

## **To Boldly Go...Enterprise and the University (0292)**

**Al-Bulushi Yousuf**<sup>1</sup>, Rebecca Boden<sup>1</sup>, <sup>1</sup>*University of Wales, Cardiff, Cardiff, United Kingdom*

Paper outline to be submitted in SRHE conference 2010

Constant changes and challenges in the local and global contexts of HE, such as massification, funding problems, globalisation, employability, knowledge transfer, and engagement in social and economic development have provided an imperative for institutions to (re)act more ‘entrepreneurially’ (Gibb et al., 2009; Shattock, 2009; Etzkowitz, 2008). These challenges and pressures have contributed to the generation of pressures on HE institutions to reconfigure themselves as ‘entrepreneurial’ (Clark, 1998; Etzkowitz, 2008). Consequently, critical changes have been made in HE policies, organisational context, governance and leadership (Shattock, 2009; Etzkowitz, 2008). Remarkable changes in university mission, culture and the ‘idea of the university’ are also evident (Nedeva, 2007; De Ziwa, 2005).

Rather than discuss the cause of these changes, challenges and pressures, this paper scrutinises the nature and extent of the entrepreneurial responses of UK HE institutions to them and considers whether and how these responses affect universities’ values, mission and culture.

Using literature from the management disciplines, the paper first presents a genealogy of the concept of the entrepreneurship from the entrepreneurial individual, through to the entrepreneurial organisations and social entrepreneurship to arrive at a robust understanding or conceptual framework that facilitates critique.

Originally, the concept of entrepreneurship was concerned with the essence of the entrepreneur’s personal characteristics and traits (Burns, 2008; Weckham, 2006; Kirby, 2003). It emphasises the importance of bearing uncertainty and risk (Casson, 1982); acting innovatively (Schumpeter, 1934); exploiting market opportunities (Krizner, 1973; Venkataraman, 1997); proactive rather than reactive behaviour (Sexton and Bowman-Upton, 1991); developing vision (Smilor, 2001); and leadership (Weckham, 2006).

This notion of entrepreneurship has been developed into the concept of ‘entrepreneurial organizations’ – organizations characterized by a set of entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviours (Covin & Slevin, 1991; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). This research asserts the possibility of integrating entrepreneurial characteristics and traits into management activity to create ‘corporate entrepreneurship’ (Covin & Slevin, 1990; Hornsby et al., 2002; Zahra et al., 2000); ‘entrepreneurial orientation’ (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Miller 1983;); and ‘entrepreneurial management’ (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990; Thomas, 2002).

Drucker (1985) asserts that entrepreneurship is based upon the same principles, whether the entrepreneur is an existing large organization or an individual starting a new venture and that entrepreneurial management is relevant to all types of organizations, regardless of whether the organization is a for-profit business, public-service agency, non-profit group or a governmental institution.

Recent perspectives on entrepreneurship encompass a wide range of applications and contexts. Thus entrepreneurship has expanded to include the development of frameworks for the emergence of entrepreneurship within the public and non-profit sectors (Dees, 1998; Drucker, 1985; Shockley et al, 2002), addressing the potential for such organisations to be entrepreneurial. According to Wickham (2006), these potential and actual applications are based on the assumption that entrepreneurship is a style of management, that entrepreneurs are managers who pursue opportunities and create change, that entrepreneurship is a social as well as an economic activity, and that entrepreneurs' motivations go beyond making money. These applications offer the prospect of 'social entrepreneurship' within the not-for-profit, business or governmental sectors.

Social entrepreneurship refers to entrepreneurial activity with a social objective (Dees & Anderson, 2003; Austin et al, 2004). Some sectors may operate hybrid structural forms which mix for-profit and non-profit approaches (Dees, 1998). The 'entrepreneurial university' can be regarded as a hybrid organisational form that combines both for-profit and non-profit elements. However, it can be far from clear in such organisations where the boundary between social and commercial activities lie and which is the most dominant. Also unclear is how all of these activities could change academic values, mission and culture.

Having developed this genealogy, this paper charts and analyses the extent of nine UK universities' entrepreneurial responses to change pressures. In-depth interviews were conducted with senior staff (up to VC level) to investigate the extent and nature of their institutional. The project explored the path to the creation of the 'entrepreneurial university' and the potential impact of such developments on values, culture and the basic idea of university.

As HE is global, and similar pressures and challenges are being felt by institutions globally, this paper concludes by exploring the potentialities and likely consequences of pursuing the notion of the entrepreneurial university in developing countries.

## REFERENCES

Casson, M. (1982) 'The Entrepreneur. An Economic Theory'. Martin Robertson and Co. Ltd. Oxford.

Clark, B. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Oxford, Pergamon for International Association of Universities & Elsevier Science Ltd.

Covin, J., and Slevin, P. (1990). New Venture Strategic Posture, Structure, and Performance: An Industry Life Cycle Analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6: 123-135.

De Ziwa, D., (2005) 'Using Entrepreneurial Activities as a Means of Survival: Investigating the Processes Used by Australian Universities to Diversify Their Revenue Streams'. *Higher Education*, Vol. 50, No. 3 (Oct., 2005), pp. 387-411.

Drucker, P., (1985). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. New York: Harper & Row.

Etzkowitz, H. (2008) 'The Triple Helix. University- Industry- Government, Innovation in Action'. Routledge. London.

Gibb, A., Haskins, G., and Robertson, I., (2009). *Leading the entrepreneurial university*. NCGE, Oxford.

Kirzner I. 1973. *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL.

Lumpkin GT, Dess GG. 1996. Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review* 21(1): 135-172.

Miller, D. (1983). The Correlates of Entrepreneurship in Three Types of Firms. *Management Science*, 29: 770-791.

Schumpeter, J.A. (1934) 'Theory of Economic Development'. Cambridge Mass. Harvard University Press.

Shattock, M. ed. (2009) 'Entrepreneurialism in Universities and the Knowledge Economy. Diversification and Organisational Change in European Higher Education'. Society for Research in Higher Education and the Open University Press. UK

Shockley, G., Frank, P. and Stough, R. (2002), "Toward a theory of public sector entrepreneurship", paper presented at the NCIIA 7th Annual Meeting, Boston, 20-22 March.

Wickham, P., (2006) *Strategic Entrepreneurship*, 4<sup>th</sup> (Ed), Person Education, UK.

Zahra S., Ireland I., and Hitt (2000) Entrepreneurship in Medium-Size Companies: Exploring the Effects of Ownership and Governance Systems. *Journal of Management* 2000, Vol. 26, No. 5, 947-976.