognise that there was a 'a serious values conflict' expressed in these competing discourses, and that his perspective 'was losing', adding that 'in fairness to the entrepreneurial people', though he 'despise(d) what they're doing in many ways', this was 'their specific view of what the culture should be' that appeared to be 'winning'. Patrick, who was employed by the same university, primarily associated the enterprise culture with its external communications and with efforts, internally, 'to build it into paperwork'. Despite the strong public entrepreneurial identity project by his university however,

he professed to experiencing, first hand, efforts by its managers to thwart the activities of a member of staff who was an advocate for enterprise education. This individual, who Patrick reported had won a number of awards for his enterprise work, which the university was happy to ‘trumpet’ and feature ‘on all of our webpages’, had actually had to ‘fight tooth and nail to, emmm (0.1) to get to do what he wants to do’, which suggested to him that the university was only committed to entrepreneurialism on a superficial level. A number of participants described the entrepreneurial university as being, primarily, a matter of ‘branding’ and ‘publicity’, such as when Arthur associated it with the university’s need to ‘advertise’ and be more ‘outward’ facing in the ‘cultural times we live in’, and to adopt vocabularies that were more ‘economic’ and ‘functional’, while Quinn compared it, as a branding exercise, to a kind of self-fashioning in which the university – as an individual writ-large – ‘presented its best face’ to the world and ‘interpreted’ its activities in new ways ‘to make it look good, like all universities do’. On this note, she remarked that ‘entrepreneurial is really (.) what you want it to be, or what you say it’s going to be’, and was less so an existing institutional culture, but a set of espoused values, a ‘common identity’, or a mission designed at the centre.

Finally, Kieran, who reported positively about playing an active role in the development of a departmental ‘enterprise’ discourse as a response to his university’s ‘business-facing’ mission, commented that while he was ‘quite happy to (0.2) espouse it openly’ as a ‘humanities person’, ‘entrepreneurialism’ was something he tended to discuss in his role as associate head of school, while within his department it tended to be ‘couched’ in different ways so that it wouldn’t ‘put people off’. Later, he described adopting an enterprise discourse as a process of ‘saying, we’re doing that already, but obviously now you’ve got a label you can put on it (laughs), so you know they were already part of it rather than responding to it’, adding that, though several of his colleagues were not ‘on board’, ‘interested whatsoever’, or ‘even engaging’ with entrepreneurialism, they were often ‘doing it already’.

## **Enterprise, Performance Cultures, and Workloads.**

‘I think it’s possible that the entrepreneurial agenda actually overlays (with the impact agenda), but that might be me using a very wide definition of entrepreneurial’. (Norah).

One of the key ‘cultural’ changes referred to by participants – though it was not always explicitly linked to ‘enterprise’ – was of a growing ‘performance’ and ‘measurement’ focus within their respective institutions, linked primarily to the pressures of the Research Excellence Framework (REF), but also to the marketisation of student fees, and in some cases to the National Student Survey (NSS). For example, a significant number of those interviewed were critical of a growing research audit and ‘measurement’ culture driven by the REF and by what Elaine labelled as ‘crude’ and ‘quantitative’ determiners of the ‘value’ and ‘quality’ of research and suggested that the priorities of the ‘enterprise culture’ tended to overlap significantly with those of existing institutional and sectoral performance and audit systems. For Norah, enterprise ‘chimed with all sorts of other imperatives’, at least in terms of her university’s ‘most broad understanding of entrepreneurial culture [which] is about the ability to make change, not just financially and economically, but also in terms of policy and social and cultural structures’. Where research was concerned, the entrepreneurial agenda, to her, had many similarities with the impact agenda, and so, in some ways ‘aligned with (her) core values’ of ‘partnership’, ‘collaboration’ and outward-facedness, even if she was dismissive of what she labelled as the enterprise missions articulation of an ‘economic’ or ‘capitalist’ model.

Fergus, pointing to a fixation on the part of management metrics and the ‘measurable’, particularly in relation to grant-getting, income generation, and ‘individual performance’, proffered that in addition to being driven by processes such as the REF, this indicated a developing ‘business ethos’, suggesting ultimately that there was a kind of symbiosis joining these agendas together. Gráinne also described a growing culture in her university around performance and evaluation at her university, joking that ‘if they can get it to sit still long enough they’ll measure it’, and suggested that this might be linked in some way to enterprise, though this mission tended to be subordinate to her institutions focus on research income generation. Some participants also tied expectations of research performance directly to their

university's enterprise mission, such as when Debby – when asked if there was any specific expectation of her to 'be entrepreneurial' in her institution - responded 'yeah definitely' and that this took the form of specific targets related to bringing in 'applied research income',

A number of participants also remarked that 'entrepreneurialism', if it was a distinct kind of academic activity, and not a metaphorical description of existing ones, could not come 'on top of other things without necessarily the support' (Janet), with Janet commenting that the pressures on academics to meet the performance criteria associated with research and the REF meant that they were already suffering from 'work overload' and that 'there is little support or scope for academics to conduct their own research, let alone become entrepreneurs'. This was ironic, she suggested, as it was the university itself who was 'setting the tone' of the entrepreneurial mission, arguing ultimately that 'in a way that's my point, you know, if you want people to be enterprising, if you want to be able to make things happen, you've got to also have (0.1) support structures and financial structures that enable rather than, eh, challenge this'. Clark similarly recounted a recent training day in which staff were asked to reflect on 'how we can we work better', commenting that while he valued reflexive professional development, the combined demands of the 'REF' and 'enterprise' agendas, on top of the traditional teaching responsibilities, had resulted in a degree of professional role complexity that was sometimes overwhelming, adding that you cannot 'demand everything from everybody all the time'. Elsewhere, Debby suggested that expectations of academics to add 'public value', which are often invoked as part of the 'engagement' model of academic entrepreneurialism, represent an unreasonable burden on top of the already considerable workload and stakeholder complexity attached to academic work, stating that she thought that academic workers were 'pretty accountable already' where their teaching, administrative, and research responsibilities were concerned.

## **Funding, University Culture and Commercialisation.**

A significant number of participants, on the basis of a narrow ‘business-related’ or ‘economic’ interpretation of enterprise, linked it to a sense that they had of a growing culture of commercialisation and preoccupation with funding sources both in their university’s communications, and with their subjective experience of academic work-life within their respective institutions. Arthur, for example, reported that one of the key changes in the ‘culture’ of his university related to a growing ‘institutional imperative to generate income’, which for him was linked to its entrepreneurial mission. Clark, similarly, related that behind efforts to transform ‘culture’ in universities, he saw ‘that very much a culture of privatisation’, ‘commercialisation’, and a gradual shift away from universities being ‘state-funded’ to becoming ‘privately funded’ or ‘profit-making’. Debby, similarly, reported that her university had developed a stronger culture of ‘income generation’ and ‘making money’, while others describing the enterprise culture as being about ‘bringing in external funding’ (Owen) and ‘bringing in money for the university’ (Elaine). Elsewhere, Janet referred to her university’s enterprise mission being oriented towards promoting the commercial exploitation of research, and to consultancy and things that could ‘be patented’, while Owen reported that expectations to be entrepreneurial came mainly in the form of increasing demands to bring in funding to the university, even if it was not required by your research, though this, had suggested, was also driven by the sector-wide research performance culture.

This theme, of university ‘culture’ being shaped not by local managers but by exogenous sector-wide developments related to phenomena such as the REF, the marketisation of fees, university league tables, and the NSS, was invoked by a significant number of participants, for whom the ‘enterprise’ mission appeared to overlap significantly with changes that were already taken place within universities as a result of outside pressures. For example, Arthur commented that while, competition for resources – including student share- ‘advantage’, and reputation had been an institutional reality for UK universities for some time, in his experience at least, the ‘enterprise agenda’ had brought this ‘economic’ focus ‘perhaps more visibly to the surface’. Clark, similarly, proffered that the culture of ‘commercialisation’ enveloping his university was likely driven by external pressures, with the enterprise mission merely

‘going alongside this’. Elsewhere, Debby, discussing her university’s focus on income generation – which she felt was what enterprise chiefly signified – commented that this was likely a response to the ‘competitive atmosphere’ in which most UK universities currently found themselves, a view which was corroborated by Elaine who believed that the enterprise paradigm was linked to universities pursuing a larger share of research and student funding. Janet, similarly, described her university’s funding focus and ‘performance-driven’, ‘quantitative, audit culture’ as strategic response to changes in the university’s external environment, rather than to concerted efforts on the part of management to drive through changes in organisational culture internally.

### **Enterprise Culture and the Social Mission.**

In the context of the emphasis placed within the entrepreneurial paradigm on academics becoming more open to new ways of sharing their knowledge and finding practical applications for it in the world outside of the university, participants were asked specifically if their university had encouraged them to ‘share’ their knowledge or expertise in ‘in new ways’, such as through finding ‘new practical uses or applications’ for it or identifying new methods for dissemination of their work. Participants were also asked if they felt, personally, that academics *should* be more accountable for adding ‘public value’ to their work, such as through community engagement or participative research.

For Arthur, while the expectation to be entrepreneurial in this way had not been ‘tangible’ at his university, he did report that a social enterprise model had been a feature of their communications. Further to this, he commented that he would ‘utterly support’ any effort to make his university more ‘transparent’, ‘accountable’, and beneficial to local communities and the region, and that this had always been a norm that informed his practice, though it had not been communicated to him that this would be considered ‘enterprising’. Bernadette, who worked at the same university, stated that a clear point had been ‘certainly put forward’ about finding new ways to disseminate knowledge, but that this was already something she pursued, and that she suspected her university’s message had a more ‘economic spin’ and was about ‘generating money’. Clark argued that, although he believed that the state had a legitimate expectation of ‘some kind of broader public return’ from the universities it funded, this, to

him, largely represented ‘management speak’, and that exhortations to be ‘open to new ways of thinking’ tended to mean ‘more power to markets’ and ‘less power to anything else’. Additionally, despite his openness, ‘in principle’, to enhancing public engagement, he stressed that this could not be another item added to the ‘already huge list of things’ that academics do, without proper support. Norah, similarly, commented that ‘our public value is in teaching and research, we should be accountable for the public value of the things we are contracted to do’.

Debby, though her university had not promoted a social or engagement model of enterprise among staff, stated that she ‘quite welcomed’ any opportunity to find some ‘practical application’ for her work, or to make it ‘meaningful to some- (.) to somebody’, and that she was positive about the way that this was being driven sectorally by ‘impact’ component of the REF, which was a sentiment corroborated by several other participants including Elaine, Clark, and Fergus, most of whom agreed that the university should ‘stop being an ivory tower and to be more open to a wider public’ (Elaine) and that academics had an obligation to become ‘co-producers’ of knowledge with communities, instead of engaging in vampire knowledge production’ which entailed ‘suck(ing) out the data from the community’ that you are working with, rather than working with them in ways that served *their* interests (Fergus). Fergus, however, was highly critical of the ‘social enterprise’ model adopted by his university and felt that it was typically promoted amongst students as an ‘anteroom to entrepreneurship proper’ and something ‘for their CVs’.

To this end, Fergus also commented that he had been actively engaged with communities for his whole professional life, but that his institution - which treated his outreach work with ‘benign indifference’ - was more interested in collaborations that could deliver ‘knowledge transfer’ that was ‘commercially exploitable’. Patrick, who was employed at the same university, also proposed that ‘knowledge transfer I think is the buzzword, not entrepreneurship’ in their approach to research outcomes, and though he felt that the university did encourage staff ‘to exploit our skills in the wider community’, this was not typically articulated as part of the ‘enterprise mission’, which tended to focus on student employability activities. He also stated that conventionally, while the academic’s role was usually defined under the four headings ‘teaching, research, administration, and community (.) engagement’, he felt that, in his

experience, community had ‘taken a back seat’ and was ‘much less valued now than it used to be’, even as his university had developed an increasingly entrepreneurial posture.

Janet remarked that, through her portfolio of curatorship, textbook publication, and her work ‘running summer schools’ with the university’s arts centre, sharing and disseminating her knowledge and expertise in non-academic context was very much part of her practice, but she could not recall being explicitly encouraged to adopt a more outward-facing orientation, or identify new avenues for knowledge sharing, as a consequence of her university’s entrepreneurial mission. Similarly, she preferred to describe work she had done to open up the university’s ‘facilities’ to the community as being about promoting ‘democratic access’ and widening participation’ in publicly funded universities, rather than ‘enterprise’ or ‘value added’. Norah, who worked at the same institution, was very positive about the idea of sharing her knowledge with non-academic constituencies, commenting that she wished ‘there were more opportunities for it’, but claimed that there was very little support or acknowledgment of this within her university, unless could ‘make money’. Also, where there was pressure to find new outlets for your work, she considered this to be coming not from the university, but from HEFCE and the ‘national research agenda’.

### **5.5.2. The ‘Visibility’ of the Enterprise Culture**

Participants were asked about the visibility of the enterprise mission on their respective university campuses, whether or not enterprise featured strongly in their organisational communications, and about the modes through which it may, or may not, have been communicated to them, such as in the form of their university’s ‘business communication’ which includes ‘formalized and planned messages codified in letters, memos, reports, websites, and advertising campaigns’ and its more general ‘organisational communication’ which incorporates ‘informal and day-to-day interactions among organizational members’ (Keyton, 2005, p.12). In the literature on organisations, ‘communication’ is often conceptualised as a medium which ‘generates, not merely expresses, key organizational realities’

(Ashcraft, Kuhn, & Cooren, 2009, p.2) and so plays a key role in structuring members' subjective experiences of the organisations where they are employed. Following the 'linguistic turn' in organisational studies (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000, p.138), communication has also come to be viewed as one of the main tools through which managers can direct change in organisational 'cultures', understood as the cognitive and semiotic dimensions of the 'set of shared values, beliefs, assumptions, and practices that shape and guide members' attitudes and behaviour' (Kasensap, 2017, p.335) in the organisation's members as a whole. In this section of the schedule, by asking participants about how the enterprise mission was 'communicated to them', 'culture' was framed in terms of official imaginary and 'prevailing organizational sentiments' (Tierney, 1988, p.3), rather than as a deeply-rooted set of beliefs, traditions, and customs shared by all of a university's members.

One theme that emerged from the interviews was that, at some universities, the entrepreneurial mission and branding was quite ubiquitous and all-embracing and could be detected in many aspects of organisational life, while in others it was limited to official, often outward-facing communications and had very little presence in the micro-interactions of the academic lifeworld. Arthur, for example, reported that his university had quite a pronounced enterprise identity, which was expressed in its external communications, in 'changed committee headings', in 'internal communiques', and 'publicity pasted up around the campus'. However, while he was cognisant of the 'broad principles' of his university's entrepreneurial mission, he found it easy to remain distant from it, regarding it predominantly as an 'external messages' and adding that it was unclear how he was expected to 'engage with it'. This seemed to imply that, even on a university campus with a particularly pervasive entrepreneurial identity, it was not difficult for academics in particular disciplines or departments to disregard it completely. Norah, who worked at 'Institution 1' alongside Arthur, related that her university had a particularly strong enterprise mission, and that it was handled like 'the equivalent of (...) you know, the Chinese five-year plan, this is what we're going to do, this is what we're going to call it, we're going to plaster it everywhere, we're going to put the logo everywhere and you're gonna follow it'. In this regard, she remarked that the enterprise mission was difficult to ignore, though it had left her feeling 'preached to' and 'alienated'.

Owen, meanwhile, commented that the enterprise message was most apparent in the strategic priorities of university management, such as in terms of the creation of roles with specific enterprise remits, the staging of 'entrepreneurial' events for students, the appointment of 'entrepreneurs' to positions inside the institution, and the distribution of occasional 'bullshit memos'. Kieran, Clark, Louie, Debby, and Janet also referred to the enterprise message as being communicated in the creation of particular management roles or university units with specific remits for 'enterprise'. More concretely, Owen reported that the language of enterprise was in evidence in university policies related to skills provision and the design of module guides. Patrick, who worked at the same institution, stated that the entrepreneurial paradigm was most evident in the university's publicity and marketing, particularly in its embrace of the title of 'entrepreneurship university of the year', though he felt that this was a matter of rhetoric, and not a substantive internal mission. Elsewhere, like Owen, he remarked that he had been 'encouraged to build it into the paperwork', particularly in relation to employability and programme learning outcomes. Additionally, he observed that 'enterprise' was 'enshrined in certain core kinds of policy documents' but that, generally, the university's approach was generally 'very ad-hoc and haphazard'.

Fergus reported that his university's 'official interpretation of entrepreneurship' could be detected in official communications as 'the dominant eh- institutional culture and objective', meaning that engaging with it was unavoidable, though this often resulted in he and his colleagues showing 'outward signs of deference' by disingenuously adopting or 'subverting' its vocabularies as a strategy of resistance. And though none of this 'impacted' on his thinking, he referred to entrepreneurial messages as a feature of the regular 'edicts' and 'hierarchical missives coming down from the centre', and as a strong component of their external marketing, 'corporate branding and media output'. While Gráinne referred to her university's entrepreneurial mission sometimes being communicated through its 'message of the day', a convention which she likened to 'like living in a communist state isn't it? it's not uplifting'. She also alluded to 'these little banners that hang around' the campus announcing the university's status as an enterprising institution and being 'bombarded' with emails that contained 'various corporate messages', sometimes associated with entrepreneurialism, communicated by the University Management. As a result, while the entrepreneurial paradigm was 'conspicuous' in university communications, such as through

internal and external magazines, emails, and other reports, she regarded this as a ‘top-down’ process of communication which had very little salience for her department, describing ‘most academics based in an academic department’ as ‘completely immune’ to these messages.

A number of participants reported that one of the more explicit ways in which their university’s enterprise mission had become visible was through its rhetoric surrounding their research policies and support structures. Clark, for example, reported that one of the main ways in which ‘entrepreneurialism’ – which he framed as indivisible from the commercialization of research outputs - manifested at his university was through a ‘strong emphasis on, em, being entrepreneurial’ in cross-university research and support offices’. Similarly, Bernadette, who recounted being quite ‘surprised’ at how prominent ‘enterprise’ and ‘entrepreneurialism’ had become in the internal and external publicity of her institution, reported that it was through the university’s research policies that its entrepreneurial message had been made most explicit, such as when its research support office was renamed as the ‘research and enterprise committee’, making the two activities ‘indistinguishable’ within the university’s communications. Debby also suggested that it was through her university’s emphasis on the imperative for all academics to contribute towards bringing in ‘what’s called applied research income’ that the entrepreneurial mission might be mediated though this was not explicitly articulated in this way. In some cases, participants felt that it was through the university’s communications or ‘missives’ (Fergus) around employability initiatives that enterprise messages were most likely to be encountered, with several proffering that very little distinction was drawn between ‘employability and entrepreneurialism’ at their university (Louie).

‘to what extent people engage with that on a- really, you know, for those who are working predominantly on the chalk-faces, like always, it’s (.) more like business as usual’ (Kieran).

Kieran commented that the enterprise mission was evident in university communications, stating that ‘obviously, it’s in all the literature, sort of like five-year plans and mission’, though he was unsure as to what extent ordinary members of staff made a point of reading these materials, adding that his position as an associated head of school drew him into engaging with the ‘whole message’ of

entrepreneurialism. Similarly, Matt proffered that the enterprise mission was something one was more likely to be aware of if one was ‘in that kind of loop, of committees’ which meant ‘obviously receiving a lot of papers from the centre’ with ‘information about ‘targets that need to be reached’.

Some participants, particularly those working in the ‘Ancient’ collegiate university, reported that the entrepreneurial paradigm was ‘really not a rhetoric you encounter very much’ (Iris), and that, within this type of organisational structure, it was easier to disregard university communications coming ‘from the centre’(Matt). Debby reported having very little day-to-day interaction with the entrepreneurial paradigm on campus and joked that if university management had been trying to communicate an entrepreneurial agenda to her, ‘I haven’t really noticed’, and that if she had, she wouldn’t really listen as ‘I’ve got my own agenda’ ((laughs))’.

In summary, participants reported to becoming aware of the enterprise paradigm through their university’s official communications, external marketing, within the campus environment, or in the manner in which terms such as ‘enterprise’ had been appended to existing or newly created management and administrative roles. Further to this, a number reported that their institution’s research and employability policies tended to be articulated in ‘entrepreneurial’ terms, though specific expectations of academics themselves to be explicitly ‘enterprising’ were not widely reported.

### **Culture Change and University Governance**

Lastly, in relation to ‘culture change’ within their universities, participants were asked about any structural changes they had observed, such as in relation to university governance. Typically, advocates for the enterprise university model promote the idea that it should not be imposed in a ‘top-down’ way on the ‘academic heartland’ (Clark, 1998), but rather should invite them to participate voluntarily in the development of an ‘integrated’ enterprise culture in which institutional values and academic values are given equal parity. This is consistent with the kind of change models promoted by advocates for intrapreneurship and corporate enterprise in the traditional firm, in which the buildout of an enterprise culture is framed as something inclusive and empowering, rather than a unilateral management

initiative. In this regard, participants were asked if they had observed any changes in ‘organisational and governance structures’, or ‘styles of leadership’ within their universities, and whether or not they felt that academics had ‘a more active or less active role in decision making processes at the university’.

Bernadette associated entrepreneurialism with ‘top-down’ organisational and ‘managerial’ methods, as something ‘rolled out’ from the centre, though she felt that management efforts to ‘transform culture’ were likely only to have ‘superficial’ outcomes, stating that ‘they can roll out these new systems and structures within an institution, and some of it trickles down, but again how much of the hearts and minds does it actually capture of people?’. Further to this, she commented that despite the frequency with which management in her university had gone about making changes in its structures and organisation, in her experience, ‘nothing comes out of it’. In terms of the influence of the entrepreneurial paradigm on his university, Clark reported that management had adopted ‘economic viability’ as an overriding criterion in all matters, although he felt that ‘an interest in the bottom line’ had long been a key focus of his university. Though he felt that it was difficult to determine whether university leaderships styles were driven by ‘particular personalities’, ‘governance philosophies’, or a ‘mixture of both’, he saw the creation of new ‘entrepreneurial’ positions in his university as a ‘sign’ that there was a move towards ‘ways of working that you would expect in the private sector’. Debby also felt that her university’s growing tendency to recruit deans externally from industry, rather than from the pool of academic professionals, likely signified that it was drifting closer to a scenario, already partially realised, in which income generation would become a, if not *the*, central criteria for career progression. Gráinne, meanwhile, described a university which was obsessed with measurement and performance, which ‘drip fed’ information to staff, and offered no meaningful opportunities for academic involvement in key decision making. Further to this, she reported that her university had exercised poor judgment in appointing a particular business person to its board as, being familiar with his reputation for unethical business practices, she was ‘actually horrified’ by his recruitment. However, it was indicative of the fact that her university was, for her, governed by ‘a small group of people making all the decisions’ and who are interested in recruiting individuals on the basis of their ability to ‘chase money’. Patrick also reported the growth of a ‘top-down managerial culture’, commenting that: ‘we are managed

in a way that we never were before, so and I think that actually works against notions of entrepreneurship to be honest because it inhibits spontaneity’.

Elaine described her university as having a ‘polarised’ culture, characterised by ‘top-down’ management styles, remarking that this ‘drive towards a more centralised, autocratic system’ had brought universities closer to a ‘business culture’ which she felt was, perhaps, linked to the enterprise mission in some way. In the same vein, she described university managers as coming increasingly to articulate their missions and values through the ‘kind of language and discourse’ one would expect to find in a competitive ‘market driven situation’. For Fergus, who likened managing academics to ‘herding kittens’, his university had come increasingly to take on a ‘corporate culture’ which was characterised by a bureaucratic ‘micro-management’ culture, a ‘diminution of trust’, and all of ‘those horrible Weberian bureaucratic elements’ that take ‘the joy (.) out of what the job should be’. Further to this, he commented that the most recent waves of organisational restructuring had ushered in a leaner, but ‘more centralised governance structure’, in which schools had been given devolved responsibility for their budgets and exhorted to behave ‘like small little businesses that have to balance their books’. And while many of these changes had been underway for some time, he felt that the enterprise mission was either an expression of these changes, or something that was bringing them to the fore.

Arthur related that, as he was so ‘low in the food chain’, it was difficult for him to ‘read’ what the ‘agendas’ really are, though he alluded to a situation in which a certain ‘political correctness’ had come to prevail regarding ‘how the university talks about itself’, with the result that the universities communications had become ‘more filtered’ by a ‘command and control type of cultural of management’. However, he did report that university management had changed the way in which they rewarded and ‘recognised’ staff for their work, and that changes in this are appeared to have been initiated to ‘dangle the carrots’ in the direction of entrepreneurial behaviours. However, Norah, who worked at the same university, felt that its shift towards a more entrepreneurial mode had been accompanied by a large ‘top-down’ effort at structural reorganisation, done with very little ‘consultancy or research’, which was very disruptive. She linked this to what she saw as a growing tendency for university management to fetishize change, and to regularly ‘rush into’ structures ‘that aren’t thought

about, I think that babies and bathwaters are thrown out'. And though she was glad not to work in a 'stuck institution that never does anything and always plays the status quo', she believed that her own university was often 'way too hasty' in putting its 'time into new initiatives' which often didn't 'get off the ground', lacked 'joined-up thinking', were sometimes 'foolish', and caused considerable disruption for staff. Owen, similarly reported that his university had increasingly adopted a culture of 'continual institutional revolution' in which change was initiative at such as disruptive rate that policies often didn't have time 'to bed down', thus creating 'tremendous inefficiencies', while Bernadette described a 'rate of change' that was 'constantly destabilising'.

Where academic participants in university decision-making was concerned, most participants reported that while their university paid 'lip-service' (Gráinne) to employee engagement and collegiality, and many fora and committees still existed for this purpose, very little meaningful consultation was every carried out on the university's strategic decision-making (Fergus). All of this was part, Fergus felt, of 'a less democratic style of governance' where 'charismatic' heads of school and directors of research typically fulfil the function of 'softening the blow' of 'some of the more ridiculous Weberian, Kafkaesque demands of the- the centre of the University'. Where large collegial style meetings were held on campus, he argued that these were effectively 'extended memos' where decisions that have already been made are presented to academics and top-level decision making presented by heads of school as merely 'this is what's come down'. Owen, similarly, labelled high-level committees where academics had representation were 'just a talking shop', as in the view of he and his colleagues, 'decisions are made elsewhere' and merely presented to academics in what are supposed to be democratic for a, while Clark described these kinds of structures as 'pretty much toothless' and academic representation as 'token'. Patrick, similarly, commented that 'there are a dozen people at (his university) who have all the power', and that while they regularly solicited feedback from staff, he felt that this was just an exercise in feigned democracy.

## CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION

This study set out to explore how the related concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic were constructed in the higher education research and policy literature in the United Kingdom, to enquire into how non-STEM academics working within universities that had positioned themselves publicly as ‘entrepreneurial’ interpret and negotiate these constructs, and what influence – if any – they felt that this positioning had had on their institution’s ‘culture’ and their academic work-life. University ‘culture’ was a particular focus of the study based on a consensus amongst advocates that ‘effective institutional *and* cultural change’ (OECD and EC, 2012) and the creation of an ‘integrated entrepreneurial culture’ (Burton R Clark, 1998; Clark, 2004a; Gibb *et al.*, 2009; Shattock, 2010) were necessary conditions for a university to transition towards the entrepreneurial mode.

A series of semi-structured interviews were carried out with seventeen academics, working in a variety of university types, in disciplines that could be described as ‘non-STEM’. This purposive sampling strategy was decided upon at an early stage in response to the development of an inclusive definition of academic entrepreneurialism - typically associated with the writings of Burton R. Clark - (Burton R Clark, 1998; Clark, 2001, 2004a) - which remodelled it as a whole university capacity intended not just for ‘entrepreneurial scientists’ (Etzkowitz, 1983) who were ‘consultants, patent holders and firm founders’ (Etzkowitz, 2002, p.2) but for those who dwelled in the ‘academic heartland’ where ‘traditional academic departments formed around disciplines new and old’ and ‘traditional academic values are most firmly rooted’ (Clark, 1998, p.7). Clark’s expansive conception of the entrepreneurial academic has become a recurring motif in higher education policy discourses, both in the UK (Gibb *et al.*, 2009; Coyle *et al.*, 2013) and internationally (Shattock and OECD, 2005; OECD and EC, 2012) and can typically be said to prioritise what Norman Fairclough has described as the ‘quality’ and ‘activity’ meanings or ‘senses’ of enterprise, over its traditional ‘business’ related connotations (Fairclough, 1991).

Before enquiring into participants' perspectives on what it meant for an academic or university to be 'entrepreneurial', a literature review was conducted in order both to provide a genealogy of enterprise 'discourse' and 'culture', and to delineate some of the ways in which the 'entrepreneurial' university and academic were discursively constructed in the contemporary research and policy literature of UK higher education.

### **6.1. The Concepts of the 'Entrepreneurial' University and Academic**

The 'entrepreneurial university' has been described as the 'dominant idea' of the university in late modernity (Barnett, 2011, p.6), the 'natural continuation of the development of the university' (Rinne and Koivula, 2005, p.104), a hegemonic 'higher education buzzword' (Mautner, 2005) and as an 'idea for its time' which has 'set alight a flame of institutional independence which, perhaps for the first time in some European countries, has encouraged a serious challenge to the enveloping political and cultural traditions of the European nation state' (Shattock, 2010, p.270). Though the idea of the entrepreneurial university is often critiqued as being a manifestation of 'academic capitalism' (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997), managerialism and marketisation (Bridgman, 2007), 'commodification' (Bok, 2009, p.16) and 'privatization' (Lieberwitz, 2016), an expansive conceptualisation of it has developed in higher education research, policy, and advocacy which deploys a discourse on 'entrepreneurialism' which decouples it from its origins in a 'business-related lexis' (Mautner, 2005) and portrays it as a new organisational paradigm – which in addition to commercialising 'know-how' (Gibb, Haskins and Robertson, 2009, p.3) embraces change, 'responds to problems and opportunities in the wider social environment'(Gibb, 2006b), harnesses intellectual capital 'for the benefit of the economy and society in general' (NCGE, 2010, p.2), and pursues active 'community engagement' (Fayolle and Redford, 2014, p. 40).

The main finding of the literature review component of this thesis was that, in the research and policy literatures surveyed, the concepts of the 'entrepreneurial' university and 'academic' were typically articulated in a diversity of ways which express a wide range of significations. Using a framework adapted from Fairclough (Fairclough, 1991) it was determined that 'enterprise discourse' is typically

employed in the rhetorics of UK higher education not as a ‘well-defined code’ (Fairclough, 1991, p.112) but as a shifting constellation of signifiers which Fairclough has described as its interrelated ‘business’, ‘quality’, and ‘activity’ senses. Here, Fairclough identified three distinct forms of connotation implicit in the use of ‘enterprise’ and its cognates which pointed, respectively, to a conventional restricted range of meanings associated with private enterprise, a collection of positive traits or ‘qualities’ associated with entrepreneurial personality types, and descriptions of ‘activities’ which were framed as ‘bold, arduous or momentous’ (Fairclough, 1991, p.113). For Fairclough, in principle, any occurrence of the term could be ‘interpreted in any of the three senses or any combination of them’, which gave enterprise discourse a semantic flexibility and ‘ambivalence potential’ that made it uniquely ‘exploitable’ as a ‘strategic’ resource (Fairclough, 1991, p.114). The idea of ‘strategic ambiguity as a rhetorical resource’ has been taken up separately by Jarzabkowski *et al* in their study of the use of discourse as a tool for enabling ‘collective action around a strategic goal’ in organisations that are ‘ambiguity-prone’, and where ‘multiple meanings and interests’, ‘conflicting priorities’, and ‘diffuse’ power structures prevail (Jarzabkowski, Sillince and Shaw, 2010, p.221).

In this vein, the ‘ambivalence potential’ (Fairclough, 1991) of enterprise discourse could be described as a ‘rhetorical resource’ in an institution– like the university - where there is significant ‘internal differences in terms of values, beliefs and symbolism’ (Alvesson and Sveningsson, 2008, p.46), relatively weak organisational power structures, and where university leaders are faced with managing already complicated institutions in an age believed to be characterised by ‘radical uncertainty’ and ‘supercomplexity’(Barnett, 2000a). As a ‘master metaphor’ (Hobbs, 2015) for conceptualising universities and academic practice, then, ‘entrepreneurialism’ - because of its plasticity – appears capable of accommodating multiple, sometimes contradictory, meanings and interests insofar as ‘goals are expressed with sufficient ambiguity that all actors can subscribe to them’ (Jarzabkowski, Sillince and Shaw, 2010, p.221). This is borne out by the manner in which enterprise discourse appears, within the literature, to deploy a multiplicity of fluid ‘senses’ which in some instances refer specifically to traditionally ‘entrepreneurial’ activities such as commercialisation, income generation, and university-industry linkage, and in others to ‘value-laden abstract terms’ (Räsänen and Linde, 2004, p.105) such as ‘self-reliance, adaptability, and flexibility’ (Barnett, 2000b, p.113) which evoke other ‘common-

sensical, humanistic values, which are presented as all-encompassing and context-free' (Räisänen and Linde, 2004, p.118).

In this regard, it could be argued that what du Gay has described as the 'critical tactic' of evaluating 'enterprise discourse' in higher education in terms of a narrow business-related lexis' (Mautner, 2005) will very often flounder under the weight of the many complex and 'non-reducible' (du Gay, 2004, p.41) meanings that it is able to convey. Alternatively, Skinner has proffered that if people are 'persuaded that a given evaluative term applies in circumstances in which they may never have thought of applying it', the more 'broad and inclusive' its usage will become, eventually leading to a change in the 'underlying concept' as it comes to take on 'a new prominence and a new salience' in society (Skinner, 1999, p.7). In this respect, the 'generalisation of an "enterprise form" to all forms of conduct' (Burchell, 1996, p.28) within the landscape of higher education could be argued – in its ambiguity and 'expansive meaning potential' - to be doing a certain kind of ideological work in ridding 'enterprise', 'entrepreneurship', and 'entrepreneurialism' of what, for some, are its associations with 'managerialism' (Deem, 1998, p.50) and 'marketization' (Mautner, 2005) and what Fairclough has described - writing in the early nineteen nineties – as 'a somewhat discredited private business sector' (Fairclough, 1991, p.114).

A recurring theme identified in the contemporary literature on the entrepreneurial university relates to the apparent consensus on the necessity for institutions to transform their 'cultures' and create 'integrated, entrepreneurial cultures' (Burton R Clark, 1998) in their stead. A such, the entrepreneurial university – and academic - are consistently described as being flexible, reflexive and positively disposed towards change, with institutions and individuals exhorted to adopt an 'adaptation ethic' and embrace a culture in which 'change' and 'the pursuit of new things' are promoted as 'desirable norms' and 'operating mantra(s)' (Goossen, 2008, p.43). In a manner comparable to what has been described as the 'the enterprise of the self' (Rose 1992, p.146), 'change' here denotes not a singular, episodic transition, but a permanent posture necessitated by the need to respond 'dramatically and immediately' (du Gay, 1997) to developments in an external environment which is characterised by the constant and accelerated presence of change and uncertainty. Further to this, the entrepreneurial university and its

characteristic ‘culture’ tended to be framed, within the literature, in a manner which evoked the ‘flawed dualism’ between ‘enterprise’ and ‘bureaucracy’ (Fournier and Grey, 1999) that has been a feature of ‘enterprise discourse’ going back for decades, and which promotes the idea that universities that are unwilling, or unable, to pursue entrepreneurial ‘governance’ and ‘culture’ will be ill-prepared to take on the epochal challenges which all universities presently face.

Also evident within the literature was the articulation of what Rose has labelled as the ‘institutional, ethical, and political strands’ (Rose, 1999, p.5) of enterprise discourse in higher education, manifested respectively in the related concepts of the entrepreneurial ‘university’, the entrepreneurial ‘academic’, and the notion of the ‘triple’ or ‘quadruple’ helix of university-government-industry and, more recently, civil society relations (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997; E.G. Carayannis and Campbell, 2012). Aimed both at the university as an institution, and the academic as an individual, the prescriptive thrust of higher education enterprise discourse points to the need for both organisations and subjects to embody the ‘qualities’ traditionally associated with the entrepreneurial firm and ‘self’ (Bröckling, 2015), which typically denotes some combination of ‘a cluster of loosely related inspirational values’ (Roberts, 2002) comprising self-reliance, proactivity, reflexive transformation, flexibility, and a positive change-orientation. The broad and inclusive definition of the entrepreneurial academic which pervades much of the literature appears also to emphasise what Fairclough has described as the ‘quality sense’ of enterprise, in that it tends to prioritise abstract entrepreneurial traits and general attributes, and in some cases channels the mythic archetypes of the ‘entrepreneurial ideal’ (Perkin, 1992) or the dramatic persona of the entrepreneur as ‘cultural hero’ (Waller and Hamilton, 2010), as opposed to the more mundane sense of ‘entrepreneurialism’ as entailing the setting up of businesses. However, the ‘business-related’ vocabulary traditionally associated with enterprise discourse is still very much in evidence in the HE policy and research literature, with expansive conceptions of entrepreneurial institutions, activities, and actors which seek to transcend ‘straightjacketed business definitions’ (Patel, 2004, p.1) often articulated alongside descriptions of knowledge commercialisation, spin-out company formation, student entrepreneurship, and the contributions of the university –and its employees - to local economies and national innovation systems.

Further to this, the recurring construction of the university and academic as equal nodes in a ‘triple’ or ‘quadruple’ helix of economic and social development and innovation appears to demonstrate that enterprise discourse in higher education represents, as Rose has suggested, offers an ‘apparently coherent design for the radical transformation of contemporary social relations’ (Rose 1999, p.5)’. In this regard, the entrepreneurial university model is often described as a pro-active and self-reliant institutional posture which, aside from allowing institutions more discretion over income generation and budgetary decisions, positions them more readily to integrate the missions of community engagement, and local and regional social and economic development. In addition, then, to developing a ‘diversified funding base’ (Burton R Clark, 1998) and ‘identifying, creating and commercializing intellectual property’ (Etzkowitz *et al.*, 2000, p.313), the primary objective of the entrepreneurial university is often presented as being related to the mobilisation of its resources for the benefit of community development, in which it comes to be seen as an undifferentiated element of a post-institutional network of partners engaged in the society-wide pursuit of social and economic innovation and development.

And while this undifferentiated, non-competitive, ‘systems’ perspective on the embeddedness of the university in wider society imbues it with a positive, outward-facing, and publicly-accountable new identity, some have been critical of the tendency for the entrepreneurial model to conflate the university’s ‘third mission’ of engagement in ‘entrepreneurship and business-related activities’ (Gulbrandsen and Slipersaeter, 2007, p.112) with its nascent ‘fourth mission’ of assuming a role both in local economic *and* social development. Underlying this critique, perhaps, is an identification of the ‘ambivalence potential’ of enterprise discourse in which entrepreneurialism becomes generalised to ‘all forms of social conduct’ (du Gay 2004, p.38), against the backdrop of what Jameson has described as the late modern ‘dedifferentiation of fields’ in which the boundaries between historically discrete domains of practice have been gradually ‘effaced’ by their ‘culturalisation’ (Jameson, 1992, p.72). In a similar vein, Fairclough - for whom there has been a ‘significant shift in the social functioning of language’ under the conditions of late modernity (Fairclough, 1992, p.6) – has argued that as economic discourses ‘move across boundaries between institutions’ (p.54), social domains which had historically been ‘organized and conceptualized’ in terms of their own distinctive discursive practices come

increasingly to be ‘colonized’ by the tendencies affecting a wider ‘societal order of discourse’, which for him represents the ‘structured totality’ of discourses which characterise a whole society at any given historical juncture (Fairclough, 1992). In this respect, then, ‘enterprise discourse’ comes to be seen as a societally hegemonic discursive and epistemological formation which, having ‘become disembedded from particular orders of discourse’ as a set of ‘free-floating’ discursive elements ‘elements capable of being articulated together in new ways’ (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, p 132), threatens to undermine the university’s role as a distinctive social institution at a time when it has become increasingly ‘impossible to construct (for them) a grand unifying theme’ (Scott, 1995, p.3). Ironically, however, such is the popularity of the entrepreneurial model (Barnett, 2010) that it could be said to have inherited the mantle of Newman’s liberal ‘idea’ and the ‘Humboldt myth’ (Morozov, 2016) as a hegemonic ‘master signifier’ in contemporary higher education discourse.

## **6.2. Non-STEM academics and the entrepreneurial paradigm.**

In addition to interrogating how the related concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university and academic were constructed in the higher education research and policy literature, this study had - as one of its primary aims – an exploration of the ways in which non-STEM academics working in self-described ‘entrepreneurial’ institutions interpreted and negotiated these same concepts. To this end a series of interviews were undertaken with seventeen academics, working in a range of university types, which made use of a combination of biographic-narrative and semi-structured research questions, alongside a small number of explicit sensitising statements intended to provoke interpretive discussion of some of the study’s core themes, including institutional culture change in entrepreneurial universities and the requirement for entrepreneurial academics to be self-reflexive, externally oriented, and positively disposed towards change.

### 6.2.1. Academic Values & Professional Self-Constructs.

In part A of the interview schedule, participants were asked to provide biographical accounts of their professional development, and to answer a series of questions about their values, their professional self-constructs, the ways in which they described their work to others, and the stakeholders that it benefited. This portion of the interview was less 'guided' than others, aiming to avoid – where possible - 'framing, preface or interruption' (Brannen *et al.*, 2007, p.19) on the part of the researcher, and was oriented towards exploring the 'discursive repertoires' that participants used to describe and account for their academic practice *before* the concepts of the entrepreneurial academic and university were introduced into discussion. The term 'repertoire' was utilised to indicate that participants were expected to draw flexibly on distinct discourses, conceived as 'speech or writing understood from the point of view of the beliefs, values and categories which *it* embodies' (Fowler, *cited in* Mills, 1997, p.6), rather than the consistent beliefs or values of participants themselves.

The main finding of this section of the analysis was that participants, broadly speaking, tended to utilise a combination of legitimising discourses which could be described - in order of priority – as 'liberal', 'public service', and 'political'. On the whole, the majority of those interviewed advanced a 'liberal' perspective on the nature and value of academic work, though this was sometimes described as being variously 'cultural', 'principled', 'ethical' or 'humanistic'. Regardless of the specific vocabulary deployed, however, what participants' accounts shared in common was a configuration of different statements which framed teaching as an 'intrinsic good', a matter of 'serving society', and of 'making the world a better place' through the creation of 'empowered' and 'critical' learners and an 'independently-minded' citizenry. Additionally, participants also described a commitment to serving the wider 'social good' either through teaching, scholarship, or the preservation and promotion of culture. Further to this, a considerable number of participants described their academic practice and their politics as being interwoven, whether this referred to a commitment to feminism, social equity, social justice, minority rights, or environmental activism. Critically, the traditional 'liberal' perspectives constructed by participants were generally tempered by the invocation of a 'public service' ethos in

which interviewees outlined their sense of responsibility to ‘the public’, ‘local communities’, ‘taxpayers’, or learners outside of the university, and spoke of a desire to ensure a ‘wider social return’ from their work, with one participant referring to himself as a ‘privileged knowledge worker’ with an obligation to ‘pay back’ his ‘community and society’.

Where stakeholders were concerned, participants overwhelmingly cited students as the key beneficiaries of their work, both individually and in the broader sense of a commitment to ‘broadening a generation’s horizons’, with some outlining a commitment to non-traditional learners and communities of learners outside of the university setting. A number of participants also framed their commitment to teaching as contributing – in the style of traditional defences of liberal education- to the broader social good through the creation of cultivated, critical, and ethical students. However, while some were critical of adopting the ‘language of transferable skills’, most were able to acknowledge the importance of ensuring positive vocational outcomes for students. After learners, the most frequently cited stakeholder groups were academic communities, whereby participants reported to seeing the value of their work primarily in terms of their contribution to knowledge, or the development of their discipline. However, a small number attested to a belief in producing knowledge outside of the university, such as with community partners, in a way analogous to the idea of ‘mode 3 knowledge production’ frequently employed in the literature on entrepreneurial universities, though participants framed these activities as being motivated by their political values, a desire to empower non-academic constituencies, or an interest in ‘widening participation’. And while at least half of those interviewed professed to a desire to see their work benefit lay readerships, local communities or professional’s groups – such as NGOs, arts practitioners, journalists, and teachers – there was a consistent tendency to frame this obligation in social, political, and educational terms, and to deliberately eschew appeals to utility or commercialisation.

Though tensions existed between liberal constructions of higher education as disinterested and an intrinsic good, and a near consensus around the need for academics to take their responsibilities as ‘civil’ or ‘public servants’ seriously, the consistent articulation of these two distinct frames suggests that a mixture of ‘public-service’ and ‘liberal’ norms underpins UK academics’ professional self-constructs, which is consistent with the position, taken by Becher and Trowler, that academics working

in a mass, state-funded HE system will not generally subscribe to – or will ‘struggle to hold on to’ – ‘elite, ‘pre-modern’ values’ and norms formed from the traditional discipline-based division of academic labour (Becher and Trowler, 2001, p.16). However, regardless of the combination of discourses used to frame their practice, participants were consistently opposed to what they viewed as a growing tendency for universities to become ‘utilitarian’, ‘marketised’, and ‘commercialised’, even before the researcher introduced the concepts of the entrepreneurial academic and university into discussion.

Another finding relates to the tendency for participants to engage in the self-conscious ‘bracketing’ of some of the more traditional or ‘liberal’ defences of academic practice, using various types of disclaimers and qualifiers to distance themselves from appearing to be overly invested in what might be perceived as idealised or anachronistic ways describing their work. In particular, a number of those interviewed, while setting out their beliefs about the value and purpose of their work, demonstrated a tendency to hedge their commitments by describing their own rhetoric as variously ‘high-minded’, ‘lofty’, ‘high-faluting’, or ‘unrealistic’. What this appears to demonstrate, then, is that in addition to advancing legitimising narratives on academic work which drew on both ‘liberal’ and ‘public service’ discourses, a significant number of participants felt compelled to signal a ‘realist’ perspective on the extent to which their more ‘liberal’ defences were perhaps over-idealised, even if they professed that these more ‘lofty’ identities still had value for them.

### **6.2.2. The Entrepreneurial University.**

After inviting participants to provide accounts of their own professional biographies, values, and responsibilities, the researcher then asked them a series of questions aimed at eliciting their perspectives on the concept of the 'entrepreneurial university'. The central finding of this component of the analysis was that, by and large, participants advanced a particularly narrow 'business-related' or economic sense of what it meant for a university to be entrepreneurial, with the exception of two outliers – Hope and Kieran – whose understanding of the concept aligned quite closely with the inclusive model which currently prevails in the policy and research literature. It should be noted, however, that both participants – who were employed by the same university – had played an active role in establishing their institution's entrepreneurial mission as, respectively, head of policy, and an associate head of school.

For the most part, then, participants described the entrepreneurial university concept as a manifestation of 'marketisation', or indicative of a growing tendency for universities to be operated 'like businesses', with some associating the idea with the 'cultural values' of the 'business agenda'. Even where participants were aware of a 'broader' or 'social' model of the entrepreneurial university, there was a general consensus, that in their institutions at least, enterprise had been 'corralled into a very narrow perspective' which emphasised income generation, 'spin off companies', 'proper entrepreneurship', the primacy of 'economic relationships', 'commercialisation', 'profit-making', and 'making money'. However, in some cases participants acknowledged that the entrepreneurial model represented a strategic response to the 'political and economic' realities of contemporary UK higher education, and the 'competitive context' in which universities now found themselves in with respect to funding of all sorts.

As a consequence of the narrow 'business' and 'market' related conception of the entrepreneurial university employed by participants, a considerable number of them framed it as a matter of 'values conflict' in which higher education was coming to be colonised by a set of 'alien' values – associated with marketisation and managerialism – which were described as antithetical to the traditional academic

or public-sector value-systems prized by interviewees. In particular, participants linked the entrepreneurial model to a growing student ‘consumer culture’ which was described as being in conflict with their pedagogical traditions, which generally disavowed narrow vocationalism and the ‘contractualisation’ of the lecturer-learner relationship. Some were also critical of what they considered to be the ‘behavioural’ model of entrepreneurship education in which students, based on the paradigmatic status of the ‘individual, lone, romantic, heroic capitalist’ – were being trained to become ‘dragon’s den types’. It was also widely reported that the entrepreneurial university model was more appropriate to STEM disciplines because of their history of engaging in market-aligned activities such as technology transfer, spin-out firm creation, and paid consultancy. What this set of responses appears to suggest is that, at least amongst the academics interviewed for this study, the ‘broad meaning potential’ (Fairclough, 1991) typically associated with enterprise discourse, and the idea of the entrepreneurial model as an ‘all-university’ phenomenon have yet to become accepted, with participants, for the most part, still associating them with the negatively coded ‘realm of private enterprise and economic rationality’ (du Gay, 1996).

However, approximately half of those interviewed were either aware of the more inclusive entrepreneurial paradigm or were able to understand how entrepreneurialism *could* be metaphorised to accurately describe certain aspects of their respective universities’ missions, such as in relation to its external engagement, or its strategic positioning in response to changes in the higher education funding landscape. Ultimately, however, the majority of interviewees felt that their university’s articulation of the entrepreneurial mission – where it had been encountered – was overwhelmingly ‘economic’, with the social missions attached to it perceived as being subordinate to the imperative to ‘make money’. A number of participants also considered the idea of the entrepreneurial university to be a relatively superficial ‘branding’ or ‘presentation strategy’ in which institutions merely adopted a culturally salient discourse that appealed to a diverse range of stakeholders in a way devised to communicate to the outside world that you had assumed a kind of ‘business ethos’, and that your university was not unwilling to ‘sell’ and ‘market’ itself to attract student interest, and appeal to its varied external audiences.

### 6.2.3. The Entrepreneurial Academic.

Traditionally, the academic ‘entrepreneur’ has denoted a ‘consultant, patent holder and firm founder’ (Etzkowitz 2002,p.3), or a an academic researcher, typically in a STEM discipline, who demonstrates a capacity for engaging in knowledge transfer, understood principally as a matter of finding commercial applications for their intellectual property. More recently, however, the ‘entrepreneurial’ academic concept has been broadened, both in literatures of HE policy and entrepreneurial research, to denote engagement not only with businesses, but with communities, and as a matter of universities – as good ‘corporate citizens’ contributing both to economic and social development (Bicknell et al. 2010, p.486). Elsewhere, this broad, partially non-economic definition of the ‘entrepreneurial’ academic has been described as entailing a vision of the university ‘as a collective of individuals (...) sharing nothing except for their permanent attempt to face the needs of an outside environment’ (Simons & Masschelein 2009, p.213). The academic entrepreneur is also often alluded to as the personification of the combined forces of the ‘third academic revolution’ (Viale and Etzkowitz, 2005) ‘the ‘quadruple helix’ of university-industry-government-civil society relations (Cavallini *et al.*, 2016), and ‘mode three knowledge production’ (Elias G. Carayannis and Campbell, 2012).

Here, academic ‘enterprise’ becomes a matter of establishing an outward-facing orientation towards working collectively and cooperatively with networks spanning across either government, industry, civil society, or the ‘media- and culture – based public’ (Cavallini et al. 2016, p.14) to produce, diffuse, and apply different ‘knowledge paradigms’ in an interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and integrated way. In essence, what this means is that knowledge is no longer produced predominantly by disinterested isolated scholars, within the confines of universities, for publication in peer-reviewed journals (‘mode 1’), nor is it ‘produced’ by teams of academics in applied contexts or for knowledge transfer (‘mode 2’), but rather the ‘entrepreneurial’ academic represents one node in an inclusive network of actors drawn from a number of social or professional spheres, working together to synthesise, apply, and disseminate knowledge in novel and cooperative ways. In discursive terms, then, the entrepreneurial academic is typically described as exhibiting the ‘quality’ and ‘activity’ senses of

enterprise, in that their core characteristic is a willingness to embrace change and to engage in innovative forms of partnership with communities – of various types – outside of the university system.

When asked about what they thought it meant for an academic to be entrepreneurial, the participants in this study generally responded by associating it, as they had done with the entrepreneurial university, with ‘market values’, ‘income generation’, ‘making money for its own sake’, and a growing culture of ‘commercialisation’ within the university. The difference between participants’ own academic value-systems, and the concept of the entrepreneurial academic, were typically framed as a kind of ‘values conflict’, in which the ‘market values’ associated with the figure of the entrepreneurial academic were described as being ‘alien’, ‘foreign’, and ‘antithetical’ to those which informed their own normative understandings of academic work and identity. This would appear to bear out what Rinne and Koivula have described as a ‘clash of values’ between ‘academic’ and ‘market’ values in the entrepreneurial university (Rinne and Koivula, 2005b), despite the recommendation of advocates for the model for the development of a culture which could fuse entrepreneurial values with traditional academic values (Burton R Clark, 1998; Clark, 2004a; Shattock, 2010). As participants appeared, primarily, to view academic entrepreneurialism through the narrow lens of its ‘business’ sense, many expressed the view, in some cases quite forcefully, that academics were *categorically* not entrepreneurs, as they were not in the business of ‘profit-making’ and if they were, they would have ‘gone out and started a business’.

Even where this model was not linked explicitly to the figure of the traditional business entrepreneur, participants still felt that academic entrepreneurialism was still ‘judged entirely by money’, whether with respect to securing research funding, or other forms of third-stream income generation. In some cases, while participants professed that they were happy to seek out funding opportunities for their research and other work, they felt that being ‘entrepreneurial’ would entail a different ‘attitude’ towards making money as ‘the overriding concern’, rather than as a necessity for enabling academics to carry out the work that they valued. Further to this a number of participants related that it was ‘unclear’ what academic entrepreneurialism entailed, and that it was a rather nebulous concept, which was sometimes articulated in contradictory ways within their universities. If, indeed, entrepreneurialism was something expected of all academics, several interviewees made a point of stressing that they could not see how

this new responsibility – whatever it entailed - could be added to their already complex academic workloads.

A significant number of those surveyed acknowledged that the term ‘entrepreneurial’ could, in theory, be applied to many aspects of their practices, such as ‘thinking outside of the box’, ‘making connections’, ‘problem-solving’, and proactively seeking out funding opportunities, though most remarked that this label had very little meaning for them, and did not add much in terms of explanatory power to existing ways of describing academic work as it did not point to anything that academics ‘weren’t doing anyway’. Here, then, participants appeared to acknowledge the ambiguities and ambivalences of meaning that often accompany enterprise as a generalisable, context-free discourse, but were not compelled to identify with it as it was perceived to be relatively meaningless. In some cases, participants also alluded to the flexibility of the model of the entrepreneurial academic as performing an ideological function in the generalisation of market values and economic rationalities to higher education.

A significant number of those interviewed also reported that it was difficult to distinguish – beyond its distinctive vocabularies – any substantive difference between the entrepreneurial and existing REF and impact agendas, as there was a significant degree of overlap between them, particularly with respect to how the ‘impact’ criterion requires academics to consider the ‘effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services’ (HEFCE, 2016) that can be derived from their work. In some cases, the overlap between enterprise and other agendas affecting universities prompted participants to suggest that enterprise was ‘really what you want it to be, or what you say it’s going to be’, suggesting that some interviewees were conscious of what Ritchie has described as the ‘self-sealing’, ‘circular’ and ‘tautological’ characteristics of enterprise discourse (Ritchie, *cited in* Dodd and Anderson, 2001, p.14). Further to this, though some were conversant in the ‘social’ model of entrepreneurialism as it pertained to academic practice and its associations with community engagement, it was typically felt that this was not articulated by their universities as an expectation, or where it was, it was not taken seriously. To this end, several participants reported engaging in work with non-academic constituencies outside the university - which management had taken no interest in or shown a ‘benign indifference’ to – because there was no scope for it to generate income. Some also

described academic entrepreneurialism as not a distinct, substantive practice but as a mode of publicity which was engaged in by academics who were good at 'self-promotion' and 'selling' themselves, with one participant comparing this to a kind of 'vicious cycle' of self-promotion and recognition between universities and academics who were 'good at hyping themselves'.

In summation then, in addition to perceiving the model of the entrepreneurial academic as embodying market values which were antithetical to established academic norms, participants who were able to consider that the adjective 'entrepreneurial' *could* be applied to their practice reported that it was so abstract, and sufficiently indistinguishable from other agendas affecting contemporary higher education, that it was rendered meaningless. And while some were well versed in the broader, 'social' conception of what it meant for an academic to be entrepreneurial, they were sceptical that this was anything more than a superficial 'add-on' to their university's enterprise message, if it was present at all. Lastly, a number of those interviewed considered that academic 'entrepreneurialism' was nothing more than a kind of performative self-publicity, and a kind of tautological self-fulfilling prophecy in which individuals who positioned themselves as being 'enterprising' were inevitably interpreted as such as this fulfilled their university's need to provide visible evidence of their staffs' entrepreneurial activity.

### 6.3. 'Culture' in the Enterprise University

In addition to exploring participants own professional self-constructs, and interpretations of the entrepreneurial 'academic' and 'university' concepts, this study was also oriented towards interrogating participants' understandings of their universities' 'cultures', and to enquire into the extent to which they felt that they had or had not been influenced by their respective institution's 'entrepreneurial' mission. Truly 'entrepreneurial universities' are typically described in the extant literature as requiring the development of an integrated, institutional 'enterprise culture' (Clark, 2001), to be brought about as a result of a process of organised 'culture change'. 'Culture change' is typically understood as an institutional effort to 'assess, modify, and transform its shared values, beliefs, and mind-sets' (Yeung, Ulrich, Nason, & Glinow, 1999, p.11) based on the idea that culture - as the 'psychological assets' (Hofstede, 2001, 408) of an organisation - can be mobilised both as a management technology and a source of competitive advantage. In the context of UK higher education, 'enterprise culture' has been described as a taking on distinct and hegemonic meaning within a 'strategic, managerial discourse' (Mayr, 2008) oriented towards transforming higher education institutions into 'entrepreneurial' universities.

In Burton R. Clark's definitive account of the entrepreneurial university model, he identified five organisational 'elements' or 'generalized pathways' shared by a sample of European universities which he considered to be successfully enterprising (Burton R. Clark, 1998). Three of these 'elements' were 'highly structural' and 'tangible', and included 'a strengthened steering core', 'an expanded developmental periphery', and 'a diversified funding base', while the fourth - 'the stimulated academic heartland' - and the fifth were more 'ephemeral' and located in the 'intangible realm of intention, belief, and culture' (Burton R. Clark, 1998). Clark's fifth element, the 'integrated entrepreneurial culture' represented an institution-wide phenomenon which blended 'traditional collegial academic cultures and values held by academics from academic units with (...) new entrepreneurial culture and values' (de Zilwa, 2007, p.157) and required university managers to develop an entrepreneurial change-embracing culture which academics could not only reconcile with their traditional values, but which they would

voluntarily and enthusiastically embrace. This perspective rested on what has been labelled as a 'structural realist' ontology on organizations (Ashkanasy, Wilderom and Peterson, 2000) in which they are regarded as 'structures' with an objective, independent existence, with 'culture' conceived as a 'variable' which can be used by managers to 'build organizational consensus' (Bratton, 2007, p.459) and shape the shared 'values and norms' of organisational members as part of a process of 'successful strategy implementation' (Hill and Jones, 2009, p.394).

In a later case study of the 'Enterprise University' in Australia, Marginson and Considine, drawing explicitly on Clark's conceptual framework, found that 'all enterprise universities in Australia display the first three Clark characteristics, strengthened steering core, expanded developmental periphery, and somewhat diversified funding base', but found that beyond these more structural characteristics, Clark's more intangible 'stimulated entrepreneurial heartland' and 'integrated enterprise culture' were relatively 'weak and non-existent' (Marginson and Considine, 2000). In their study, they observed institutions in which 'the corporate and the cultural' were either in 'an uneasy symbiosis' or 'the corporate (was) dominant' (Marginson & Considine, 2000, p.243), and reported on 'academic-professional' cultures that were in relative degrees of tension with institutional cultures, while university leaders 'without exception (...) saw collegial forms of decision-making as an obstacle to managerial rationalities' (Marginson & Considine, 2000, p.11).

This would appear to attest to the difficulty of Clark's prescription that the entrepreneurial university needs to 'stimulate' its various faculties to invest meaningfully in the institutional mission, so as to avoid a split between managerial and academic cultures. Further to this, as universities are complex, 'ambiguity-prone' (Jarzabkowski, Sillince and Shaw, 2010) and internally diverse organisations, typically made up of faculties with pluralistic, and sometimes contradictory values, myths, and worldviews, it appears unlikely that anything approaching a coherent unified institution-wide 'culture' could be created or 'transformed' by management decree, let alone isolated and measured as an empirical phenomenon. Elsewhere, research has pointed to the 'impossibility' of managing organisational culture, and the tendency for such efforts to 'degenerate into the enforcement of espoused behaviours' as part of a strategy of 'control' and 'compliance' (Ogbonna and Harris, 1998).

This view was largely borne out by the interviews carried out for this study, in which a significant number of participants suggested that it was difficult for them to conceive of a whole or unified culture, both before and after the theme of the entrepreneurial university and culture change were introduced into discussion in part B3 of the interview schedule. One of the key ways in which it is theorised that culture change can be instigated within an organisation is through the transformation of discourse, with ‘organizational discourse’ described as ‘the languages and symbolic media we employ to describe, represent, interpret and theorise what we take to be the facticity of organizational life’ (Grant, Keenoy and Oswick, 1998) and a medium which can structure subjects’ experiences of organisations by ‘generating, (rather than) merely expressing, key organizational realities’ (Ashcraft, Kuhn, & Cooren, 2009, p.2). With this in mind, participants were asked a series of questions about the presence or ‘visibility’ of enterprise discourse in their respective institutional environments, and while some remarked that this was something with which they had had very little, or only minimal, interaction, a larger number reported that ‘enterprise’ featured strongly in their university’s communications, and was articulated variously in the form of university marketing, ‘internal communiques’, ‘changed committee headings’, mission statements and ‘core policy documents’, managerial ‘missives’, and ‘publicity pasted up around the campus’.

A strong theme that emerged from discussions related to the ontology of organisational culture within the university, with the majority of those interviewed adopting the view that universities were far too complex and fragmented to have a ‘coherent’, ‘unified’, and ‘whole’ culture, and suggesting – instead – that it was individual departments which were most likely to influence their norms, values, and behaviours. Further to this, some also rejected completely this kind of ‘structural-realist’ or ‘functionalist’ view of organisational or departmental cultures, preferring instead to suggest that their ‘cultural values’ were more likely to evolve out of an interaction between their academic disciplines, their social backgrounds, and their own individual ethical orientations. Where ‘organisational culture’ was concerned, participants often associated this with official communications, strategic missions, internal symbolism, and university marketing, and did not generally feel that these had much potential to influence the more ‘intangible’ cultural elements of the academic life-world and its characteristic traditions and intersubjective understandings. By and large, participants reported that there was a

massive gap between university vision statements and the ‘reality on the ground’, which would appear to parallel Marginson and Considine’s findings about lack of meaningful ‘cultural’ change – in the ‘intangible’ sense – in the Australian ‘enterprise university’ (Marginson and Considine, 2000).

In keeping with the views expressed by Marginson and Considine’s respondents, and in contrast with the image promoted by figures such as Clark of the entrepreneurial university as having an ‘integrated’ and ‘collegial’ entrepreneurial culture (Burton R Clark, 1998; Clark, 2004a), the majority of the participants interviewed here reported that – where it was present – the entrepreneurial paradigm within their university tended to be a very ‘top-down’ phenomenon, where it was associated with doctrinaire governance, ‘a Taylorist approach to managerialism’, an extension of ‘control over what people do’, and as something which was ‘steam-rolled’ over academic departments, without consultation, and without sensitivity to their own disciplinary values. A similar perspective emerged from an earlier study carried out by Philpott *et al* in which interviews were undertaken with ‘key professors spanning the diverse disciplines of the university’ on the subject of ‘attitudes towards the entrepreneurial third mission’ within the context of a ‘traditional comprehensive European University’ The authors of that study alluded to an ‘increasing schizophrenic divide between the disciplines within the university’ and a ‘widespread disharmony’ linked to a ‘strong top-down push towards the entrepreneurial ideal’ (Philpott *et al.*, 2010, p.211), and while not every participant in the present study reported a similarly strong ‘push’ for enterprise within their respective institution, where it had manifested, it tended to be regarded as something imposed on academics, with no consultation, and very little meaningful effect. However, participants did report significant consequences in terms of ‘morale’, ‘alienation’, ‘values conflict’, and a growing sense of feeling at odds with their universities in an atmosphere of cultural ‘polarisation’. This was particularly the case in institution 1, a ‘post-92’ regional university, where participants tended to report that the enterprise mission was both more ubiquitous and more forcefully applied.

As such, where a substantive undertaking to ‘embed’ enterprise was reported, this tended to take the form not of a ‘bottom-up’ phenomenon emerging from the ‘organic flow of university internal development’ (Clark, 2004b), but as a ‘top-down’ administrative imposition associated with various

‘rational, professional, managed and strategic’ approaches’ (Carr and Beaver, 2002, p.108) which characterise a ‘managerial rather than an enterprise culture’ (Raven, 1989), at least as they are distinguished within the extant literature.

Interestingly, while a significant number of participants observed that enterprise discourse had become relatively ubiquitous in their university’s official communications, they tended to report that this had not had any meaningful effect on the ways in which academics themselves communicated or thought about their work. In effect, then, this seemed to suggest that enterprise messages were confined to their universities’ ‘business communications’, which include ‘formalized and planned messages codified in letters, memos, reports, websites, and advertising campaigns’, but not in its ‘organizational communication’ which incorporates ‘informal and day-to-day interactions among organizational members’ (Keyton, 2005, p.12). This seemed to corroborate a view expressed by several participants that the ‘entrepreneurial university’ represented, at least in their institution, a feature of organisational communications, rather than a lived reality, suggesting that the enterprise model - however it is mediated locally by managers – had not come to represent a ‘strong, unified, and shared culture which is (...) deeply held by all organizational members’ (Keyton, 2011, p.54). Rather it was regularly described as something that had not become ‘embedded within social practice’ or ‘affected’ individuals’ ‘value systems’, and which some participants reported as a matter of negotiating ‘language’ and ‘ideology’. To this end, Norah, a professor of performance studies in institution 1 commented that enterprise was related more to ‘how you’re expected to communicate than what you actually do’.

This would also seem to undermine the idea that ‘enterprise culture’ constitutes a ‘governmental technology’ which can be utilised to meaningfully shape the values and subjectivities of academic workers by reimagining them as entrepreneurs. In a critique of the idea of the idea of ‘enterprise’ as a feature of programmes of institutional and cultural reforms in the sociology of organisations and management, and the ‘Foucauldian tradition’ upon which this perspective draws, Fournier and Grey have argued that ‘enterprise may be best characterized as rhetoric rather than as discourse or governmental rationality’ (Fournier and Grey, 1999, p.123) in that, even where it becomes dominant in an organisation’s communications, there is no guarantee that it will actually interpellate individuals ‘as

entrepreneurial subjects' (Fournier and Grey, 1999, p.112) or bring about a wholesale 'cultural reconstruction'. In this respect, the ease with which many of this study's participants reported being able to resist, reinterpret, 'feign deference to', or 'ignore' the enterprise paradigm would seem to suggest that the possibility of effective 'administratively imposed enterprise' (du Gay 2004, p.45), at least in complex, 'ambiguity-prone' organisations such as universities is by no means guaranteed.

This also raises questions about the capacity of university leaders to meaningfully embed enterprise into staff values' and 'into the fabric of the institution' (NCEE, 2016) in the way prescribed by the policy literature, especially at the deepest levels of organisational 'culture' where 'assumptions, ideologies' and behaviours' reside (Witte and Muijen, 1999). In this respect, while it may be relatively easy for university managers and policy-makers to 'redefine employee subjectivity' (Salaman and Storey, 2008, p.315) at the level of 'official' discourse, this is quite different to securing 'permanent changes in the self-perception, attitudes and behaviour' (Roberts, p. 42) of academic staff. And while a significant number of those interviewed reported seeing the enterprise mission of their universities manifest in the vocabularies attached to 'structural' changes related to funding targets, student learning outcomes, institutional restructurings, and promotion criteria, most were uncertain about the extent to which such changes were being driven by the enterprise mission, or by some other factor such as the REF, employability agenda, or Vice Chancellor's leadership style. So, while 'enterprise' may feature semiotically in many of the more 'tangible' changes instituted by university managers, this does not mean that it is, itself, a distinct 'governmental rationality' or 'modality of control'.

## 6.4 Limitations of the Study

As a small-scale study based on interviews with a purposive sample of non-STEM academics, this research set out to answer several questions about the manner in which participants interpret and negotiate the related concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ academic and university, and to explore their perspectives on the matter of ‘enterprise culture’ within universities that have positioned themselves publicly as conforming to this model. The data presented here offers only a partial snapshot of academic engagement with the ‘entrepreneurial paradigm’ in UK higher education, with the result that its generalisability is relatively limited. Furthermore, as an interpretive study which utilised a discourse-analytical methodology, the research was oriented towards exploring the enterprise phenomenon from the point of view of participants *themselves*, by examining the ‘discursive repertoires’ that they employed to frame their understandings and experiences of it. As such, the researcher has sought to be cautious about making exaggerated claims for the broader value of the findings presented here, at least in terms of their empirical generalisability.

This limited empirical generalisability derives, in large part, from the methodology used, which draws on varieties of social constructionist discourse theory, and assumes that the accounts provided by participants are pluralistic, contextual, and in some cases, unique discursive constructions which are contingent upon the research interview as a specific type of sociolinguistic interaction. Consequently, the aim in undertaking research interviews was not to adopt a ‘factist’ (Talja, 1999) approach which pursues definitive objective knowledge of ‘extra-interview realities’ (Wengraf, 2004), or promises to furnish researchers with authentic accounts of participants “‘real” experiences, attitudes, opinions, and emotions’ (Berg et al. 2003, p.4). Instead, the aim was to analyse a collection of ‘specimens of interpretive practices’ (Talja, 1999, p.13) in which participants can be seen to construct multiple situated discursive perspectives on the complex social and subjective ‘realities’ that lie beyond the interview setting.

Despite this, the perspectives and accounts provided by participants, when evaluated using discourse analytical methods, are theorised to bear the imprint of macro-sociological forces and formations which

‘define and determine what can be said, expressed, heard, and understood in particular societies, particular milieux (and) particular historical periods’ (Blommaert, 2005, p. 12). Much discourse analytical-research is premised on the assumption that discourses ‘constitute society and culture’ while simultaneously being ‘constituted by them’ (Wodak, 1996, p. 18), implying that the conventionalized and ideologically significant patterns of language-use we call ‘discourses’ are both shaped ‘from above’ by macro-sociological forces, and ‘from below’ through the micro-level interactions of ordinary language-users. Though this analysis has emphasised participants’ discursive ‘agency’ and proceeded from the position that it is difficult to make definitive inferences about the constraining effects of macro-social discourses on individual participants’ speech, a larger study incorporating more sustained ethnographic observation of multiple subjects - and their communications- could theoretically provide a more empirically-grounded account of the relations that exist between individual participants’ speech, university ‘culture’, and organisationally ‘institutionalised’ discourses which have become ‘solidified into specific institutional arrangements and organisational practices’ (Brink, M. van den, 2009, p. 31) in individual university settings.

Another limitation of the study relates to its timeliness, and specifically to the fact of its empirical data collection and preliminary analysis having been undertaken between 2010 and 2012. In the more than half a decade since the interviews were carried out, higher education policy and governance discourses which deploy the conceptual vocabulary of ‘enterprise’ and ‘entrepreneurialism’ have continued to evolve and accumulate new significations and representations which reflect the changing realities of higher education, both in the UK and internationally. In the intervening years, the international scholarly and policy literature advocating for the entrepreneurial university model has continued to grow and evolve (Pinheiro & Stensaker, 2014) (U.S Dept. of Commerce, 2013) (Coyle, P. et al, NCEE, 2013) (Cunningham *et al*, 2016) (HEInnovate, 2014) in ways which it is difficult for the present study to capture.

## 6.5 Implications for Further Research

One of the strongest themes to emerge from this research concerned participants' perspectives on the ontology of 'culture' within the university, which has implications for the prescription, often expressed within the policy and research literature on the entrepreneurial university, that the path towards a truly 'entrepreneurial' university lies in the 'intangible realm of intention, belief, and culture' (Clark, 1998). Participants consistently reported that the entrepreneurial mission, while a strong feature of their university's communications, had not become 'embedded' in any meaningful way in the quotidian interactions of the academic life-world, or put more simply, their 'day-to-day' lives. This would appear to warrant further, more extensive research into the experiences of academics working 'at the chalk-face' in self-described 'entrepreneurial universities', with a particular emphasis on the possibility of meaningful culture change, and the utilisation of enterprise discourse as a 'strategic rhetorical resource', in the university as a complex, 'ambiguity-prone' organisation (Jarzabkowski, Sillince and Shaw, 2010, p.221).

The findings presented here also appear to corroborate, at least from the perspective of this study's participants, the conclusion reached by Philpott *et al* – in their study of the enterprise ideal in a single, comprehensive university setting – that the creation of an 'enterprise culture' often takes the form of a 'top-down' bureaucratic initiative which has the potential to alienate academics and generate 'attitudinal splits' and 'widespread disharmony' between departments and disciplinary communities (Philpott *et al.*, 2010). This would suggest, perhaps, that a study with a broader empirical scope could ascertain the extent to which this is a generalisable feature of the 'entrepreneurial' university. In a similar vein, a larger study could present an opportunity to establish whether or not the tendency which this study demonstrated for non-STEM academics to associate 'entrepreneurialism' with the 'cultural values' of the 'business agenda', commercialisation, and 'profit-making' had any wider significance. In particular, research which combined interviews and textual analysis with ethnographic participant observation of the organisational practices and communications of individual university sites could provide a richer, more grounded, and more 'authentic' picture of their respective 'cultures' and discursive practices

which, in turn, would supply a more ‘grounded’ context for the accounts and representations provided by interview participants.

Additionally, an interesting observation that emerged from the research was that there appeared to be a significant degree of overlap – at least from the perspectives of participants - between the enterprise paradigm and the ‘impact agenda’ driven by the research excellence framework. With their shared emphasis on universities becoming more outward-facing, community-engaged, and committed to contributing to local, regional, and national social and economic development, it is easy to see how this might be the case. However, though the conflation of enterprise with the rhetorics surrounding the REF may merely be a product of the former’s status as a complex and semantically flexible discourse, an interpretive study of a larger sample of academics’ understandings of how these agendas intersect could be of interest to higher education policy makers and university managers. The same may also be said about the relationship between the ‘enterprise’ mission and drive for ‘employability’.

Finally, as the literature on enterprise, entrepreneurship, and entrepreneurialism in higher education has continued to evolve since the data collection was undertaken for this research, so too have the conceptual vocabulary and broader ‘orders of discourse’ which accompany and inform it. Described as the ‘discourse/semiotic aspect of a social order’ (Fairclough, 2001, p.232) or as ‘the linguistic elements of networks of social practices’ (Fairclough, 2003, p. 24), ‘orders of discourse’ are theorised to operate as organising structures which constrain linguistic variability in particular areas of social life in much the same way as the ‘social order’ provides the scaffolding which links together social institutions, mores, norms, and customs in a manner which gives structure and orderliness to everyday life. It is, in essence, a network concept, developed by Fairclough to account for the social ordering of language and the dialectical relationships that exist between social and discursive practices at both the ‘macro’ and ‘micro’ levels. Looked at through this lens, ‘enterprise discourse’ in higher education represents a complex cluster of genres, discourses, and styles of language which emanate from the interactions of a diverse intertextual network of scholars, policy makers, governments and interstitial organisations at the national, European, and global level. Though this study focussed primarily on the scholarship of Burton R, Clark and Henry Etzkowitz, and on the publications of institutions such as the UK’s National

Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education (NCEE, formerly the NCGE) and OECD, in recent years ‘enterprise discourse’ in European higher education has been significantly shaped by the European Commission, EU Directorate-General for Education and Culture, and OECD’s establishment of the ‘HEInnovate’ initiative, which facilitates universities’ ‘self-assessment’ for ‘innovation and entrepreneurship’ and ‘effective management of institutional and cultural change’ (European Commission, 2015), and by the parallel development of the Accreditation Council for Entrepreneurial and Engaged Universities (ACEEU), a body set up by the University-Industry Innovation Network (UIIN) to ‘recognise and promote’ universities internationally that ‘create greater social, economic and cultural impacts’ and embrace ‘culture change’ by becoming ‘more entrepreneurial and engaged’ (ACEEU, 2017).

Originating in a 2011 European Commission organised ‘University Business Forum’, which brings together higher education institutions, businesses, policy makers, and ‘public authorities’ to ‘network and exchange ideas and good practice’ and enhance ‘university-business cooperation’ at the European level, HEInnovate was established to provide a ‘guiding framework’ and suite of self-assessment tools that could assist European Universities in benchmarking themselves as ‘entrepreneurial higher education institutions’ (HEInnovate & OECD, 2015). In broad terms, the HEInnovate framework defines the entrepreneurial mission as being about local and national economic and social development and as having a number of wider social objectives such as ‘widening access to higher education for disadvantaged groups’ and promoting ‘social mobility’, in addition to ‘stimulating the birth of new enterprises and innovation in existing firms’ (HEInnovate, 2014). It also frames the entrepreneurial model as an objective and rationally necessary response to the challenges faced today by universities and society by invoking the same ‘epochalism’ associated by du Gay with an orthodox view amongst theorists of contemporary economic and organizational change about the need for institutions ‘to change dramatically and immediately’ (du Gay, 1997, p.297) in response to the a ‘societal environment characterised by high levels of uncertainty and complexity’ (Gibb, 2013, cited in HEInnovate, 2014, p.3). Spurred on by the necessity to respond to environmental pressures associated with decreased funding, proliferating stakeholder expectations, and university’s role as a primary driver of economic and social development, the entrepreneurial institution is described as one which ‘reflexive’,

‘innovative’, and willing to radically alter its ‘institutional form’ (HEInnovate, 2014, p.2) for the purpose of adaptation and the redress of what Clark has referred to as the contemporary university’s ‘demand-response imbalances’ (Clark, 1998, p.140).

The model for institutional transformation and performance measurement developed by HEInnovate – which has seven ‘dimensions’ or ‘areas’ of focus – is reminiscent of Burton R. Clark’s conceptualisation of the enterprise university’s ‘organisational pathways of transformation’ (Clark, 1998, 2001) particularly with respect to the emphasis it places on the role of strong ‘leadership and governance’ in building and fostering an inclusive, institution-wide ‘entrepreneurial culture’, the link between a diversified funding base and an entrepreneurial disposition, and the promotion of ‘knowledge exchange with industry, the public sector and society’ (HEInnovate, 2018a) at what Clark would have described as ‘the developmental periphery’ (Clark, 1998, 2001).

Where the HEInnovate framework expands on the ‘Clarkian’ model is through its focus on the ‘dimensions’ of ‘entrepreneurial teaching and learning’ and internationalisation which - as the findings of this research also suggest – point to a progressive blurring of the boundaries between the enterprise, internationalisation, and employability ‘missions’ or ‘agendas’. With respect to ‘entrepreneurial teaching and learning’, HEInnovate encourages universities both to embed traditional entrepreneurship education across its programmes in order to ‘train students in the skills they need to set up a business and manage its growth’ but also advocate for a more inclusive form of campus-wide entrepreneurial pedagogy oriented towards developing more generic skills and competencies such as the ability to ‘to identify and exploit opportunities’ and ideas, develop entrepreneurial ‘mindsets’ and ‘drive’ (HEInnovate, 2018b), and cultivate ‘risk-taking behaviours’ (HEInnovate, 2014, p.8). In a paper prepared to ‘review the concept’ of the entrepreneurial university and provide ‘the analytical and conceptual background for HEInnovate’ (HEInnovate, 2014), the authors explicitly link entrepreneurial teaching and learning with employability, arguing that 21<sup>st</sup> century transversal skills - such as developing a ‘can-do approach’, an ‘openness to new ideas’, and ‘a drive to create value from these’ – overlap significantly ‘with the competences and skills associated with entrepreneurship, both in a broader sense of being ‘enterprising’ as well as in terms of starting-up and running a business’

(HEInnovate, 2014, p.5,6.). As such, the entrepreneurial learning ‘dimension’ of the HEInnovate framework appears to make use of the kind of ‘double-voiced’ discourse, identified in this research, which emphasises what Norman Fairclough has labelled as the ‘business sense’ of entrepreneurialism, while also trading flexibly on its ‘activity’ and ‘quality’ senses (Fairclough, 1991) in ways which make the model more generalisable to all disciplines and teaching and learning activities. In a further slight departure from the seminal ‘Clarkian’ model, HEInnovate also describes internationalisation as core to the entrepreneurial mission as the new relationships and networked arrangements it engenders can work to ‘stimulate entrepreneurial behaviours and practices’ and ‘strategic thinking and innovation’ in research, pedagogy and student and faculty collaboration (HEInnovate and OECD, 2015, p.7). The influence of the triple/quadruple helix systems model and the associated concept of ‘mode 3 knowledge’ (Viale & Etzkowitz, 2005) (Etzkowitz, 2008)(Carayannis *et al*, 2012) can also be detected in the frequent reference made throughout the literature surrounding HEInnovate to the relationship between the entrepreneurial mission and the ‘networked environment’ that universities now find themselves and the opportunities that this creates for actors and institutions to work collaboratively in ways which systematically cross ‘disciplinary and knowledge boundaries’ (HEInnovate, 2014, p.3) and embed engagement and collaboration with external stakeholder in every aspect of university practice, including knowledge production and dissemination.

Consistent with the definitions of the entrepreneurial university that have been addressed in this research, HEInnovate draws flexibly on ‘enterprise’ as a signifier. Emphasising its ‘business sense’, it makes repeated calls for universities to invest in ‘business start-up education’ and ‘incubation’ (HEInnovate, 2018c) and knowledge exchange and commercialisation through engagement with industry and science parks. Simultaneously, it also utilises a more inclusive or holistic ‘beyond-business concept of entrepreneurship, innovation and institutional change’ (HEInnovate, 2014, p2) which it argues should be embedded across the university in its governance, departmental ‘cultures’, pedagogical approaches, institutional form, and - most importantly – the ‘mindsets’ (HEInnovate, 2018d) ‘behaviours’ (HEInnovate, 2014, p2) and ‘attitudes’ (HEInnovate, 2018e) of its individual students and staff. Ultimately, its vision of ‘enterprise’ is sufficiently wide that it proffers that there is no ‘unique’

or prescribed way to be ‘entrepreneurial’, but rather that there are ‘a variety of ways in which higher education institutions can act entrepreneurially’ (HEInnovate, 2014, p.3).

Although a detailed analysis of the expansive scholarly and policy literature surrounding HEInnovate is beyond the scope of this study, the conceptual underpinnings of its framework suggests that Clark’s entrepreneurial model, which Rhoades and Stensaker have described as uniquely influential for its wide utilisation ‘not just academically, but also politically’ (Rhoades & Stensaker, p.129), is foundational to the initiative’s understanding of what constitutes an entrepreneurial higher education institution. In addition to Clark’s organisational model, the systems-level theory of the contemporary university’s positioning within a complex network assemblage such as the triple or quadruple helix- taking in institutions from across education, industry, government, and society - also appears to have had a strong influence.

Alongside the ‘guiding framework’ for entrepreneurial universities provided by HEInnovate, another significant development in advocacy for – and the discourses surrounding – the model of the entrepreneurial institutions and academics can be found in the UIIN’s establishment of the global ‘Accreditation Council for Entrepreneurial & Engaged University’ (ACEEU). Like HEInnovate, the ACEEU utilises a conception of the entrepreneurial university that is rooted both in the need for institutions to respond more proactively to the needs and expectations of external stakeholders in both ‘business and society’, to make ‘a greater social, economic and cultural impact’ (ACEEU, 2016, p.4) and to ‘drive mind-set and behavioural change among individuals and groups within the organisation’ (ACEEU, 2016, p.6). Consistent with the ‘Clarkian’ model adopted by HEInnovate, the ACEEU places a strong emphasis on university autonomy, culture change, leadership and alignment, external engagement and knowledge production, and entrepreneurship education, while also advancing a similarly semantically complex definition of enterprise and entrepreneurialism which is not restricted to its traditional business sense. Where the ACEEU model does deviate most visibly from that employed by HEInnovate and the NCEE is through the distinction it draws between the concepts of the ‘entrepreneurial’ and ‘engaged’ university. Offering institutional accreditation for both ‘entrepreneurial’ *and* ‘engaged’ institutions (‘dual accreditation’ is also available), the ACEEU defines

the former as a university which is ‘oriented towards and strategically positioned to deliver a range of societal contributions, with a focus on economic impacts’ and the latter as ‘strategically positioned to deliver a range of societal contributions, benefits and impacts’ (ACEEU, 2018). And while there is a significant degree of overlap in how the ACEEU literature articulates these two models, the ‘engaged’ university is typically distinguished from the ‘entrepreneurial’ to the extent that it serves stakeholders in ‘private, public and not-for-profit sectors’ in ways which ‘provide greater social and cultural impacts’ and are ‘collaborative and mutually beneficial’, but do not necessarily result in measurable economic or business-related outcomes. Though the provenance of the ‘engaged’ university concept is not made explicitly clear in the ACEEU’s literature, it appears to have much in common with the model described by the UK’s National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) which defines this institutional type simply as one which ‘embeds public engagement into its work’, ‘positively impacts on community’, and facilitates a ‘two-way flow of knowledge and insight between the university and wider society’ (NCCPE, 2018). Though these activities and characteristics are typically subsumed under the label of ‘entrepreneurship’ or ‘entrepreneurialism’ in the literature that has informed this research project, the ACEEU’s dual accreditation model, in drawing a conceptual distinction between ‘engagement’ and ‘enterprise’, appears to attest to a lack of consensus internationally about the generalisability of ‘enterprise’ as a metaphor for representing the totality of activities that take place in contemporary universities which are committed to collaboration with external stakeholders, institutional reform, and innovation. The differences that separate the ‘entrepreneurial’ and ‘engaged’ university models, respectively, presents a compelling avenue for future research on UK and international higher education policy, organisational and governance discourse.

## REFERENCES.

- ACEEU (2016) *Accreditation Process Manual*, Amsterdam, available at:  
[https://www.aceeu.org/docs/ACEEU\\_Process\\_Manual\\_v1.0.pdf](https://www.aceeu.org/docs/ACEEU_Process_Manual_v1.0.pdf) [accessed Mar 1, 2018]
- ACEEU (2017) 'Our belief, vision, mission and values', available at:  
<https://www.aceeu.org/index/mission> (accessed April 1, 2017)
- ACEEU (2018) 'Accreditation Types and Levels', available at:  
<https://www.aceeu.org/index/accreditationtypes> [Accessed March 1, 2018].
- Adams, J. (2001) 'Not 100% sure, the "public" understanding of risk', in Bennett, D. J. and Jennings, R. C. (eds) *Successful Science Communication: Telling it Like it is*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 90–100.
- Alasuutari, P. (1995) *Researching Culture: Qualitative Method and Cultural Studies*, London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Alexius, S., Furusten, S. & Löwenberg, L. (2013) 'Sustainable banking? the discursive repertoire in sustainability reports of banks in Sweden'. In *European Group for Organizational Studies Annual Conference*. Montreal: Stockholms Universitet Publikationer. Available at: <http://su.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:678522/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- Allaire, Y. & Firsirotu, M.E. (1984) 'Theories of organizational culture'. *Organization Studies*, 5(3), pp.193–226.
- Alvesson, M. (2002) *Understanding organizational culture*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, London: Sage
- Alvesson, M. & Kärreman, D. (2000) 'Taking the linguistic turn in organizational research challenges, responses, consequences'. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 36(2), pp.136–158.
- Alvesson, M. & Sveningsson, S. (2008) *Changing Organizational Culture: Cultural Change Work in Progress*, London: Routledge.
- Anderson, B. (2006) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, R. (2006) *British Universities Past and Present*. London: Hambledon Continuum.
- Anon, 1970. 'Reports and Documents: University Reform in Germany'. *Minerva*, 8(2), pp.242–267. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41822022>.

- Antaki, C. et al. (2003) 'Discourse analysis means doing analysis. a critique of six analytic shortcomings', *Discourse Analysis Online*. Available at:  
<http://www.shu.ac.uk/daol/previous/v1/n1/index.htm>.
- Armstrong, P. (2005) *Critique of Entrepreneurship: People and Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ashcraft, K.L., Kuhn, T.R. & Cooren, F. (2009) Constitutional amendments: “materializing” organizational communication'. *The Academy of Management Annals*, (3), pp.1–64.
- Ashkanasy, N.M., Wilderom, C.P.M. & Peterson, M.F. (2000) 'Introduction'. In N. M. Ashkanasy & C. P. M. Wilderom, eds. *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate*. London: Sage Publication Ltd., pp. 1–18.
- Bailey, C. (1993) ‘The politics of work in an enterprise culture: technology networks and the revival of the inner cities’, *Journal of Design History*, 6(3), pp. 185–197.
- Barker, C. & Jane, E.A. (2011) *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*, 5th ed., London: SAGE Publications.
- Barnett, R. (2010) *Being a University*, London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Barnett, R., (2000a). *Realizing the University in an Age of Supercomplexity*, Ballmoor: Society for Research into Higher Education, Open University Press.
- Barnett, R. (2000b) 'Reconfiguring the university'. In P. Scott, ed. *Higher Education Re-formed*. London: Falmer Press, pp. 111–126.
- Barnett, R. (2015) *Thinking and Rethinking the University: The Selected Works of Ronald Barnett*, London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Barnett, R. (2000c). 'University knowledge in an age of supercomplexity'. *Higher Education*, 40(4), pp.409–422.
- Barnett, R. & Standish, P. (2002) 'Higher education and the university'. In N. Blake, P. Smeyers, & P. Standish., eds. *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 215–233.
- Barry, J., Chandler, J. & Clark, H. (2001) 'Between the ivory tower and the academic assembly line\*'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38, pp.87–102. Available at:  
<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/bpl/joms/2001/00000038/00000001/art00229>.
- Bauman, Z. (2007) *Liquid times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty*. Oxford: Polity Press.

- BBC (1999a) 'Blair aims for enterprise culture', *BBC News*. Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/387531.stm> (Accessed: 8 October 2013).
- Beaugrand, P. (2004) *And Schumpeter Said, 'This Is How Thou Shalt Grow': The Further Quest for Economic Growth in Poor Countries*. USA: International Monetary Fund.
- Beaver, G. (2002) *Small Business, Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Development*. Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Becher, T. & Trowler, P.R. (2001) *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines* 2nd ed., Ballmoor: Society for Research into Higher Education Open University Press.
- Bechofer, F. (1992) 'Review: deciphering the enterprise culture by Robert Burrows', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 43(2), p. 305.
- Beck, J. (1998) *Morality and Citizenship in Education*. London: Cassell.
- Beck, U., Giddens, A. and Lash, S. (1994) *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Begley, T. M. and Boyd, D. P. (1987) 'Psychological characteristics associated with performance in entrepreneurial firms and small businesses', *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2(1), pp. 79–93.
- Behmler, G. K. (2000) 'Introduction', in Behmler, G. K. and Leventhal, F. M. (eds) *Singular Continuities: Tradition, Nostalgia and Identity in Modern British Culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 1–10.
- Beloff, M. (1968) *The Plateglass Universities*, Rutherford, Madison, Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Benington, J. & Moore, M.H. (2011) *Public Value: Theory and Practice*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Berg, H. van den (2003) 'Contradictions in interview discourse'. In H. van den Berg, M. Wetherell, & H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, eds. *Analyzing Race Talk: Multidisciplinary Approaches to the Interview*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 119–137.
- Berg, H. Van Den, Wetherell, M. & Houtkoop-Steenstra, H., 2003. 'Introduction'. In H. van den Berg, M. Wetherell, & H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, eds. *Analyzing Race Talk: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on the Research Interview*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–10.
- Bhaskar, R. (1989) *Reclaiming reality: A Critical Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy*, London:

Verso.

- Bicknell, A., Smythe, J.-F. & Arthur, J. (2010) 'Knowledge transfer: de-constructing the entrepreneurial academic'. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 16(6), pp.485–501.
- Birks, M. & Mills, J. (2011) *Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide*, London: Sage.
- Bligh, D.A., McNay, I. & Thomas, H. (1999) *Understanding Higher Education: An Introduction for Parents, Staff, Employers and Students*, Bristol: Intellect Books.
- Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boehm, J. (2008) *Entrepreneurial Orientation in Academia*, Wiesbaden: Gabler-Verlag/ Springer Science & Business Media.
- Botterill, J. (2010) *Consumer Culture and Personal Finance: Money Goes to Market*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brannen, J. et al. (2007) *Coming to Care: The Work and Family Lives of Workers Caring for Vulnerable Children*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Bratton, J. (2007) *Introduction to Work and Organizational Behaviour*, 3rd ed., London: Palgrave.
- Bridgman, T. (2007) 'Freedom and autonomy in the university enterprise'. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20(4), pp.478–490.
- Briggs, C.L. (2003) 'Interviewing, power/knowledge, and social inequality'. In J. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium, eds. *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns*. London: Sage Publications, Inc., pp. 495–506.
- Brink, M. van den (2009) *Rijkswaterstaat On the Horns of a Dilemma*, Delft: Uitgeverij Eburon.
- Brinkmann, S. (2013) *Qualitative Interviewing: Understanding Qualitative Research*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bröckling, U. (2015) *The Entrepreneurial Self: Fabricating a New Type of Subject*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Bruce Truscot (pseud.) (1943) *Redbrick University: A Study of the Modern Universities of England*, London: Penguin Books.
- Bryman, A. (1984) 'The debate about quantitative and qualitative research: a question of method or epistemology?' *The British Journal of Sociology*, 35(1), pp.75–92.

Burchell, G. (1993) 'Liberal government and techniques of the self', *Economy and Society*, 22(3), pp. 267–282. doi: 10.1080/03085149300000018.

Burchell, G. (2013) 'Liberal government and techniques of the self', in Barry, A., Osborne, T., and Rose, N. (eds) *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government*. London: Routledge, pp. 19–36.

Butler, J. (1997) *Excitable Speech: a Politics of the Performative*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Butt, Ronald (1981) 'Interview for Sunday Times', *The Margaret Thatcher Foundation*. Available at: <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/104475> (Accessed: 3 March 2015).

Campbell, D.F.J. & Carayannis, E.G. (2012) *Epistemic Governance in Higher Education: Quality Enhancement of Universities for Development*, London: Springer Science & Business Media.

Cameron, D. (2011a) 'Full transcript | David Cameron | speech to conservative spring conference | Cardiff | 6 March 2011', *New Statesman*. Available at: <https://www.newstatesman.com/2011/03/enterprise-government-party> (Accessed: 3 March 2015).

Carayannis, E.G. & Campbell, D.F.J. (2012) 'Mode 3 knowledge production in quadruple helix innovation systems: twenty-first-century democracy, innovation, and entrepreneurship for development'. *Quadruple Helix Innovation Systems, SpringerBriefs in Business* 7.

Carney, M. (2016) 'Consensus as a management strategy for healthcare organizations: culture, involvement and commitment'. In A. Örténblad, C. A. Löfström, & R. Sheaff, eds. *Management Innovations for Healthcare Organizations: Adopt, Abandon Or Adapt?*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 102–118.

Carr, P. (2000) 'Understanding enterprise culture: the “fashioning” of enterprise activity within small business', *Strategic Change*, 9(November), pp. 405–414. doi: 10.1002/1099-1697(200011)9:7<405::AID-JSC498>3.0.CO;2-Z.

Carr, P. and Beaver, G. (2002) 'The enterprise culture: understanding a misunderstood concept', *Strategic Change: Briefings in Entrepreneurial Finance*, 11(2), pp. 105–113. doi: 10.1002/jsc.579.

Cavallini, S. et al. (2016) *Using the Quadruple Helix Approach to Accelerate the Transfer of Research and Innovation Results to Regional Growth*, Brussels: CoR. Available at: <http://cor.europa.eu/en/documentation/studies/Documents/quadruple-helix.pdf>.

CEPES, Maassen, Vabø & Lindqvist (2006) *Evaluation of UNESCO-CEPES*. NIFU STEP Studies in Innovation, Research and Education.

Chaddock, K.E. & Cooke, A.J. (2015) 'Enduring testing: histories of liberal education in U.S. higher

- education'. In M. B. Paulsen, ed. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Volume 30*. London: Springer Science and Media B.V.
- Chamberlayne, P., Bornat, J. & Wengraf, T. (2000) *The Turn to Biographical Methods in Social Science: Comparative Issues and Examples*, London: Routledge.
- Charle, C. (2004) 'Chapter 2: patterns'. In W. Rüegg, ed. *A History of the University in Europe: Volume 3, Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (1800-1945)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 33–82.
- Chung, Y. B. (2006) 'External-internal control', in Jackson, Y. (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Multicultural Psychology*. London: SAGE Publications, p. 209.
- Churchill, H. & Sanders, T. (2007) *Getting Your PhD: A Practical Insider's Guide*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Clark, B. (2001) 'The entrepreneurial university: new foundations for collegiality, autonomy, and achievement'. *Higher Education Management: Education and Skills (OECD Journal of the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education)*, 13(2), pp.9–24.
- Clark, B.R (1998) *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities : Organizational Pathways of Transformation*, 1st ed., Oxford ; New York: Published for the IAU Press by Pergamon Press.
- Clark, B. R. (2004) *Sustaining Change in Universites: Continuities in Case Studies and Concepts*. London: Open University Press Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Clark, B.R. (2002) 'University transformation: primary pathways to university autonomy and achievement'. In S. G. Brint, ed. *The Future of the City of Intellect: The Changing American University*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 322–344.
- Cole, M.I. & Parston, G. (2006) *Unlocking Public Value: a New Model for Achieving High Performance in Public Service Organizations*, London: John Wiley.
- Collini, S. (2012) *What are Universities For?*, London: Penguin Books.
- COM (2005) *Mobilising The Brainpower of Europe: Enabling Universities to Make their Full Contribution to the Lisbon Strategy*, The European Commission. Available at: [http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/education\\_training\\_youth/lifelong\\_learning/c11078\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/education_training_youth/lifelong_learning/c11078_en.htm).
- Council, B. (2008) *The Entrepreneurial University: A Policy Dialogue on Higher Education in Sri Lanka and the UK*, Colombo: British Council Sri Lanka. Available at: <http://www.britishcouncil.org/srilanka-projects-and-networking-pmi-the-entrepreneurial->

university.pdf.

- Courpasson, D. (2000) 'Managerial strategies of domination. power in soft bureaucracies', *Organization Studies*, 21(1), pp. 141–161. doi: 10.1177/0170840600211001.
- Coyle, P. et al. (2013) *The Entrepreneurial University: From Concept to Action*, Coventry: NCEE.
- Cummins, A.-M. and Hoggett, P. (1995) 'Counselling in the enterprise culture.', *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling.*, 23(3), pp. 301–311.
- Cunningham, J.A., Guerrero, M. & Urbano, D. (2016) 'Entrepreneurial Universities? Overview, Reflections, and Future Research Agendas', in *The World Scientific Reference on Entrepreneurship*. WORLD SCIENTIFIC, pp. 3–19. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1142/9789813220591\\_0001](https://doi.org/10.1142/9789813220591_0001).
- Deal, T.E. & Kennedy, A.A. (1982) *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*, London: Penguin Books.
- Deem, R. (2004) 'Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities'. In M. Tight, ed. *The Routledge Falmer Reader in Higher Education*. London: Routledge Falmer, pp. 288–302.
- Deem, R. (1998) "New managerialism" and higher education: the management of performances and cultures in universities in the united kingdom'. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 8(1), pp.47–70.
- Della-Gusta, M. and King, Z. (2006) 'Enterprise culture', in Casson, M. et al. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 629–650.
- Denzin, N.K. (1991) 'Representing lived experiences in ethnographic texts'. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, pp.59–70.
- Derrida, J. (1976) *On Grammatology*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dingwall, R. (1997) 'Accounts, interviews, and observations'. In G. Miller & R. Dingwall, eds. *Context and Method in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 51–65.
- Dodd, S. D. and Anderson, A. R. (2001) 'Understanding the enterprise culture: paradigm, paradox and policy', *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 2(1), pp. 13–26. doi: 10.5367/0000000011101298747.
- Dooley, L. & Philpott, K. (2017) 'The entrepreneurial university: academic attitudes of adoption within a full service university setting'. In J. Cunningham, M. Guerrero, & D. Urbano, eds. *The World Scientific Reference on Entrepreneurship: Volume 1: Entrepreneurial Universities:*

- Technolog and Knowledge Transfer*. London: World Scientific, pp. 21–54.
- Dorey, P. (2014) *Policy Making in Britain: An Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Down, S. (2006) *Narratives of Enterprise: Crafting Entrepreneurial Self-identity in a Small Firm*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Du Gay, P (2004) 'Against "Enterprise" (but not against "enterprise", for that would make no sense)'. *Organization*, 11(1), pp.35–57.
- Du Gay, P (1996) *Consumption and identity at work*. SAGE Publications.
- DuGay, P. (1993) 'Entrepreneurial management in the public sector'. *Work, Employment & Society*, 7(4), pp.643–648.
- Du Gay, P (1996b) 'Making Up Managers: Enterprise and the Ethos of Bureaucracy', in Clegg, S. R. and Palmer, G. (eds) *The Politics of Management Knowledge*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 19–35.
- DuGay, P. (1997) 'Organizing identity: making up people at work'. In P. du Gay, ed. *Production of Culture: Cultures of Production*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Du Gay, P (2000) 'Representing "Globalization": Notes on the Discursive Orderings of Economic Life', in Gilroy, P., Grossberg, L., and McRobbie, A. (eds) *Without Guarantees: In Honour of Stuart Hall*. London: Verso, pp. 126–133.
- Du Gay, P. (2003) The tyranny of the epochal: change, epochalism and organizational reform'. *Organization*, 10(4), pp.663–684. Available at: <http://org.sagepub.com/content/10/4/663.abstract>
- Du Gay, P and Salaman, G. (1992) 'THE CULT[URE] OF THE CUSTOMER', *Journal of Management Studies*, 29(5), pp. 615–633.
- Elder-Vass, D. (2012) *The Reality of Social Construction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ernest, P. (2002) *The Philosophy of Mathematics Education*. London: Routledge.
- European Commission (2017) 'University Business Cooperation', available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/higher-education/university-business-cooperation\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/higher-education/university-business-cooperation_en) [Accessed March 25, 2018].
- Etzkowitz, H. (1983) 'Entrepreneurial scientists and entrepreneurial universities in American academic science', *Minerva*. Springer Netherlands, 21(2), pp. 198–233. doi: 10.1007/bf01097964.
- Ezkowitz, H. *et al.* (2000) 'The future of the university and the university of the future: evolution of

ivory tower to entrepreneurial paradigm', *Research Policy*, 29(2), pp. 313–330.

Henry Etzkowitz (2002) *MIT and the Rise of Entrepreneurial Science*, London: Routledge.

Etzkowitz, H. (1998) 'The norms of entrepreneurial science: cognitive effects of the new university-industry linkages'. *Research Policy*, 27(8), pp.823–833. Available at:  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048733398000936>.

Etzkowitz, H. (2001) 'The second academic revolution and the rise of entrepreneurial science'.  
*Technology and Society Magazine, IEEE*, 20(2), pp.18–29.

Etzkowitz, H. (2008) *The triple helix : university-industry-government innovation in action*, New York: Routledge. Available at: <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip081/2007040853.html>.

Etzkowitz, H. & Zhou, C (2017) *The Triple Helix: University–Industry–Government Innovation and Entrepreneurship* 2nd ed., London: Routledge.

Etzkowitz, H. and Leydesdorff, L. A. (1997) *Universities and the Global Knowledge Economy : a Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations, Science, Technology, and The International Political Economy Series*. London ; New York: Pinter.

Etzkowitz, H. & Manoel, J. (2002) 'The rise of a triple helix culture: Innovation in Brazilian economic and social development'. *International Journal of Technology Management and Sustainable Development*, 2(3), pp.159–171.

European Commission (2015) HEInnovate: A Self-Assessment Tool for Innovation and Entrepreneurship, available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/education/resources/heinnovate\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/education/resources/heinnovate_en) [accessed mar 10, 2018]

Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*, London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Fairclough, N. (1993) 'Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: the universities'. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), pp.133–168. Available at:  
<http://das.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/4/2/133..>

Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis: the Critical Study of Language, Language in Social Life*. Edited by N. Fairclough. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*, Cambridge: Polity.

Fairclough, N. (2001) 'The Dialectics of Discourse'. *Textus*, XIV (2), pp.231–242.

Fairclough, N. (1991) 'What might we mean by “Enterprise Discourse”', in R. Keat & N.

- Abercrombie, eds. *Enterprise Culture*. London: Routledge, pp. 38–57.
- Fallis, G. (2007) *Multiversities, Ideas, and Democracy*, London: University of Toronto Press Incorporated.
- Fallis, G. (2016) 'The university and society: structural change and conflicting roles', in J. E. Côté & A. Furlong, eds. *Routledge Handbook of the Sociology of Higher Education*. London: Routledge, pp. 19–29.
- Fayolle, A. & Redford, D.T. (2014) *Handbook on the Entrepreneurial University*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Ferlie, E. et al. (1996) *The New Public Management in Action*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fichte, J.G. (1988) 'Some lectures concerning the scholar's vocation'. In D. Breazeale, ed. *Fichte: Early Philosophical Writings*. London: Cornell University Press, pp. 144–184.
- Finlaye, I. (2004) 'Living in an "entrepreneurial" university'. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 9(3), pp.417–433.
- Fish, S. (2005) 'Take this job and do it: administering the university without an idea'. *Critical Enquiry*, 31(2), pp.271–285.
- Fitzgerald, P. (2006) 'Intrapreneurial and entrepreneurial developments at the University of the North'. In M. Nkomo, D. Swartz, & B. Maja, eds. *Within the Realm of Possibility: From Disadvantage to Development at the University of Fort Hare and the University of the North*. Cape Town: HSRC Press, pp. 104–126.
- Foss, L. & Gibson, D. v, eds (2015) *The Entrepreneurial University: Context and Institutional Change*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1991) *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*, London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Farazmand, A. (2009) 'Bureaucracy and the administrative system of ancient world-state persian empire: implications for modern administration', in Farazmand, A. (ed.) *Bureaucracy and Administration*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, pp. 19–52.
- Foucault, M. (1988) 'Technologies of the Self', in L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton, eds. *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1994) 'The subject and power', in Scott, J. (ed.) *Power: Critical Concepts*. London: Routledge, pp. 218–233.

- Fournier, V. and Grey, C. (1999) 'Too much, too little and too often: a critique of du gay's analysis of excellence', *Organization*, 6(1), pp. 107–128.
- Frankenberg, R. (1996) 'Whiteness and Americanness: examining constructions of race, culture, and nation in white women's life narratives'. in S. Gregory & R. Sanjek, eds. *Race*. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press, pp. 62–77.
- French, R. et al. (2008) *Organizational Behaviour*, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Frost, N. (2011) *Qualitative Research Methods in Psychology: Combining Core Approaches*, Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.
- Frost, P.J. et al. (1991) 'The integration perspective'. In P. J. Frost et al., eds. *Reframing Organizational Culture*. London: Sage Publications, Inc., pp. 11–13.
- Gesler, W.M. & Kearns, R.A. (2002) *Culture/Place/Health*, London: Routledge.
- Ghuman, K. (2010) *Management: Concepts, Practice & Cases*, New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill.
- Gibb, A. (2006a) 'Entrepreneurship: Unique solutions for unique environments. Is it possible to achieve this with the existing paradigm?' Working Paper 038/2006. National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (NCGE) UK.
- Gibb, A. et al. (2009) *Leading the Entrepreneurial University: Meeting the Entrepreneurial Development Needs of Higher Education Institutions*. Coventry: NCGE, Saïd Business School, University of Oxford.
- Gibb, A. (2006b) *Towards the Entrepreneurial University: Entrepreneurship education as a lever for change*, Coventry: National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (NCGE).
- Gibb, A., Haskins, G. & Robertson, I. (2009) 'Leading the entrepreneurial university: Meeting the entrepreneurial development needs of higher education institutions', Saïd Business School, University of Oxford, Available at:  
[http://www.ncge.org.uk/publication/leading\\_the\\_entrepreneurial\\_university.pdf](http://www.ncge.org.uk/publication/leading_the_entrepreneurial_university.pdf).
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. London: Polity.
- Goddard, J. & Vallance, P. (2013) *The University and the City*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Goossen, R. J. (2008) *Entrepreneurial Excellence: Profit from the Best Ideas of the Experts*. Sydney, NSW: Accessible Publishing Systems Pty Ltd.
- Gordon, C. (1991) 'Government Rationality, an Introduction', in Burchell, G., Gordon, C., and Miller,

- P. (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, pp. 1–52.
- Graffham, L. Y. of (1992) 'Enterprise Regained', in Heelas, P. and Morris, P. (eds) *The Values of Enterprise Culture: The Moral Debate*. London: Routledge, pp. 29–35.
- Grant, D., Keenoy, T. & Oswick, C. (1998) 'Defining organizational discourse: of diversity, dichotomy, and multi-disciplinarity'. In D. Grant, T. Keenoy, & C. Oswick, eds. *Discourse & Organization*. London, pp. 1–14.
- Gray, C. (1998) *Enterprise and Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Greene, F. J., Mole, K. F. and Storey, D. J. (2007) *Three Decades of Enterprise Culture: Entrepreneurship, Economic Regeneration and Public Policy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Guerrero-Cano, M., Kirby, D. & Urbano, D. (2006) A Literature Review on Entrepreneurial Universities: An Institutional Approach. *3rd Conference of Pre-Communications to Congresses*. University of Barcelona, 2006. Available at: [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract%7B\\_%7Ddid=1838615](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract%7B_%7Ddid=1838615).
- Gulbrandsen, M. & Slipersaeter, S. (2007) 'The third mission and the entrepreneurial university model', in A. Bonaccorsi & C. Daraio, eds. *Universities and Strategic Knowledge Creation: Specialization and Performance in Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, pp. 112–143.
- Hagen, S. (2012) 'Creating the Entrepreneurial University: The Educational Rationale'. *The University Alliance Blog*. Available at: <https://www.unialliance.ac.uk/blog/2012/12/10/creating-the-entrepreneurial-university-the-educational-rationale/> [Accessed June 23, 2015].
- Hall, S. (2001) 'Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse'. In M. Wetherell & S. Taylor, eds. *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*. London: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 82–81.
- Hammersley, M. & Gromm, R. (2008) 'Assessing the radical critique of interviews', in *Questioning Qualitative Inquiry: Critical Essays*. London: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 89–101.
- Hancock, P. & Tyler, M. (2001) *Work, Postmodernism and Organization: A Critical Introduction*, London: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Hays, D.G. & Singh, A.A. (2012) *Qualitative Inquiry in Clinical and Educational Settings*, London: The Guilford Press.
- Heelas, P. and Morris, P. (1992) 'Enterprise Culture: its Values and Value', in Heelas, P. and Morris, P. (eds) *The Values of the enterprise culture: the moral debate*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–26.

- HEFCE (2016) 'REF impact'. Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), Bristol, UK.  
Available at: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/REFimpact/mapfaqs/> [Accessed September 3, 2016].
- HEInnovate (2014) *The Entrepreneurial Higher Education Institution: A Review of The Concept and its Relevance Today*, Brussels. Available at:  
[https://heinnovate.eu/sites/default/files/heinnovate\\_concept\\_note\\_june\\_2014.pdf](https://heinnovate.eu/sites/default/files/heinnovate_concept_note_june_2014.pdf).
- HEInnovate & OECD (2015) *Workshop Training Manual: A Guide to Delivering HEInnovate Workshops*, Brussels. Available at:  
[https://heinnovate.eu/sites/default/files/heinnovate\\_training\\_manual\\_0.pdf](https://heinnovate.eu/sites/default/files/heinnovate_training_manual_0.pdf) (accessed March 15, 2018).
- HEInnovate (2018a) 'The HEI is committed to collaboration and knowledge exchange with industry, the public sector and society', available at: <https://heinnovate.eu/en/resource/hei-committed-collaboration-and-knowledge-exchange-industry-public-sector-and-society> [Accessed April 1, 2018].
- HEInnovate (2018b) 'Training is offered to assist students, graduates and staff in starting, running and growing a business', available at: <https://heinnovate.eu/en/resource/training-offered-assist-students-graduates-and-staff-starting-running-and-growing-business> [Accessed March 3, 2018].
- HEInnovate, (2018c) 'The HEI supports its students, graduates and staff to move from idea generation to business creation', available at: <https://heinnovate.eu/en/resource/hei-supports-its-students-graduates-and-staff-move-idea-generation-business-creation> [Accessed March 15, 2018].
- HEInnovate (2018d) 'The HEI provides diverse informal learning opportunities and experiences to stimulate the development of entrepreneurial mindsets and skills', available at:  
<https://heinnovate.eu/en/resource/hei-provides-diverse-informal-learning-opportunities-and-experiences-stimulate-development> [Accessed April 18, 2018].
- HEInnovate (2018e) 'The HEI is open to engaging and recruiting individuals with entrepreneurial attitudes, behaviour and experience', available at: <https://heinnovate.eu/en/resource/hei-open-engaging-and-recruiting-individuals-entrepreneurial-attitudes-behaviour-and> [Accessed March 3, 2018].
- Hendry, J. (2004) 'Cultural confusions of enterprise and the myth of the bureaucratized entrepreneur', *Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 5(1), pp. 53–57.
- Herman, E. (1995) *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts*. London: University of California Press.
- Hetzner, C. (1999) *The Unfinished Business of Thatcherism: The Values of the Enterprise Culture*. London: Peter Lang.
- Hickox, M. (2005) 'Cultural Disease and British Industrial Decline: Weber in Reverse', in Allen, T. and Skelton, T. (eds) *Culture and Global Change*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge, pp. 137–145.
- Hildebolt, W. (2010) *The Professional Entrepreneur: When Cowboys Grow Up*, Winston-Salem, N.C:

William Hildebolt.

Hill, C. & Jones, G. (2009) *Strategic Management Theory: An Integrated Approach* 9th ed., Mason, OH: South-Western CENGAGE Learning.

Hobbs, D. (2015) 'Business as a master metaphor: working class entrepreneurship and business-like policing', in R. Burrows, ed. *Deciphering the Enterprise Culture: Entrepreneurship, Petty Capitalism and the Restructuring of Britain*. London: Routledge, pp. 107–126.

Hofstetter, M.J. (2001) *The Romantic Idea of a University: England and Germany, 1770-1850*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hull, D. L., Bosley, J. J. and Udell, G. G. (1980) 'Renewing the hunt for the Heffalump: Identifying potential entrepreneurs by personality characteristics', *Journal of Small Business Management*, 18(1), pp. 11–18.

Humboldt, W. von (1810) 'Wilhelm von Humboldt's Treatise "On the Internal and External Organization of the Higher Scientific Institutions in Berlin" (1810)'. *German History in Documents and Images (GHDI)*. Available at: [http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub\\_document.cfm?document\\_id=3642](http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3642) [Accessed November 14, 2016].

Hunt, P. (2001) *Children's Literature*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Jackson, P.T. (2006) 'Making Sense of Making Sense: Configurational Analysis and the Double Hermeneutic'. In D. Yanow & P. Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. London: M .E.Sharpe, pp. 264–281.

Jameson, F. (1992) *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic Of Late Capitalism*, London: Verso Books

Jarzabkowski, P., Sillince, J.A.A. & Shaw, D. (2010) 'Strategic ambiguity as a rhetorical resource for enabling multiple interests'. *Human Relations*, 63(2), pp.219–248. Available at: <http://hum.sagepub.com/content/63/2/219.abstract>.

Jessop, B. (2017) 'Varieties of academic capitalism and entrepreneurial universities'. *Higher Education*, 73(6), pp.853–870.

Jones, C. & Rupp, S. (2007) 'Understanding the carers' world: a biographical-interpretive case study'. In P. Chamberlayne, J. Bornat, & T. Wengraf, eds. *The Turn to Biographical Methods in Social Science*. London: Routledge, pp. 276–290.

Jones, C. & Spicer, A. (2006) 'Outline of a genealogy of the value of the entrepreneur', in G. Erreygers & G. Jacobs, eds. *Language, Communication and the Economy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

- Publishing Company, pp. 179–199.
- Jones, C. and Spicer, A. (1999) *Unmasking the Entrepreneur*. London: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Jones, C. and Spicer, A. (2005) 'The Sublime Object of Entrepreneurship', *Organization*. SAGE Publications Ltd, 12(2), pp. 223–246. doi: 10.1177/1350508405051189.
- Josephson, P., Karlsohn, T. & Östling, J. (2014) 'Introduction: the Humboldtian tradition and its transformations'. In *The Humboldtian Tradition: Origins and Legacies*. Boston: Brill, pp. 1–22.
- Josephson, P., Karlshon, T. & Östling, J. (2014) 'Introduction: the Humboldtian tradition and its legacie's. In P. Josephson, T. Karlshon, & J. Östling, eds. *The Humboldtian Tradition: Origins and Legacies*. Boston: Brill, pp. 1–22.
- Kanter, R. M. (1990) *When giants learn to dance, The Executive*. London: Touchstone. doi: 658.4KAN.
- Kasensap, K. (2017) 'Unifying a framework of organizational culture, organziational climate, knowledge management, and job performance', in IRMA (ed.) *Organizational Culture and Behavior: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, pp. 327–356.
- Karataş-Özkan, M. & Chell, E. (2010) *Nascent entrepreneurship and learning*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Keat, R. (1991) 'Introduction: Starship Britain or universal enterprise', in Keat, R. and Abercrombie, N. (eds) *Enterprise culture*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–21.
- Kelly, P. (2016) *The Self as Enterprise: Foucault and the Spirit of 21st Century Capitalism*. London: Routledge.
- Kent, C. A. (1990) 'Introduction: Educating the Heffalump', in Kent, C. A. (ed.) *Entrepreneurship Education: Current Developments, Future Directions*. London: Quorum Books, pp. 1–26.
- Keyton, J. (2011) *Communication and Organizational Culture: A Key to Understanding Work Experiences* 2nd ed., London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Kilby, P. (1971) *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Kirby, D. (2006) 'Creating entrepreneurial universities in the UK: Applying entrepreneurship theory to practice'. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31(5), pp.599–603. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10961-006-9061-4>.
- Kirkpatrick, G. (2008) *Technology and Social Power*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Kirzner, I. M. (1973) *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Krause-Jensen, J. (2010) *Flexible Firm: The Design Culture at Bang & Olufsen*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Krijnen, C. (2015) *The Very Idea of Organization: Social Ontology Today: Kantian and Hegelian Reconsiderations*, Boston: BRILL.
- Kwantes, C.T. & Glazer, S. (2017) *Culture, Organizations, and Work: Clarifying Concepts*, Cham: Springer.
- Kwiek, M. (2008) 'Entrepreneurialism and private higher education in Europe'. In M. Shattock, ed. *Entrepreneurialism In Universities And The Knowledge Economy: Diversification And Organizational Change In European Higher Education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, UNESCO, pp. 100–120.
- Labov, W. (1982) 'Speech actions and reactions in personal narratives'. In D. Tannen, ed. *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Law, J. (2002) 'Economics as interference', in Gay, P. du and Pryke, M. (eds) *Cultural Economy: Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 21–39.
- Lawson, N. (1993) *The View from No. 11*. London: Corgi Books.
- Letwin, S. R. (1992) *The anatomy of Thatcherism*. London: Fontana.
- Liddicoat, A.J. (2011) *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis: Second Edition*, London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Lieberwitz, R.L (2016) 'Privatizing and corporatizing the university: A US and UK comparison', in M. A. Fineman, T. Mattsson, & U. Andersson, eds. *Privatization, Vulnerability, and Social Responsibility: A Comparative Perspective*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 143–160.
- Liesner, A. (2006) 'Education or Service? Remarks on teaching and learning in the entrepreneurial university'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(4), pp.483–495. Available at: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2006.00206.x>.
- Louis, K.S. et al. (1989) 'Entrepreneur in academe: an exploration of behaviours among life scientist'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34(1), pp.110–113.
- Low, M. B. and Macmillan, I. C. (1988) 'Entrepreneurship: Past Research and Future Challenges', *Journal of Management*, 14(2), pp. 139–161.

- Lupton, D. (1992) 'Discourse analysis: a new methodology for understanding the ideologies of health and illness'. *Health, Australian Journal of Public*, 16(2), pp.145–150.
- Lyotard, J.-F. & Massumi, B. (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Macdonald, S.J. (2009) *Towards a Sociology of Dyslexia: Exploring Links between Dyslexia, Disability and Social Class*, Saarbrücken: VDM Publishing.
- Mann, S. (2016) *The Research Interview: Reflective Practice and Reflexivity in Research Processes*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. (1989) *Rediscovering Institutions: the Organizational Basis of Politics*, New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Marginson, S. (2013) 'Teaching and research in the contemporary university'. In V. C. H. Tong, ed. *Geoscience Research and Education: Teaching at Universities*. London: Springer, pp. 11–20.
- Marquand, D. (1992) 'The enterprise culture: old wine in new bottles?', in Heelas, P. and Morris, P. (eds) *The Values of the Enterprise Culture: The Moral Debate*. London: Routledge, pp. 61–72.
- Mars, M. M. and Rios-Aguilar, C. (2010) 'Academic entrepreneurship (re)defined: Significance and implications for the scholarship of higher education', *Higher Education*, 59(4), pp. 441–460. doi: 10.1007/s10734-009-9258-1.
- Marttila, T. (2015) *Post-Foundational Discourse Analysis: From Political Difference to Empirical Research*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mascarenhas, R. C. (1993) 'Building an Enterprise Culture in the Public Sector: Reform of the Public Sector in Australia, Britain, and New Zealand', *Public Administration Review*, 53(4), pp. 319–328.
- Mautner, G. (2005) The Entrepreneurial University - A discursive profile of a higher education buzzword'. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2(2), pp.95–120.
- Mayr, A. (2008) Discourse of higher education: Enterprise and institutional change in the university. In A. Mayr, ed. *Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*. London: Continuum, pp. 26–45.
- McCabe, D. (2008) 'Who's Afraid of Enterprise?: Producing and Repressing the Enterprise Self in a UK Bank'. *Organization*, 15(3), pp.371–387. Available at: <http://org.sagepub.com/content/15/3/371.abstract>.
- McClelland, D. C. (1987) *Human Motivation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- McDowall, D. (2016) *Queen's University, Volume III, 1961-2004: Testing Tradition*, Kingston, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- McGregor, D. & Joel Cutcher Gershenfeld (2006) *The Human Side of Enterprise, Annotated Edition*, London: McGraw-Hill.
- Medina, J. (2006) *Speaking From Elsewhere: A New Contextualist Perspective on Meaning, Identity, and Discursive Agency*, New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mentinis, M. (2016) *The Psychopolitics of Food: Culinary Rites of Passage in the Neoliberal Age*. London: Routledge.
- Merchant, K. A. and Stede, W. A. Van der (2007) *Management Control Systems: Performance Measurement, Evaluation and Incentives*. 2nd edn. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Merriam, S.B. (2009) *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass: A Wiley Imprint.
- Microsoft, (2013) Excel 2013.
- Miller, J.H. & Asensi, M. (1999) *Black Holes/J. Hillis Miller: or, Boustrophedonic Reading*, Redwood City: Stanford University Press.
- Miller, P. and Rose, N. (2008) *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life*. London: Polity.
- Mills, S. (1997) *Discourse*, London: Routledge.
- Miner, J. B. (1997) *A Psychological Typology of Successful Entrepreneurs*. London: Quorum Books.
- Moll, F. & Leede, J. de (2017) 'Fostering Innovation: The Influence of New Ways of Working on Innovative Work Behaviour'. In J. de Leede, ed. *New Ways of Working Practices: Antecedents and Outcomes*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd, pp. 95–144.
- Morozov, Oleg, Wilhelm Von Humboldt and Berlin University: A New Look at the Origin of the Humboldt Myth (October 20, 2016). Higher School of Economics Research Paper No. WP BRP 134/HUM/2016. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2856268> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2856268>.
- Mountford, V.G. (2014) 'Rules of Engagement Beyond the Gates: Negotiating and Capitalising on Student "Experience"', In Y. Taylor, ed. *The Entrepreneurial University: Engaging Publics, Intersecting Impacts*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 61–81.
- Nayak, A. & Beckett, A. (2008) 'Infantilized adults or confident consumers? enterprise discourse in

the uk retail banking industry'. *Organization*, 15(3), pp.407–425.

NCCPE (2018) 'What does an engaged university look like?', available at:

<http://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/about-engagement/what-does-engaged-university-look>  
[Accessed April 1, 2018].

NCEE (2016) '2016/2017', Coventry: NCGE , available at: <http://ncee.org.uk/20162017-2/> [Accessed September 8, 2017].

NCEE (2012) *ENTREPRENEURIAL UNIVERSITY OF THE YEAR 2012*, Coventry: NCGE, available at: <http://ncee.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/EUOTY2012.1.pdf> [Accesses June 23, 2015]

NCGE (2010) 'Entrepreneurial University of the year 2010/2011', Coventry: NCGE, Available at: [http://www.ncge.org.uk/publication/entrepreneurial\\_university\\_of\\_the\\_year.pdf](http://www.ncge.org.uk/publication/entrepreneurial_university_of_the_year.pdf) [Accessed September 8, 2017]

NCEE (2016) 'Times Higher Education, Outstanding University Entrepreneurship Award 2017 Shortlist', Coventry: NCGE, available at: <http://ncee.org.uk/the-entrepreneurial-university/>  
[Accessed March 3, 2017].

NCEE (2011) *Times Higher Education Entrepreneurial University of the Year Award 2011/2012*, Coventry: NCEE.

NCGE (2010) 'Entrepreneurial University of the year 2010/2011', Coventry: NCGE, available at: [http://www.ncge.org.uk/publication/entrepreneurial\\_university\\_of\\_the\\_year.pdf](http://www.ncge.org.uk/publication/entrepreneurial_university_of_the_year.pdf) [accessed March 3, 2015]

NCGE (2011) 'NCGE is now trading as the National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education', Coventry: NCGE, available at: <http://ncee.org.uk/ncge-is-now-trading-as-the-national-centre-for-entrepreneurship-in-education/> [Accessed June 18, 2015].

Neuman, W.L. (2012) 'Designing the Face-to-Face Survey', in L. Gideon, ed. *Handbook of Survey Methodology for the Social Sciences*. London: Springer, pp. 227–248.

Newman, J.H. (2015) *The Idea of a University*, London: Aeterna Press.

Newman, J.H. (1982) *The Idea of a University*, Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.

Newman, J.H. (2008) *The Idea of a University Defined and Illustrated: In Nine Discourses Delivered to the Catholics of Dublin*, Project Gutenberg, available at [www.gutenberg.org/files/24526/24526-pdf.pdf](http://www.gutenberg.org/files/24526/24526-pdf.pdf) [accessed May 29, 2012]

Nixon, S. (1997) 'ADVERTISING EXECUTIVES AS MODERN MEN: Masculinity and the UK advertising industry in the 1980s', in Nava, M., Blake, A., and MacRury, I. (eds) *Buy This Book:*

- Studies in Advertising and Consumption*. Routledge. London, pp. 103–120.
- OECD & EC (2012) *A Guiding Framework for Entrepreneurial Universities*, OECD, Paris, available at: <https://www.oecd.org/site/cfecpr/EC-OECD-Entrepreneurial-Universities-Framework.pdf> [accessed July 13, 2016]
- OECD (2005) 'Special issue: Entrepreneurship', *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 17(3).
- Ogbonna, E. & Harris, L.C. (1998) 'Managing Organizational Culture: Compliance or Genuine Change?', *British Journal of Management*, (9), pp.273–288.
- Office of Public Sector Information (OPSI) (1998) *Data Protection Act 1998*, Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/29/section/7> [accessed 3 March, 2016]
- Osborne, D. and Gaebler, T. (1992) *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Wokingham: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Östling, J. (2014) The Humboldtian Tradition: The German University Transformed, 1800-1945. In P. Dhondt, ed. *University Jubilees and University History Writing: A Challenging Relationship*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, pp. 183–216.
- Patel, R. (2004) *Creating an Enterprise Culture: Understanding the National Mission; A Campaign Perspective*. London: Enterprise Insight.
- Parkinson, C. & Howorth, C. (2008) 'The language of social entrepreneurs', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal*, 20(3), pp.285–309. Available at: <http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/08985620701800507>.
- Pelikan, J. (1992) *The Idea of the University: A Reexamination*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Perkin, H. (1992) 'The enterprise culture in historical perspective: birth, life, death - and resurrection?', in Paul Heelas and Morris, P. (eds) *The Values of the Enterprise Culture: The Moral Debate I*. London: Routledge, pp. 36–60.
- Peters, M. (2001) 'Education, Enterprise Culture and the Entrepreneurial Self: A Foucauldian Perspective'. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 2(2), pp.58–71.
- Phillips, L. & Jørgensen, M. (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, London: Sage.
- Philpott, K. et al. (2010) 'The entrepreneurial university: Examining the underlying academic tensions', *Technovation*, 31(4), pp. 161–170. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6V8B-51XFXJX->

1/2/05cdfc96eba55b1c9bea8ec505f4c921.

Pihl, J., (2015) 'Epistemological and Methodological Challenges Concerning Youth at the Margins', in S. Bastien & H. B. Holmarsdottir, eds. *Youth "At the Margins": Critical Perspectives and Experiences of Engaging Youth in Research Worldwide*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 41–65.

Pinchot, G. and Pellman, R. (1999) *Intrapreneuring in Action: A Handbook for Business Innovation*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Pinheiro, R. & Stensaker, B. (2014) 'Designing the entrepreneurial university: The interpretation of a global idea'. *Public Organization Review*, 14(4), pp.497–516.

Poole, D. (2005) 'The Possibilities of University Transformation', in R. Nata, ed. *Issues in higher education*. Nova Science Publishers.

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*, London: Sage.

Power, T. J. and González, J. (2003) 'Culture, Values, and Perceptions of Corruption: A Cross-National Analysis', in Ramaswamy, S. and Cason, J. W. (eds) *Development and Democracy: New Perspectives on an Old Debate*. London: University Press of New England, pp. 71–97.

Punch, K. (2009) *Introduction to Research Methods in Education*, London: Sage.

QSR (2012) QSR NVivo 10.

Rae, D., Gee, S. & Moon, R. (2009) 'Creating an Enterprise Culture in a University: The Role of an Entrepreneurial Learning Team'. *Industry and Higher Education*, 23(3), pp.183–197.

Räisänen, C. & Linde, A. (2004) 'Technologizing Discourse to Standardize Projects in Multi-Project Organizations: Hegemony by Consensus?', *Organization*, 11(1), pp.101–121. Available at: <http://org.sagepub.com/content/11/1/101.abstract>.

Ranga, M. & Etzkowitz, H. (2011) 'Creative Reconstruction: A Triple Helix-Based Innovation Strategy in Central and Eastern Europe Countries', in M. Saad & G. Zawdie, eds. *Theory and Practice of Triple Helix Model in Developing Countries: Issues and Challenges*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 249–282.

Rappert, B. & Webster, A. (1997) 'Regimes of ordering: the commercialization of intellectual property in industrial-academic collaborations'. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 9(2), pp.115–130. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09537329708524274>.

Raven, J. (1989) 'Viewpoint: British history and the enterprise culture', *Past & Present*, 123(1), pp.

178–204.

Readings, B. (1996) *The University in Ruins*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rhoades, G. & Stensaker, B. (2017) 'Bringing Organisations and Systems Back Together: Extending Clark's Entrepreneurial University'. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 71(2), pp.129–140.

Riazi, A.M. (2016) *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed-Methods Research*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Rinne, R. & Koivula, J. (2005) 'The Changing Place of the University and a Clash of Values: The Entrepreneurial University in the European Knowledge Society, A Review of the Literature'. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 17(3).

Ritchie, J. (1991) 'Enterprise cultures: a frame analysis', in *Deciphering the Enterprise Culture (Routledge Revivals)*. London: Routledge.

Robbins & Education, T.R.C. on H. (1963) The Robbins Report. Available at:  
<http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/robbins/robbins1963.html> [Accessed March 1, 2014].

Roberts, R. H. (2002) *Religion, Theology and the Human Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Röpke, J. (1998) *The Entrepreneurial University, Innovation, academic knowledge creation and regional development in a globalized economy., Working Paper Department of Economics, Philipps- Universität Marburg, Germany*, Available at:  
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6225/8e61ed0a86c3e5b9a118bf07a83f49b12e33.pdf> [accessed Dec 8, 2017]

Rose, N. (1992) 'Governing the Enterprising Self', in Heelas, P. and Morris, P. (eds) *The Values of the enterprise culture: the Moral Debate*. London: Routledge, pp. 141–164.

Rose, N. (1998) *Inventing our Selves: Psychology, Power, and Personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N. (1990) 'Governing the Enterprising Self (Conference Paper)', Conference on the Values of the Enterprise Culture, University of Lancaster, September 1989, available at:  
<https://www.scribd.com/document/317455750/Rose-1990-Governing-the-Enterprising-Self-EnT-R> [accessed Feb 18, 2016]

Rose, N. (1999) *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*, 2nd ed., London: Free Association Books.

- Rothblatt, S. (2006) *The Modern University and Its Discontents: The Fate of Newman's Legacies in Britain and America*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rowlands, J. (2017) *Academic Governance in the Contemporary University: Perspectives from Anglophone Nations*, Singapore: Springer.
- Salaman, G. and Storey, J. (2008) 'Understanding Enterprise', *Organization*, 15(3), pp. 315–323.
- Sanderson, M. (2008) 'Educational and Economic History: The Good Neighbours', in Goodman, J., McCullough, G., and Richardson, W. (eds) *Social Change in the History of British Education*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 27–44.
- Sarangi, S. (2003) 'Institutional, professional, and lifeworld frames in interview talk', in H. van den Berg, M. Wetherell, & H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, eds. *Analyzing Race Talk: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on the Research Interview*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 64–84.
- Schelsky, H. (1963) *Einsamkeit und Freiheit: Idee und Gestalt der deutschen Universität und ihrer Reformen*, Reinbek: Rowohlt.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934) 'The theory of economic development: an inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle', *Harvard economic studies*, 46(2), p. xii, 255 . doi: 10.2307/1812657.
- Scott, P. (2009) 'Structural Changes in Higher Education: The Case of the United Kingdom', in D. Palfreyman & T. Tapper, eds. *Structuring Mass Higher Education: The Role of Elite Institutions*. London: Routledge, pp. 35–56.
- Scott, P. (1995) *The Meanings of Mass Higher Education*, Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Scruton, R. (2010) 'The Idea of a University'. *The American Spectator*. Available at: [http://spectator.org/38984\\_idea-university/](http://spectator.org/38984_idea-university/) [Accessed November 5, 2016].
- Shakespeare, S. (2001) *Kierkegaard, language and the reality of God*, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Schwartz, D. and Stanley, D. M. (1981) 'Matching Corporate Culture and Business Strategy', *Organizational Dynamics*, 10(1), pp. 30–48.
- Shattock, M. (2010) 'The entrepreneurial university: an idea for its time'. *London Review of Education*, 8(3), pp.263–271. Available at: <http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/14748460.2010.515125>.
- Shattock, M. & OECD (2005) 'Introduction to the Special Issue: Entrepreneurialism and the Knowledge Society'. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 17(3), pp.9–12.
- Shattock, M., SRHE & UNESCO (2008) *Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge*

*Economy : Diversification and Organizational Change in European Higher Education*,  
Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.

Simons, M. & Masschelein, J. (2009) 'The Public and Its University: beyond learning for civic employability?' *European Educational Research Journal*, 8(2), pp.204–217.

Simon, R.L. (1994) *Neutrality and the Academic Ethic*, London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Simons, M. and Masschelein, J. (2008) “‘It makes us believe that it is about our freedom’”: notes on the irony of the learning apparatus’, in Smeyers, P. and Depaepe, M. (eds) *Educational Research: the Educationalization of Social Problems*. Springer, pp. 191–204. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4020-9724-9\_13.

s

Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L.L. (1997) *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and The Entrepreneurial University*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smircich, L. (1983a) 'Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28(3), pp.339–358.

Smircich, L. (1983b) 'Organizations as shared meanings', in G. Morgan, P. J. Frost, & L. R. Pondy, eds. *Organizational Symbolism*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 55–65.

Smith, D. (1999) 'Book review: Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation'. *Higher Education*, 38(3), pp.373–374.

Social Research Association (SRA) (2013) *Social Research Association Ethical Guidelines, December 2003*, available at: <http://the-sra.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/ethics03.pdf>. [accessed September 8, 2010]

Styhre, A. & Lind, F. (2010) 'Balancing centripetal and centrifugal forces in the entrepreneurial university: a study of 10 research centres in a technical university'. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 22(8), pp.909–924. Available at:  
10.1080/09537325.2010.520471%5Cn<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=54595070&site=ehost-live>.

Subotzky, G. (1999) 'Alternatives to the Entrepreneurial University: New Modes of Knowledge Production in Community Service Programs'. *Higher Education*, 38(4), pp.401–440.

Subotzky, G. (2005) 'The Contribution of Higher Education to Reconstructing South African Society: Opportunities, Challenges, and Cautionary Tales', in G. A. Jones, ed. *Creating Knowledge, Strengthening Nations: The Changing Role of Higher Education*. London: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, pp. 127–154.

- Talja, S. (1999) 'Analyzing qualitative interview data: the discourse analytic method'. *Library & Information Science Research*, 21, pp.459–477.
- Taylor, M.P. (2012) 'The entrepreneurial university in the twenty-first century'. *London Review of Education*, 10(3), pp.289–305.
- Taylor, Y. (2014) *The Entrepreneurial University: Engaging Publics, Intersecting Impacts*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- ten Have, Paul (2004) *Understanding Qualitative Research and Ethnomethodology*, London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Thompson, J. D. (2003) *Organizations in Action: Social Science Bases of Administrative Theory*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Thompson, P. and Findlay, P. (1999) 'Changing the people: social engineering in the contemporary workplace', in Ray, L. and Sayer, A. (eds) *Culture and Economy After the Cultural Turn*. London: Sage, pp. 162–188.
- Tierney, W.G. (1988) 'Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials'. *Journal of Higher Education*, (59), pp.2–21.
- Truscot, Bruce (pseud.) (1943) *Redbrick University: A Study of the Modern Universities of England*, London: Penguin Books.
- US Department of Commerce (2013) *The Innovative and Entrepreneurial University: Higher Education, Innovation & Entrepreneurship in Focus*, Washington, DC. Available at: [https://www.eda.gov/pdf/the\\_innovative\\_and\\_entrepreneurial\\_university\\_report.pdf](https://www.eda.gov/pdf/the_innovative_and_entrepreneurial_university_report.pdf).
- Veciana, J. M. (2007) 'Entrepreneurship as a Scientific Research Programme', *Entrepreneurship*, 8(3), pp. 23–71. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-48543-8.
- Viale, R. & Henry Etzkowitz (2005) 'Third academic revolution: polyvalent knowledge; the “DNA” of the triple helix', *5th Triple Helix Conference*. Turin, Milano, available at: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.88.2728&rep=rep1&type=pdf> [accessed April 3, 2011]
- Walkerdine, V. (1987) 'No laughing matter: girls' comics and preparation for adolescent sexuality'. In J. M. Broughton, ed. *Critical Theories of Psychological Development*. New York: Plenum Press, pp. 87–126.
- Waller, W. & Hamilton, D.B. (2010) 'The entrepreneur as a cultural hero', in D. Hamilton et al., eds. *Cultural Economics and Theory: The Evolutionary Economics of David Hamilton*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 58–66.

- Wengraf, T. (2004) *Qualitative Research Interviewing: Biographic Narrative and Semi-Structured Methods*, London: Sage Publications.
- Westwood, R. & Clegg, S. (2003) 'The Discourse of Organization Studies: Dissensus, Politics, and Paradigms', in R. Westwood & S. Clegg, eds. *Debating Organization: Point-Counterpoint in Organization Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, pp. 1–42.
- Whyte, W. (2015) *Redbrick: A Social and Architectural History of Britain's Civic Universities*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiener, M. J. (2004) *English culture and the decline of the industrial spirit, 1850-1980*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511735073.
- Widdicombe, S. (1995) 'Identity, Politics and Talk: A Case for the Mundane and the Everyday', in S. Wilkinson & C. Kitziner, eds. *Feminism and Discourse: Psychological Perspectives*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 106–127.
- Williams, J. (2016) *Academic Freedom in an Age of Conformity: Confronting the Fear of Knowledge*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Williams, R. (1983) *Culture and Society, 1780-1950*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Williams, R. (2011) *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. London: Routledge.
- Winter, R. (2009) 'Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education'. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 31(2), pp.121–131. Available at: <http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/13600800902825835>.
- Witte, K. De & Muijen, J.J. van (1999a) Organizational Culture. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(4), pp.497–502.
- Witte, K. De & Muijen, J.J. van, (1999b) 'Organizational Culture: Critical Questions for Researchers and Practitioners'. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(4), pp.583–595.
- Wittrock, B. (1993) 'The Modern University: The Three Transformations', in S. Rothblatt & B. Wittrock, eds. *The European and American University Since 1800: Historical and Social Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 303–363.
- Wodak, R., 1996. *Disorders of Discourse*, London: Longman.
- Woollard, D., Zhang, M. & Jones, O. (2007) 'Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Insights from a new university business school'. *Institute for Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, (November), pp.1–15, available at: [www.isbe.org.uk/content/assets/BP07-Prac.pdf](http://www.isbe.org.uk/content/assets/BP07-Prac.pdf).

Yeung, A.K. et al. (1999) *Organizational Learning Capability: Generating and Generalizing Ideas with Impact*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zilwa, D. de (2007) 'Australian University Leaders: Agents of the Mc University, Entrepreneurial Transformers, or Bureaucrats?', in P. B. Richards, ed. *Global Issues in Higher Education*. Hauppauge, New York: Nova Science Publishers, pp. 149–172.

## APPENDIX A: LIST OF RESEARCH SITES

	Institutional Type	Interviews
1.	A 'post-92' regional urban university, formerly a polytechnic, primarily focussed on teaching, but with a growing research capacity.	4.
2.	A 'plate-glass' public research university, formerly a technical college, located in a large urban centre, and founded in the nineteen sixties.	3.
3.	A 'post-92' public research university, formerly a polytechnic, located in a regional and formerly industrially significant urban centre.	2.
4.	A 'red brick' regional public research university, and part of the Russell Group,	4.
5.	A 'post-92' university, formerly a technical college, based in the 'home counties', primarily focussed on teaching, but with a growing research capacity.	2.
6.	One of England's 'Ancient' collegiate public research Universities.	2.

## APPENDIX B: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

List of Participants					
Pseudonym	Discipline	Institution	Gender	Role	Service
'Arthur'	Education	1.	M	Lecturer.	30 Years
'Bernadette'	Education	1.	F	Lecturer.	Approx. 10 years
'Clark'	Political Science	2.	M	Professor.	Approx. 10 years
'Debby'	Linguistics, Education	3.	F	Professor.	25 – 30 years
'Elaine'	English & English Lit.	4.	F	Professor.	25 – 30 years
'Fergus'	Politics, International Studies, Environment.	4.	M	Reader.	20 + years
'Grainne'	Social Sciences.	3.	F	Lecturer.	20 – 30 years
'Hope'	History, Policy.	5.	F	Lecturer.	< 5 years
'Iris'	History.	6.	F	Professor.	30 Years
'Janet'	Arts, Visual Culture, Photography	1.	F	Professor.	> 30 Years
'Kieran'	Humanities, History.	5.	M	Professor.	20 – 30 years
'Louie'	Journalism	2.	M	Lecturer.	<10 years
'Matt'	Humanities, History.	6.	M	Professor.	> 30 Years
'Norah'	Performance Studies, Performing Arts.	1.	F	Professor.	20 years approx.
'Owen'	Politics, Public Policy.	4.	M	Senior Lecturer.	10 – 15 years.
'Patrick'	Arts, Theatre.	4.	M	Senior Lecturer.	Approx. 10 years
'Quinn'	Writing, Creative Writing.	2.	F	Lecturer, Chair.	< 5 years

## **APPENDIX C: THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

**[Date] [Participant Initials]**

### **PART A**

**1a.** Can you tell me about how you got to where you are today professionally?

*(The aim here is to elicit 'storied' accounts from participants - to induce 'narrative' - though do not state this indirectly)*

**1b.** What factors influenced you to choose this career?

*(What motivated you?)*

**1c.** How would you typically describe your work to others?

**1d.** What does your job entail?

**1f.** What values do you see as underpinning your work?

**1g.** How is your work important? Who does your work benefit? What purposes does it serve?

**1h.** How does the institutional culture of your university and its values influence your work? (Its 'vision')

### **PART B**

#### **B1. The Entrepreneurial University**

**1a.** The University that you work at has positioned itself publicly as an 'entrepreneurial university', what do you think it means for a university to be 'entrepreneurial'?

*(Both a) For a university to be 'entrepreneurial' and b) for your institution to have positioned itself as such.)*

**1b.** How is the university's entrepreneurial agenda communicated to you? *(form (channels of communication) and content)*

**1c.** How does the university's entrepreneurial stance impact on your work?

**1d.** Has this had any impact on how you feel about your work? Or talk about it?

## **B2. The Entrepreneurial Academic**

- 2a.** What does it mean for an academic to be entrepreneurial?
- 2b.** Can you align yourself with this concept? What relevance does this have to you and your work?
- 2c.** Do you feel that there is an expectation of you to be entrepreneurial in your work? How are you required to demonstrate this?
- 2d.** Does your university interpret any aspects of what you already do in your work as ‘entrepreneurial’? Do you agree with their assessment?
- 2e.** In an entrepreneurial culture academic workers are encouraged always to be open to new ways of thinking about their work, what do you think is driving this? Are you encouraged to behave as such?
- 2f.** Have you been given any responsibility for facilitating enterprise or cultivating entrepreneurial thinking in others?
- 2g.** Have you had any experience of working with staff responsible for supporting enterprise? What offers of support and development have been made? What role do you think that these staff members should be taking?

*(What level of engagement have they had with institutional staff appointed to facilitate enterprise and entrepreneurial thinking within their institutions)*

## **B3. Culture Change**

- 3a.** Advocates for ‘entrepreneurial universities’ place a strong emphasis on the imperative to transform ‘culture’ institutionally, what do you think that this means?
- 3b.** Is there much priority given to ‘culture change’ in your own University?
- How has this been communicated to you?
- 3d.** What changes to you think are actually happening?
- 3e.** Does this impact on your work?

Does this impact on how you are expected to communicate at work?

Does this influence how you think about your work?

#### **B4. Management and Leadership**

**4a.** In light of the emphasis on entrepreneurialism in your university, have you observed any changes in organisational and governance structures?

**4b.** Is this emphasis accompanied by its own styles of leadership?

**4d.** Have you been given any new responsibilities?

**4e.** Do you see yourself as having a more active or less active role in decision making processes at the university?

#### **Other Questions**

##### **Knowledge Sharing**

**5a.** Is there any onus on you to use or share your knowledge or expertise in new ways?

Are you expected to find new practical uses or applications for your knowledge?

What are your thoughts on these new expectations?

*(To explore new outlets for sharing or 'leveraging' knowledge and tacit 'know how')*

**5b.** Do you believe that academic workers should be more accountable for adding 'public value' to their work?

##### **Teaching**

**6a.** Do you think that it should be one of your responsibilities to develop 'entrepreneurial' thinking in your students?

**6b.** Are you expected to? And what do you think about this? How do you interpret it?

## APPENDIX D: TRANSCRIPTION NOTATION

Example	Name	Use
'My values are that (0.6) that people need'	Timed Pause	A number in parentheses indicates the time, in seconds, of a pause in speech. (.) Indicates a 'micro-pause'.
'They- my values are that- I feel that...'	Hyphen	Indicates the abrupt halt or interruption of an utterance.
'One hopes that <u>they</u> know what it means...'	Underline	Indicates a speaker emphasising or placing stress on a particular word or phrase.
(text)	Parentheses	Indicates speech that is unclear or in doubt.
'If such (h)a th(h)ing can be said...'	Laughter	Indicates laughter in speech.